

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—TWENTY EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

18 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME X, 1969

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, 1969,
TO THE TEWENTY-SECOND DAY OF OCTOBER, 1969, INCLUSIVE.
INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

Queen's Printer for Canada, Ottawa, 1969

29180—651½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 18, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRICE STABILITY, INCOMES AND EMPLOYMENT

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER REPORTS OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

On the order: Government notices of motion:

That a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, to be known as the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Price Stability, Incomes and Employment, be appointed to consider the reports of the Prices and Incomes Commission, with powers to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon; to send for persons, papers and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the house; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee; and to delegate to sub-committees any of its powers except the power to report directly to the House of Commons.

That 12 members of the House of Commons, to be designated at a later date, act on behalf of the house as members of the said committee, seven of whom shall be required for a quorum.

That when a quorum is not present, the chairmen of the said committee or of its sub-committees be authorized to proceed with meetings for the purpose of receiving and printing evidence; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that house to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,670—**Mr. Yewchuk:** (supplementary)

1. What was the ratio of federal Civil Service employees to the total population of Canada in 1950, 1955, 1960, 1965, 1968?

2. What were the total expenditures for Civil Service salaries during the above years?

3. What was the average income tax paid by Canadians during the same years?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1, 2 and 3.

Year	Ratio Federal Government Employees to Total Population	Total Expenditures for Civil Service Salaries ($ Thousand)	Average Income Tax per Canadian (Dollars)
1950	1 : 106	34,123	89
1955	1 : 84	45,792	150
1960	1 : 88	62,895	167
1965	1 : 94	82,866	214
1968	1 : 87	116,031	264

Supplementary answer to the above Question which was tabled by the Hon. the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the House of Commons on April 2, 1969 (House of Commons Debates, pp. 7425-6) supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is as follows:

(a) The amounts shown under the heading "Total Expenditures for Civil Service Salaries ($ Thousand)" should be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Year	
1950	355,161
1955	542,856
1960	760,929
1965	1,029,761
1968 (Jan-Sept only)	1,062,602

Questions

(b) The column setting out the employee-population ratios should be footnoted as follows:

"Based on estimates of population as at June 1 and on the number of employees as at June 30 in the year concerned."

LEGALITY OF HOUSING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Question No. 2,139—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Did the government or the Department of Transport or any agency of government commission a study as to the constitutional legality of the recommendations by the Task Force on Housing?

2. If so, who was so commissioned, and what were the results of such a study?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1 and 2. The Task Force on Housing and Urban Development requested F. R. Scott, Esq., formerly Dean of Law, McGill University, and W. R. Lederman, Esq., formerly Dean of Law, Queen's University, to make observations on the functional constitutional issues concerning housing and urban development in Canada. As a result a memorandum was prepared and submitted.

SASKATCHEWAN—RECEIPTS UNDER ROADS-TO-RESOURCES PROGRAM

Question No. 2,164—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Under the Roads-to-Resources Program, what amounts has Saskatchewan received from the federal government for each year from 1958 up to and including 1967?

2. Has the federal government any record of the amounts spent by companies in Saskatchewan as their one-third share of any approved access road and, if so, what is the amount for each year the program was in effect?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. 1958-59, $750,000.00; 1959-60, $961,-224.08; 1960-61, $1,940,259.79; 1961-62, $806,-326.92; 1962-63, $581,565.81; 1963-64, $311,-863.04; 1964-65, $410,945.57; 1965-66, $718,-079.66; 1966-67, $563,622.16; 1967-68, $422,-535.47; 1968-69, $33,577.50; Total, $7,500,000.00.

2. There were no mine access roads constructed in Saskatchewan under the Road to Resources Program. However, under the Mine Access Roads Program which was in effect from 1946 to 1957, two mining roads were constructed in northern Saskatchewan. In each case the cost of construction was shared by the federal government, the provincial government and a mining company. The sum of the federal contributions was $75,583. The actual company expenditure is not on record in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources but is presumed to be $\frac{1}{3}$ of total cost.

[Mr. Pepin.]

Stony Rapids-Black Lake Road: A 14-mile gravel highway from Stony Rapids to Black Lake. The road was built in 1950 to serve the Black Lake property of Nistro Uranium Mines Limited and facilitated the installation of heavy equipment. The total cost of the road was $26,750, the contribution of the federal government was $8,917.

Ace Lake-Black Bay Road: Fourteen miles long, this road, built in 1950-51 connected the Beaverlodge mine of Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited with the port facilities at Black Bay on the Athabasca water route. Eldorado paid part of the cost of its construction and the federal government contributed $66,666.

TRANSFER OF TAXES PAID BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES

Question No. 2,246—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the government received from Quebec a request for the transfer to the provinces of the taxes paid by telephone companies?

2. What would be the value of such transfer?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Enquiries made at the Privy Council Office and the Department of National Revenue, and a search of Department of Finance files indicate that no formal request to this effect has been received from the Province of Quebec.

2. This information is not available.

REQUESTS FOR LETTER CARRIER SERVICE

Question No. 2,253—**Mr. Latulippe:**

Will the Minister of Communications give consideration to requests made by municipalities for letter carrier service and more particularly by such municipalities which have made expenditures in order to fulfil the requirements of the Department in this respect?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: Since March 1968, no new letter carrier delivery services have been established, because of the need to reduce governmental expenditures. Unfortunately, as long as the need to restrict new expenditures exists, provision of letter carrier delivery service in these communities will have to be deferred.

ADVERTISING FOR SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 2,262—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

How much money has the Department of Manpower and Immigration spent on advertising as part of the program to further summer student employment and what was the result of such advertising?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Summer 1968: Amount, $72,000. Results: Reports received by the Department indicate that the program was successful. Between July 25, 1968 and August 29, 1968, Canada Manpower Centres registered 11,652 students and made 12,231 placements. In addition there were many thousands of casual placements in day labour for farm work, berry picking, etc. There is no doubt that increased publicity lead to a greater number of jobs being obtained through CMCs than was normal for the time of the year. Summer 1969: Amount, $200,000. Results: It is much too early to be able to provide results of the 1969 Summer Employment for Students Campaign.

ATHABASCA—AREA DEVELOPMENT AID

Question No. 2,283—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. How many companies in the constituency of Athabasca have received aid under the Area Development Agency?

2. How many applications for aid have been received by the agency from this constituency to date?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. None.

2. Five. One was approved but not proceeded with by the applicant; two were withdrawn; two were rejected—one because it was located outside the designated area and the other because it did not involve manufacturing or processing.

APPLICATIONS FOR SECOND CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,287—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many applications for second class mailing privileges have been received by the Post Office Department since September 1, 1968 and how many of these were from non-profit organizations—religious, educational, welfare, trade union, co-operative, ethnic, etc.?

2. How many of the applications for second class mailing privileges received since September 1, 1968 have been approved and how many have been rejected by the Post Office Department?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. (a) 3779; (b) Information is not compiled in such a way as to indicate the number of applications received from specific types of organizations. To obtain the information requested would require the examination of individual files, would be time consuming and require undue labour and expense.

2. 2,476 applications have been accepted. 1,303 applications have been rejected.

SUBSIDIES TO INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Question No. 2,292—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. What was the total amount of credits made available to the Canadian Dairy Commission during the 1968-69 fiscal year for the payment of subsidies to industrial milk producers?

2. What was the total amount in subsidies paid to industrial milk producers in Canada by the Canadian Dairy Commission during the period from April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969?

3. What was the amount per province?

4. What was the subsidy rate per one hundred pounds of milk with a fat content of 3.5 for (a) 1967-1968 (b) 1968-1969?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The amount made available from the Agricultural Stabilization Account to the Canadian Dairy Commission for all of its activities totalled $134,845,000. This included provision for producer subsidies, storage, interest charges, advertising and all other activities of the Commission for the dairy support program.

2. Direct subsidies to industrial milk producers, including export equalization holdbacks, totalled $117,662,580.17.

3. P.E.I., $1,870,976.26; Nova Scotia, $584,809.94; New Brunswick, $1,246,826.94; Quebec, $52,540,738.14; Ontario, $40,056,084.01; Manitoba, $5,203,951.55; Saskatchewan, $4,481,753.10; Alberta, $10,146,510.24; British Columbia, $1,530,929.99.

4. (a) $1.21; (b) $1.31.

NEIL STEVENS—RECOGNITION TO PRIVATE PILOT

Question No. 2,325—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Has the government considered extending any measure of recognition to private pilot Neil Stevens who recently won a prize in the Great Transatlantic Air Race?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): No.

PRIVY COUNCIL INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,361—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does Privy Council Office provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by that Office for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Questions

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. No.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

BEAUCE—C.B.C. TRANSMISSION TOWER

Question No. 2,370—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

Does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation own a television relay transmitting tower in the Constituency of Beauce and, if so (a) where is it situated (b) in what year was it erected (c) what was the cost of the project (d) who carried out the work (e) what contractors took part in the construction (f) what was the value of each of the contracts (g) what is the power of the transmitter (h) what is the radius covered by the transmitter (i) which engineering firm prepared the technical report (j) what is its annual maintenance cost (k) are new studies under way presently concerning the site?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: (a) The C.B.C. owns a television rebroadcasting transmitter, CBVT-1, located adjacent to Highway 24, 2½ miles northeast of St. George de Beauce; (b) 1967; (c) $56,227; (d) Work was carried out under supervision of C.B.C. engineers; (e) and (f) RCA Victor, transmission facilities: $44,580; G. Morissette, building: $3,400; improvements to property: $2,200; Land, legal fees, surveying: $4,144; Provincial sales tax: $1,903; (g) five watts; (h) Service is not omnidirectional hence there is no radius of service. St. George de Beauce is southwest of the transmitter and from south to northwest the estimated Grade A service is 3 miles; Grade B is eight miles; (i) C.B.C. engineering headquarters; (j) Approximately $2,000; (k) Further study by C.B.C. engineers shows that due to the terrain some areas receive an inadequate signal. An application has been submitted to the CRTC for the relocation of this station to overcome the problem while maintaining satisfactory service in those areas where the signal is now acceptable.

"DON MESSER JUBILEE"—CONTINUATION ON REGIONAL BASIS

Question No. 2,384—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Would C.B.C. stations be free to negotiate for the use of a show produced by a Hamilton television station without network affiliation with either C.B.C. or C.T.V.?

2. If so, would any restrictions be placed by C.B.C. on its own stations as to the time such show could be telecast and, if so, what restrictions?

3. Did C.B.C. offer to the Don Messer Jubilee the opportunity to continue their show on a local or regional basis and, if so, on what suggested terms and to what point in negotiations?

4. Will any station or region of the C.B.C. be showing the Don Messer Jubilee in the Fall-Winter season of 1969-70 and, if so, which ones?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The only restrictions on C.B.C. stations would be that the program would have to be scheduled in a local time period to avoid conflict with network programming obligations.

3. No.

4. No arrangement has been made for C.B.C. local or regional scheduling.

NEWSTART PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,396—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Where are NEWSTART programmes presently in operation?

2. What was the date of their commencement?

3. What staff is involved in each NEWSTART and in what positions?

4. What monies have been expended in each NEWSTART Corporation?

5. What numbers of students have been involved in each NEWSTART?

6. What provincial monies have been expended?

7. What specific training projects are presently in operation and what is the research value?

8. Have any programmes or projects developed by NEWSTART Corporation been implemented in the educational system of any of the various provinces and, if so, which ones?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):

1.	2.	4. (as of 1 June 1969 $)
Yarmouth County, Nova Scotia	29 June, 1967	1,438,100
Kings County, Prince Edward Island	28 August, 1967	942,065
Prince Albert, Saskatchewan	10 August, 1967	865,000
Lac la Biche, Alberta	9 August, 1967	1,994,822
Richibucto, New Brunswick	27 May, 1969	10,000

[Mr. Robinson.]

3. 5. 7. 8. NewStart Corporations are autonomous, non-profit comapnies set up under the provincial legislation of the provinces in which they operate and requests for information about their internal management and operations should therefore be made to the corporations.

6. None. Under the federal-provincial agreements by which NewStart Corporations are formed the Federal Government assumes responsibility for 100 per cent of the costs.

SEED POTATO MISSIONS TO CANADA

Question No. 2,405—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What attempts have been made by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, to increase the number of seed potato missions to Canada in 1968, 1969 and 1970?

2. What countries has the Department invited or encouraged to visit seed potato areas in Canada?

3. Has consideration been given to sending seed potato missions for exporting purposes to countries outside Canada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is sponsoring a Seed Potato Mission from Israel during the summer of 1969 and is considering the possibility of a mission to South America sometime during this fiscal year. In 1968 the Department sponsored a Seed Potato Mission from Romania. In 1968 the Department also arranged visits to Venezuela and Cuba by a Department of Agriculture expert to look into plant health problems in seed potato shipments. The Department's Trade Missions Programme for 1970 is presently under consideration.

2. The Department has invited a number of countries in which markets or potential markets for seed potatoes exist to send representatives to visit seed potato areas in Canada. The following have accepted: Greece, Argentina, Jamaica, Uruguay, Italy, Venezuela, Portugal, South Africa, Romania and Israel.

3. Yes.

CIVIL SERVICE REORGANIZATION

Question No. 2,429—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Is the government considering reorganization of the Civil Service?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): No.

ALBERTA AREA DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Question No. 2,437—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Did the following companies in Alberta qualify for grants under the Area Development Agency; Becker Manufacturing, Phillips Wire and Cable, Saratoga Gas and Oil and Imperial Oil Ltd.?

2. If so, what was the amount of grant in each case?

3. In what year were the grants paid?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. One company only; Imperial Oil Limited.

2. It is expected that two grants of 5 million dollars each will be paid in respect of two separate facilities.

3. Not applicable.

SUBSIDY TO "LES MINES MADELEINE LIMITÉE"

Question No. 2,443—**Mr. Cyr:**

1. Has the government paid, or promised to pay, a subsidy to "Les Mines Madeleine Limitée" of Ste-Anne-des-Monts, Quebec, through the Area Development Agency and, if so, what is the total amount of such subsidy or the sum paid?

2. Did the company ask for financial assistance in any form from government for the opening new mining industry in Gaspé and, if so, under what programme has this assistance been given?

3. On what date did any such subsidy begin and in what amount?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): 1. No.

2. No.

3. Not applicable.

TASKS ALLOTTED TO CANADIAN FORCES

Question No. 2,471—**Mr. Robinson:**

What are the specific tasks allotted to the Canadian Forces and what is the breakdown of forces for each task?

Mr. W. D. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence): At the present time, the specific tasks allotted to the Canadian Forces are as outlined in the White Paper on Defence, tabled in the House of Commons, in March 1964. The forces allotted to these tasks are as shown at pages 839-851, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 23, of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, dated February 4, 1969.

*KINGSTON, ONT.—WINDOW WASHING CONTRACT

Question No. 2,475—**Mr. Hales:**

1. Did the Department of Supply and Services pay under contract the Acme Window Cleaners, Kingston, Ontario the sum of $18,430 for the period May 12 to October 31, 1969 for window washing at the Canadian Forces Base, Kingston and, if so, for what reasons were Base personnel unable to perform such services?

2. How many buildings are involved?

3. On what basis did the Department estimate the value of work done?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is in three parts. 1. A contract was awarded to Acme Window Cleaners, Kingston, Ontario, for window cleaning at the Canadian Forces Base, Kingston, Ontario, in the amount of $18,430. Payment is based on spring cleaning at $9,065 for work to be completed by approximately June 27, 1969, and fall cleaning at $9,365 for work to be completed by October 31, 1969. The base establishment does not provide military or civilian staff to carry out services of this nature. In addition, it is considered more economical to carry out this type of work at urban locations by contract rather than by casual labour.

2. 128 buildings were involved.

3. The contract was placed on the basis of the lower competitive tender received for performance of the work. The estimated cost was based on size, height and number of windows.

QUEBEC—CANADIAN FORCES TRADE SCHOOL

Question No. 2,478—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the federal government's intention to establish a French-speaking trade school in Quebec for Canadian Forces and, if so, what is the cost, how many tradesmen will be trained per month and how will they be absorbed into the Canadian Forces?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence): L'École Technique des Forces canadiennes was opened at Saint-Jean, Quebec, on April 15, 1969. In view of the fact that only one course has commenced, an estimate of the costs involved, and the number to be trained per month is not yet available. On completion of training, these tradesmen will be absorbed into French-speaking units of the Canadian Forces. This will not preclude them, however, from future employment with English-speaking units.

CABINET COMMITTEES ON POVERTY

Question No. 2,489—**Mr. Broadbent:**

What are the names of the two Cabinet committees co-ordinating the economic and regional aspects of poverty and what Ministers belong to each of the Cabinet committees as mentioned by the Prime Minister in *Hansard* of April 23, page 7857?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The arrangements made by the Cabinet for the discharge of the business for which it is collectively responsible are matters for the Cabinet itself and are not customarily disclosed.

[Mr. Hales.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

LEASING OF BUILDINGS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,456—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many leases does the federal government have with firms or individuals that are for a period of one year or more where the rental in question is between $10,000 and $50,000 annually?

2. Is each instance, what is the name of the firm or individual, what is the term of the lease, where is the space located, what is the annual amount of the rental and on what date does the lease expire?

Return tabled.

CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Question No. 1,859—**Mr. Peddle:**

1 How many post offices and/or federal public buildings were completed, commenced, constructed or enlarged in Canada since the beginning of 1965 in towns or villages of less than 8,000 population?

2 What are the locations, total or estimated costs and populations served in each case?

3 What is the total floor space area of each such building?

Return tabled.

PROMOTION OF WHEAT SALES TO JAPAN

Question No. 1,880—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

What, if any, promotional activities are being undertaken by Canada to convince the Japanese of the many uses of Canadian wheat (a) what agencies are involved in carrying out such promotion (b) is Canada successfully competing with other countries in relation to this matter?

Return tabled.

INQUIRY AS TO SECOND CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,141—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. What periodicals and publications in Canada as at April 29 enjoyed second class mailing privileges?

2. What is the criteria applied in the granting of such privileges?

3. Was the criteria applied in the case of each publication listed, or were there any exceptions or special cases?

4. Where exceptional or special treatment was accorded, what are the names of the publications to benefit from such treatment and in each case what was the reason?

Return tabled.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we could have the co-operation of the government in answering question No. 2,047 which has been on the order paper for almost two months? It is a very simple and straightforward question and I should like an answer before the conclusion of this session.

Mr. Forest: We will look into the matter.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 120, 162, 169 and 199 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

BACKGROUND REPORTS FOR HOUSING TASK FORCE

Motion No. 120—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all background reports and studies prepared for the Task Force on Housing.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY POLLUTION STANDARDS

Motion No. 162—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all standards on pollution established by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry.

Motion agreed to.

LOG EXPORTS TO JAPAN

Motion No. 169—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the representatives of any organizations, companies or provincial authorities regarding the export of logs to Japan.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING PHOSPHOROUS PLANT AT PLACENTIA BAY

Motion No. 199—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all arrangements, correspondence, etc., between the Government of Canada and the Electric Reduction Company regarding the establishment of a phosphorous plant at Long Harbour, Placentia Bay, Newfoundland.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 198 is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING POLLUTION AT PLACENTIA BAY

Motion No. 198—**Mr. Harding:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland regarding the pollution problem at Placentia Bay, Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 198 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motion Nos. 142, 144, 154, 155, 156, 157, 171, 174, 182, 183, 201, 219 and 220?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motion be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

CANADIAN JAVELIN LINERBOARD MILL

Motion No. 142—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, memoranda, agreements or arrangements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and Canadian Javelin Limited, or its subsidiary, Melville Pulp and Paper Limited, regarding a new linerboard mill and wood products complex.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, no agreements or arrangements on this matter have been completed. While the production of papers will always be considered if and when an agreement or arrangement has been made with any company, it would be a breach of business confidentiality if information were made public before such a case is concluded. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Motions for Papers

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

TEXAS GULF NORTHERN ONTARIO SMELTER

Motion No. 144—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, agreements or arrangements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Ontario, and the Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, regarding a new smelter in Northern Ontario.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that no confidential information relating to the competitive position of the company concerned which has been given to the government in connection with an application for grant should be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 144 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS TO GOLDEN EAGLE AT QUEBEC

Motion No. 154—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, arrangements, etc., between the Government of Canada and Golden Eagle Corporation at Quebec City, Quebec, regarding financial grants or incentives under the Area Development Incentives Act.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that no confidential information relating to the competitive position of the company concerned which has been given to the government in connection with an application for grant should be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 154 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS TO IRVING OIL AT QUEBEC

Motion No. 155—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, arrangements, etc., between the Government of Canada and Irving Oil Corporation at Quebec City, Quebec, regarding financial grants or incentives under the Area Development Incentives Act.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that no confidential information relating to the competitive position of the company concerned which has been given to the government in connection with an application for grant should be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 155 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS TO IRVING OIL AT SAINT JOHN

Motion No. 156—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, arrangements, etc., between the Government of Canada and Irving Oil Corporation at Saint John, N.B., regarding financial grants or incentives under the Area Development Incentives Act.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that no confidential information relating to the competitive position of the company concerned which has been given to the government in connection with an application for grant should be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 156 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS TO GULF OIL AT POINT TUPPER

Motion No. 157—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, arrangements, etc., between the Government of Canada and Gulf Oil Corporation at Point Tupper, Nova Scotia, regarding financial grants or incentives under the Area Development Incentives Act.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that no confidential information relating to the com-

petitive position of the company concerned which has been given to the government in connection with an application for grant should be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that Notice of Motion No. 157 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

PLANNING PROGRAMMING BUDGETING GUIDE

Motion No. 171—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the cost-benefit study, as prescribed by Treasury Board Manual *Planning Programming Budgeting Guide*, on the Defence Development Sharing Program referred to by Mr. D. Mundy, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on April 1, 1969.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) that he cannot accept this motion for the following reasons:

1. At no time did the minister or officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce state that a cost-benefit study had been carried out on the defence development sharing program as prescribed by Treasury Board's planning programming budgeting guide.

2. In accepting the hon. member's previous motion in this house on April 23, 1969, which was No. 101, it was agreed to produce a copy of a cost-benefit analysis showing sales resulting from defence industry productivity program support to Canadian industry.

This analysis, which the member has already received, showed the ratio between sales achieved and projected and government funds expended on all completed projects up to the end of 1967 under the defence industry productivity program. Furthermore, this analysis is exactly that described by an official of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in his testimony before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on April 1, 1969.

In view of this,—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some reservations about the statement which the parliamentary secretary is making now. It seems to me he is debating the issue. He should indicate to the house whether or not it is his intention to accept the motion. I understand that he has indicated he is not prepared to accept the motion. It is up to the hon. member to indicate whether he wishes it transferred for debate.

Mr. Broadbent: I ask that it be transferred for debate, Mr. Speaker.

Transferred for debate under Standing Order 48.

GUIDELINES ON CAPITAL FLOW FROM U.S.

Motion No. 174—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, memoranda, agreements, etc., between the Government of the United States regarding guidelines on the flow of capital from the United States administered by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for Exernal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table exchanges of letters between the Minister of Finance and the United States Secretary of the Treasury dated March 7 and December 16, 1968 which contain all the essential elements of the arrangements between Canada and the United States with regard to guidelines on the flow of capital from the United States. These letters have already been made public but are being tabled again today for the convenience of the hon. member. All other correspondence with the United States on this matter has been by way of technical elaboration. Such correspondence represents confidential communications exchanged in the course of negotiations between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States. On this basis I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Broadbent: I withdraw the motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INFORMATION TASK FORCE INTERIM REPORT

Motion No. 182—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interim report of the Government Task Force on Information.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 182 is for a copy of the interim report of the task force on government information. The report referred to was largely oral and not in

a form suitable for tabling. However, the government will be receiving the final report over the next few weeks, and a decision will be made as to whether or not publication is in the public interest after there has been an opportunity to give the entire report careful study.

For these reasons I ask that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Mather: I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INFORMATION TASK FORCE CONSULTANT STUDIES

Motion No. 183—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all consultant studies, questionnaire surveys and other background reports prepared for the Government Task Force on Information.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the reports and papers asked for in motion No. 182 were prepared on a confidential basis. Therefore I ask that this motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Mather: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, may I ask that the matter be transferred for debate?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is in order and the item is transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

Transferred for debate under Standing Order 48.

CONTRACTOR BIDS ON COMMUNICATION SATELLITE

Motion No. 219—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the contractor bids on the communication satellite by RCA Victor Limited and Northern Electric Co. Limited.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications and Postmaster General): The two companies referred to in this motion, R.C.A. Limited and Northern Electric Company Limited, have not been requested to submit contractor bids on the communication satellite as procurement contracts have not yet been awarded. I informed the House of Commons on June 13, 1969 that officials in the Department of Communications were on that date instructed to open negotiations with these two companies on the procurement contract for Canada's domestic communication satellite. Under the circumstances I ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

[Mr. Walker.]

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be transferred for debate.

Transferred for debate under Standing Order 48.

LAUNCHING OF CANADIAN SATELLITE

Motion No. 220—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the principles agreed to by Canada and the United States regarding the launching of a Canadian satellite.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications and Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the text of the public statement agreed to by Canada and the United States which sets out the details of an agreement in principle regarding the launching of a Canadian satellite was quoted in the house on June 13, 1969 (page 10016 of *Hansard* of June 13, 1969). Under the circumstances I ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Gilbert: I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ESTABLISHING OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE—PARTICIPATION BY OTHER COUNTRIES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the proposed international development centre has been established by the government.

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

Mr. Stanfield: Is it expected that this centre will be established shortly? Has the Prime Minister any information he can give us with regard to progress in this direction?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. I cannot give the house any date on which it may be. I can say what has been said earlier by the Secretary of State for External Affairs—that projects have been prepared and are now being examined by the government.

Mr. Stanfield: I would have asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs about this if I had any idea when he would return. Is it contemplated that other countries will

participate in this international centre or will it be established and financed entirely by Canada itself?

Mr. Trudeau: The policy has not yet been determined in a final way by the government and therefore I should not like to announce it.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CANADAIR LIMITED, MONTREAL—LAY-OFF OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Supply and Services regarding Canadair Limited in Montreal, which allegedly has laid off some 1,500 men since January 1 without any notice whatsoever. In view of the fact that this company is operating mainly on the basis of government contracts, may I ask whether there are any provisions in these contracts to safeguard the Canadian employees of this United States subsidiary and ensure that proper notice is given these employees who are being laid off?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, because I do not know the details of the contracts as they may affect the security of employees.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that Orenda, the company at Malton which makes the engines for these planes, does give its employees notice and severance pay, will the minister make representations to Canadair to see that it gives the same treatment to its employees?

Mr. Richardson: I will look into that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

ST. JEAN BAPTISTE DAY—CELEBRATION OF ST. GEORGES DE BEAUCE—MONTREAL PARADE

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

Following the unfortunate events that took place in Sherbrooke recently the Prime Minister has been invited to Saint-Georges de Beauce to attend the celebration of St. Jean Baptiste Day—the feast of French Canadians—and I would like to ask him if he is seriously thinking of accepting that invitation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have not yet seen that invitation, but I was told before coming to the house that I had effectively received it, and I am most happy. Such an invitation is extremely welcome under the circumstances and certainly indicates that the population is standing firm. There are probably many Liberals and a few Créditistes there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I will send my reply as soon as possible.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

As there are lots of Créditistes in Beauce, is he of the opinion and does he admit that those people are at least civilized?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Charlevoix.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

The president of the St. Jean Baptiste Day celebrations announced this morning in Montreal that 10 countries would be represented in the St. Jean Baptiste parade and that 25 ambassadors would attend. He also added that he had not considered inviting any representative of the federal government.

As I know that this is an insult to French Canadians who are members of this house, could the Prime Minister, on behalf of parliament, protest strongly and officially against the attitude of the leaders of the St. Jean Baptiste society of Montreal?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it belongs to me to protest strongly. I understand that a private body is organizing those celebrations, but I quite agree with the hon. member and it seems to me that those who accept to participate in such a demonstration could well ask themselves how it is that they are invited if the federal government is not.

[*English*]

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR WHITE PAPER ON NATIONAL SECURITIES COMMISSION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the

Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Could the minister advise the house what progress he has made with the provinces in arriving at an agreement in regard to a national securities commission, and when does the minister envisage that this house will be given either a white paper or an indication of the legislation to establish this commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we are considering our position and having some discussions with the provinces. I hope to make some definitive statement after I have had some discussions with the government during the course of the summer.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—CONGRATULATIONS TO ONTARIO UPON ACCEPTING PLAN

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I wonder whether he could convey to the Premier of Ontario the congratulations of this house or of the government on his sudden and spectacular conversion to the federal medicare plan, especially in light of his recent description of it as the greatest Machiavellian fraud ever perpetrated on the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAINLAND CHINA—REPORTED NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING CANADIAN DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Make sure you face the camera.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I always wait until the applause dies down. I have just given the cameraman a sign and I will now ask my question.

My question is to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement made in Stockholm yesterday which was given wide publicity in the news this morning—I am sure that the Prime Minister is thoroughly familiar with it—that a good deal of hard bargaining is expected by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the negotiations between Canada—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member now put his question.

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker, now the picture has been taken I can relax and ask my question. In view of this hard bargaining that the Secretary of State for External Affairs expects in these negotiations, does the government expect that Canada will have to pay a high price for the privilege of recognizing Communist China?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the question as asked by the hon. member does not have argumentative overtones?

Mr. Hees: Then I will ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which is not argumentative at all.

Mr. Bell: They might take another picture.

Mr. Hees: May I ask the Prime Minister by way of a supplementary question whether the government is examining the report which has been widely circulated today that Communist China is going to demand that Canada accept in the future a large quantity of textiles each year as the price for allowing China to be recognized by this country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear. hear.

Mr. Hees: Turn the other way, Pierre.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Prime Minister should now address the Chair.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I can remember the answer, let alone the question. I think perhaps there is a link between the question the hon. member asked and the question of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). If I were to congratulate all those who have been converted to the governments' point of view I should have little time for anything else.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: The Prime Minister should hire some new speech writers to write some new speeches.

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE—TRANSFER OF MATERIALS ACROSS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether anyone with his back to the camera can be made to be heard. May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Has the United States government sought and obtained the permission of the Canadian government to transport across our territory germs and other materials to be used at biological warfare test centres in Alaska and Greenland?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. I think it ought to be asked of the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, no such request has been received.

Mr. Lewis: May I direct a supplementary question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. Are such flights being made over Canadian territory and do these flights carry very dangerous germs and other materials? If that is so will the minister make inquiries about the matter?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, under our arrangement with the United States it is expected that before any such flights are made there will be consultation with Canada. I would therefore be rather surprised if the speculation advanced by the hon. member turns out to be warranted.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to gather from the minister's answer that the Canadian government until now has not been consulted on the matter at all?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, no permission for such flights has been sought.

Mr. Lewis: That is no answer, Mr. Speaker.

VISIT OF MINISTER TO SCANDINAVIA

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of reports that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is presently visiting Scandinavia to carry the gospel of Canada's continuing interest in NATO to Finland and Sweden, that minister having been reported to declare that he did not go to Stockholm to meet Chinese diplomats, will the Prime Minister tell us the reason for the visit to Scandinavia at this time, when the session has a few days only to run and when the minister's presence is needed here?

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

AIRPORTS

CHARLOTTETOWN—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF TERMINAL

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which is prompted by a reply given the other day to my question concerning the much needed extension of Charlottetown airport. Will the minister have another look at this very important and, indeed, urgent matter with a view to giving it a far higher priority than seemed to be indicated the other day?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I shall be glad to review the matter.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since we need adequate instrument landing facilities at Charlottetown or Summerside airports and since facilities at these airports are outdated and inadequate for the maintenance of proper jet service, will the minister reconsider his department's answer to the effect that the necessary new equipment will not be installed at the earliest until 1972 or 1973?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be pleased to look into that.

GRAIN

WHEAT—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION TO MEET LOWER PRAIRIE INCOME

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Now that the minister has had ample time to study the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture on its western tour, what action is the government contemplating in solving the serious cash shortage of the western grain grower?

An hon. Member: The minister has no answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that there was debate on this very subject which lasted all day yesterday and all evening. If he is asking the

minister to make a statement, I think that statement ought to be made on motions.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question not having been allowed, there cannot be a supplementary.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is asking his question because the minister gave us no answers yesterday.

Mr. Olson: I made adequate answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to take your suggestion to heart and make a statement on motions about this matter?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will consult *Hansard* at pages 10262 and 10263 he will see there an indication of the government's position.

Mr. Baldwin: So far as an answer is concerned, those pages are a complete blank.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE

SHORTAGE OF FUNDS FOR ADVERTISING AND PROTECTIVE STAFF

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. Is the minister now in a position to answer the question that was addressed to him in his absence last Friday by my colleague for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding). It was about funds of the National Arts Centre. Is the centre short of funds for advertising, adequate protective staff and other purposes?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have no immediate recollection of that question having been asked. It seems to me that type of question ought to be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour could check *Hansard* for last Friday and you will see that the question was asked. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Mr. Stanbury) said that the minister would be in the house on Monday to answer it. In view of publicity that has been given to certain allegations I think there is urgency to the question.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the directors of the National Arts Centre that there is no financial problem at all. On the contrary, I was told this morning by the director about the unexpected success achieved at the box office. The fact is that where it was expected that 65 per cent of available tickets would be sold, 86.6 per cent were sold. Accordingly, the Centre had enough funds to finance its own advertizing for its opening festival. I was also told that security guards were available in sufficient numbers. Security problems arise rather from lack of experience, but the situation is being corrected and is improving every day.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister satisfied that there are sufficient funds for advertising and other purposes in the months that lie ahead?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Secretary of State who answers to this house for the C.B.C. maintains that there are no difficulties so far as the budget is concerned for the arts centre, will he make sure that the C.B.C. is accurate in its news reporting?

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will there be sufficient advertising funds for programs to come two weeks from now, after the present showing at the National Arts Centre of "Anne of Green Gables" and "Johnny Belinda"? These shows do not require advertising, being of great excellence.

OIL

AGREEMENT ON EXPORTS OF CRUDE TO U.S.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. The question has to do with one department of government. Since the Canadian Petroleum Association indicated in evidence before the committee last evening that the 1967 agreement which gave the United States the right to cut back exports of Canadian crude petroleum was kept confidential, may I ask whether since that date any agreement of a confidential nature has been signed with the United States having to do

with exports of crude petroleum from Canada to the United States?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot cover from my personal knowledge all that period since 1967. I think the hon. member ought to direct his question to the appropriate minister.

Mr. Woolliams: I think the Prime Minister misunderstood the question. Has a new confidential agreement that has been kept from the oil industry been made with the government of the United States about exports of crude petroleum?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the Prime Minister replies I must remind the hon. member that questions ought to be directed to the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: May I put the question to the Chair, sir?

Mr. Speaker: That is understood.

Mr. Woolliams: May I?

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Woolliams: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not hear my question. I should like to ask it of the Prime Minister. Since 1967 has any confidential agreement that has been kept from the oil industry been entered into with the United States, under which the United States is to cut back exports of crude petroleum from this country to the United States? Does the Prime Minister not want to reply?

Mr. Trudeau: The question was not directed to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

BELLEVILLE, ONT.—INVESTIGATION RESPECTING DEFECTIVE EQUIPMENT

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the increasing number of reportedly defective railway cars found at the Belleville C.N.R. terminal, including a lack of proper brake pipe testing, will the minister take immediate steps in the interests of safety to delay the removal of any carmen at the end of June until such time as an investigation is conducted by the Board of Transport Commissioners?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I suspect that is entirely outside my responsibility, in terms of the removal of employees, however I will be glad to look at the question and convey the hon. member's representations to the C.N.R.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

JOSEPH DUFFOR—APPEARANCE BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Possibly the minister may wish to take it as notice and give me an answer tomorrow. Was Joseph Duffor hired by the Special Committee of Poverty in the other place? If so, on what basis was he selected for this position?

Mr. Speaker: I think this is a question which ought to be placed on the order paper, if it is in order at all.

COMMUNICATIONS

SUPPORT BY DR. O. M. SOLANDT OF BELL CANADA RATE INCREASE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Yesterday the hon. member for Wellington-Grey was ruled out of order when he attempted to ask the President of the Treasury Board a question concerning the appearance of Dr. Solandt, Chairman of the Science Council of Canada, before the Canadian Transport Commission in support of the application of the Bell Telephone Company for a rate increase.

In view of the fact that the public interest is involved to a considerable extent, and the importance of knowing on whose behalf and with what authority Dr. Solandt appeared, I ask the President of the Treasury Board if he will ascertain and let the house know as soon as convenient whether Dr. Solandt appeared on behalf of the Science Council of Canada, on his own personal initiative, or with the authorization of the government?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

D.D.T.—REASONS FOR BANNING OF USE IN SCANDINAVIA

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I am glad to see he is here in the house in spite of the roster for today. Now that

Denmark has joined Sweden in banning the use of d.d.t. in agriculture, forestry and horticulture, can the minister advise whether his department is studying the reasons for such a ban in these Scandinavian countries?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have this under constant review. We are also very keenly aware of the great benefits in lowering the cost of production that d.d.t. has for our farmers in Canada. We must also take that into account.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are discussions being held by the Department of Agriculture with other government departments which are interested in pollution control?

Mr. Olson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): A supplementary to the Prime Minister. Since the matter of the roster has been mentioned, will the Prime Minister assure the house that he will not take disciplinary action against—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot rise on a supplementary at this point. Perhaps he may have a legitimate question in a moment. I draw to his attention that this is not a supplementary.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

AMENDMENTS TO MEASURE TO RESTORE DELETIONS MADE FOLLOWING MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the news reports of last Friday that the premier of one of the provinces may well contest the legality of the official languages bill in the courts, is it the intention of the minister to introduce amendments to the bill when it comes before this house to restore the provisions of the bill which were deleted or amended following his meeting with the Attorneys General of the provinces earlier this year?

Mr. Speaker: It seems the hon. member is asking a question about a matter which will be considered later today. I suggest the hon. member cannot in this way anticipate an order of the day.

LABOUR RELATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTLEMENT OF IRON ORE STRIKE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask him if representations have been made to him to have the federal Department of Labour join with the provinces of Quebec and Newfoundland in an attempt to settle the iron ore strike in Quebec and Labrador? This affects not only workers coming under provincial jurisdictions, but also dock and railway workers. What action is the Prime Minister taking with regard to these representations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am informed I did receive a telegram to that effect this morning. I referred the matter to the Department of Labour.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary to the Prime Minister or the Acting Minister of Labour. Has an approach been made to the Premier of Quebec and to the Premier of Newfoundland indicating the willingness of the federal government to lend its good offices to settle this six week old strike? If so, what was the reply of the respective premiers?

Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the minister on June 9 indicated the government's willingness to enter into this, and to mediate. The province of Quebec agreed with this, but not the province of Newfoundland.

COMBINES

BEEF—INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE PROSECUTIONS UNDER ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the proper statement made by the Minister of Agriculture that receipts by farmers of present prices for beef are fair and reasonable, and the difference of opinion expressed by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, will the minister say now whether he is contemplating prosecuting under the Combines Investigation Act? The information available today is that while wholesale prices of beef have risen 13.6 cents a pound over a period of time, chain stores have raised their prices from 25 cents to 40 cents a pound. Is the minister going to take some action in this regard?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members of the government will be delighted with the endorsement from the right hon. gentleman, and the acknowledgement that the Minister of Agriculture is a

great fighter on behalf of the interests of the department; also the acknowledgement by the right hon. gentleman that the Minister of Agriculture has properly put the case before the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must bring to the attention of hon. members and the minister that we are running short of time. I see large numbers of members waiting for a chance to ask questions.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That kind of answer—

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the right hon. gentleman in a moment. I remind hon. members we are running short of time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After the prelude of nonsense, will the minister say whether for once he is going to be a responsible minister and protect the Canadian consumers by taking action?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

DRUGS—PRICE FIXING BY B.C. PHARMACISTS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the minister say when a report is expected from the combines investigation branch on a matter recently referred to that branch by the Minister of Welfare of the province of British Columbia, namely the legality of the $1 fee being charged welfare patients for their drug prescriptions by the British Columbia Professional Pharmacists Society?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation to the minister. I think that question might be placed on the order paper and discussed at the time of adjournment.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister which I am sure he is expecting. Will the Prime Minister assure the house he will not take disciplinary action against the five cabinet ministers who defied his orders and came into the house today to carry out their duties, even though we know there are ulterior reasons for their doing so?

EDUCATION

EXTENSION OF YOUTH ALLOWANCE

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the minister received any correspondence from boards of education requesting that the youth allowance be extended until the completion of students' secondary school courses, regardless of age?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Not that I can recall, Mr. Speaker.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE—DISCUSSION AS TO AGENCY TO CO-ORDINATE ACTION

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Was there any discussion at the recent constitutional conference with respect to the establishment of a special federal agency to co-ordinate the many ways in which the federal government is involved in the field of human resources development, or education?

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

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

RECOGNITION OF ST-JEAN-BAPTISTE DAY

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is just a short one for the Prime Minister in order to clarify information for visiting school groups. Will next Tuesday, June 24, St-Jean-Baptiste day, one of the days on which this house normally does not sit, be recognized as a holiday by the house as usual?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR GRANT BY UNITED BLACK FRONT

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the minister advise whether the grant in respect of the Black United Front in Nova Scotia will be paid directly to the front, or directly to the county of Halifax to supplement their own program?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the matter of a grant and the manner of payment is still under consideration by the government, the Secretary of State and so on.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the

cause of the delay arises out of the fact that the government is now considering an interim grant as opposed to the full $100,000 at the outset?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was ever any question of a full lump sum grant initially. It was always in terms of a phasing over a period of years.

Mr. Forrestall: Then, could the minister give some indication whether this matter will be resolved before the house recesses for the summer?

Mr. Munro: It is hopeful, Mr. Speaker.

PENITENTIARIES

FEDERAL PRISON AT MILLHAVEN—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION BY STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Solicitor General. In view of the statement by Professor Stuart Ryan of Queen's University that the new federal prison at Millhaven which will be the replacement for the Kingston penitentiary is a glorified hole of bullet-proof glass and stainless steel which we should all be afraid of, will the minister make a statement on motions and refer this matter to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for study?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker, I would not be disposed to dignify in that way the statement the hon. member has just made. But if there is any concern about the institution I would be very glad to answer any questions I can on that subject.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, would the minister make a statement on motions with regard to the serious matter the professor has pointed out to the Canadian public.

WATER RESOURCES

POLLUTION BY D.D.T. OF INLAND FISHERY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries which revolves around a question I asked him concerning the effect of d.d.t. on our freshwater fish. Because of the importance of this would the minister make a statement on motions with regard to his findings in this matter.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I do not want to create any unnecessary alarm about d.d.t. in Canadian lakes, because it is not a threat, but a factual answer is required and I will consider making a statement on this important subject.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister aware of the difficulties reportedly encountered by the Premier of Newfoundland in obtaining a visa to enter Red China? If so will this be the subject of negotiations at Stockholm and what steps will the government take—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Even at this point I do not think the question is in order.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

CHANGE IN TIMING OF COURT SITTINGS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Secretary of State whose department is responsible for the holding of citizenship courts. Could the minister explain to the house why the time of meeting of these courts has been changed from the evening to the day time, at considerable inconvenience and expense to new Canadians.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt very much if this question is in order. Again I must repeat what I said yesterday about its being a little difficult to indicate to hon. members that questions should be placed on the order paper. However, even realizing this I doubt whether all questions can be asked at this time. I think this is a question which could easily be placed on the order paper.

FISHERIES

DAMAGE TO EQUIPMENT CAUSED BY DRAGGERS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact that there are further reports of outside dragging activities in northwestern Newfoundland which are causing damage to and interference with fishing operations, would the minister indicate whether it is his intention to increase patrol operations in that area to overcome this unhealthy situation?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the fisheries protec-

tion officers in the area have been alerted to this problem and I am awaiting a report.

AIR TRANSPORT

SHORTAGE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, although I was beginning to run out of steam I kept on rising. Last Tuesday the Minister of Transport told the house he hoped to make a statement on motions with regard to air traffic control within a day or two. Will the minister say when we may expect a statement on this subject which is so important to the safety of those who travel by air.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, hon. members have asked for a great many statements. I made one yesterday on the matter of auto safety. I would not like to hog the show, so I will put off this statement for a couple of days.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): When the minister makes this statement would he also table the second volume of the Robinson report?

AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—USE OF JUMBO JETS AT NEW INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Now that the economic use of jumbo jets is brought into question I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government is considering delaying the opening of the jumbo jet airport in Quebec until a decision is made with regard to the airport itself?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance which is supplemantary to the question left unanswered by the Prime Minister. Does the Minister of Finance endorse the idea of spending $500 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money on an airport to service aircraft which may not even go into service?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): If we do not have jumbo jets we will have supersonic jets.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REPORTED AGREEMENT AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE AS TO AMENDING FORMULA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister give us a little further information on the important matter which arises out of his answer yesterday that the federal government does not intend to discuss a constitutional amending formula until there has been agreement on a "certain number of questions of substance". Could the Prime Minister tell us what he had in mind when he mentioned a certain number of questions. Did he have in mind particular areas in respect of the constitution or is this a quantitative measure?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubt whether this question is not a debate. However, we have a few minutes left before the end of the question period which might be used for the purpose of a reply from the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Go ahead and ask your jumbo question.

Mr. Stanfield: Perhaps the Prime Minister would reply, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Trudeau: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the amending formula has not come under consideration yet in the discussions between the federal and provincial governments. Government policy on this particular aspect will be formulated and announced in due course. We have not yet reached any conclusion on the kind of amending formula which could be used for either amending the total constitution or various parts of the constitution.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister give us any more indication in terms of time when the government of Canada might be making the proposal or inviting the provincial governments to discuss an amending formula.

Mr. Trudeau: We have always taken the position that the question of the mechanics of the amending formula itself would be at the end of the agenda, but of course if the provinces do not agree with this—and in certain cases they have asked that we study certain things other than those which we propose—we would be open to representation in this regard.

PRICE STABILITY, INCOMES AND EMPLOYMENT

POSSIBILITY OF SITTINGS OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE DURING SUMMER RECESS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are

called I wonder whether I could direct a question to the acting house leader.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can only direct a question to the acting house leader with the unanimous consent of the house since the question period has expired.

Mr. McGrath: It concerns the business of the house. I assume I have consent to ask the acting house leader whether it is the intention of the government to bring forward a measure to set up a special committee of the Senate and the House of Commons dealing with the stability of prices and incomes, and is it the intention of the government to have this joint committee sit during the recess?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that is a far more involved question than the order of business coming before this house.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISIONS RESPECTING STATUS AND USE— APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.— REPORT STAGE

The house proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris) moved:

That Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended in Clause 12 to read as follows:

"12. In accordance with and subject to the provisions of this act and the terms of any agreement that may be entered into by the Governor in Council with the government of a province as described in Section 15, the Governor in Council and the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation establish one or more federal bilingual districts (hereinafter called 'bilingual districts') in a province, and alter the limits of any bilingual districts so established."

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member knows, there may be some difficulty in connection with the amendment he has moved, but at the same time it appears not to present any difficulties from a procedural standpoint. In view of all the circumstances, the hon. member may wish to proceed with the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would like to point to the Chair and to the house that during the first meeting of the special committee on the official languages bill, it had been clearly understood and unanimously agreed that everything possible would be done to hasten the printing of the minutes of proceedings and evidence.

This had been agreed to and it had even been resolved, then, that special measures would be taken to give priority to the printing and distribution of the minutes of proceedings and evidence, since we are getting near the end of the session, and we must expedite the business of the house.

Well, not a single report of the proceedings of the special committee on the official languages bill has been printed and handed to members of parliament yet.

Therefore, I object strongly at the very beginning of this debate—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fortin: —if we do not have in our hands—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fortin: —the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the said committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member and tell him that I am assured that the said reports have been distributed to all hon. members. It may be the distribution system of the hon. member that is at fault.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte), who was a member of the special committee on the official languages bill at the same time as myself, at one time, has not received any copy of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of that committee.

For my part, I have not received any and I can assure you that my distribution system is operating smoothly.

Members of parliament have the right to receive reports and considering that we are now—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member and tell him that copies of the report are available. He has only to ask for one and he will get it.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: Thus far this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the proceedings have been marked by an air of cordiality, if not conviviality. Just before I get into the substance of the

matter before the house perhaps I might suggest that it would be a good idea to have the television camera in parliament every day if we could create the atmosphere and the high level of attendance we experienced today. Certainly I do not want to detract from the prevailing spirit as we begin to discuss what is regarded by all members of the house as a basic and critical matter to the future development of Canadian nationhood.

Unfortunately, under the new rules one of the problems faced by members during the debate at the report stage is the necessity of submitting amendments well before the matter is discussed in the House of Commons. Those of us who have been around for some years know that under the old rules we became accustomed to the privilege of bringing forward amendments during the course of the actual debate in the house. For that reason I can appreciate the comment Your Honour made that the amendment I propose to clause 12 of Bill C-120 may trespass upon areas of responsibility which devolve almost exclusively upon the provincial governments in Canada.

I have been giving some thought to this matter and I am reminded that last week in Ottawa there began a series of important discussions on the relationship between the federal and provincial governments in areas of joint responsibility. As I understand from what news has become available about those discussions, up to the present moment there has been a considerable degree of progress in respect of the distribution of responsibility as between the federal and provincial governments, particularly in fiscal areas where the problem of joint responsibility overlaps on spending programs.

The point I am trying to emphasize in the amendment gives the provincial governments an important say in decisions regarding bilingual districts in Canada. I hope that it will also be a subject for discussion at the continuing conference between the provincial premiers and the Prime Minister of Canada. I understand there is to be a document produced by the Prime Minister in due course in respect of this matter which may clarify the issue, certainly so far as fiscal matters are concerned.

If we are to draw any conclusions at all from the statement of the Premier of Ontario about the agreement which has now been reached on the question of medicare, there is now a clearcut pattern established as to respective areas of responsibility in joint programs. The Premier of Ontario has summed up the situation in a significant phrase, that he anticipated that with the changing emphasis on federal-provincial responsibility there will be no more medicare fiascos of this kind. Unfortunately, the misunderstanding has unnecessarily delayed their implementation of this important program for people in certain provinces.

• (3:10 p.m.)

In respect of this amendment, what I had in mind was the spirit that operated to a magnificent degree last week when the Premier of Ontario and the Premier of Quebec were able to agree upon an entente cordiale which will go a long way toward solving the problems of bilingualism and biculturalism in their respective spheres of influence. This is the sort of spirit I would like to see prevail among all provincial governments because this entente cordiale, arrived at by mutual agreement of the provinces concerned, will, I believe, ultimately reduce the tensions which exist within the body politic of Canada. These tensions are always present because we are a geographically large and an ethnically, culturally and economically diverse nation.

I should like to point out in passing that this spirit also prevails in other provinces. In 1966 the province of Manitoba, of its own accord and without any legislative coercion from Ottawa, took the initiative of providing educational services in areas of substantial minority groupings. This does not only apply to French speaking areas; certain privileges have been accorded to areas of other cultural predominance because of the nature of the mosaic which exists in western Canada.

I am not a lawyer, and I was going to obtain a legal opinion from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in this respect, but he can read *Hansard* and see what I have in mind in this regard. It would seem to me there is general agreement that l'esprit de la loi is much more important than the letter of the law with regard to linguistic and cultural rights. One of the reasons there has been so much controversy in certain areas of Canada is the overtones of compulsion which inevitably arise from Bill C-120. This is of special concern to western Canada and other provinces of similar cultural make-up wherein many minorities are involved.

I refer in passing—this strongly motivated the amendment I have put before the house this afternoon—to the fact that there is rapid progress toward transferring responsibility in respect of what might be recognized by all members of the house as the ethnic group which has been most seriously ignored and violated from the standpoint of its fundamental rights. I refer to our first Canadians, the Indians and Eskimos. We know there is a move under way that will gradually transfer to the provincial level the major responsibilities for ensuring first-class citizenship status to our native population. This policy has been agreed to on both sides of the house. In view of this transfer of responsibility to the provinces, I believe the provinces should have a special concern and voice in these matters. This, of course, applies also to other ethnic groups.

As I look at the other amendments on the order paper I am reassured to find that we will have an opportunity to debate this matter under another amendment which deals with the problems of multiculturalism and multilingualism in western Canada. As I indicated in my opening remarks in reply to your question, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to introduce a discordant note as we begin this important debate. Certainly I do not wish to trespass upon any area that would be regarded as a provincial matter. I do not wish to interfere with provincial affairs. I agree that this matter should be left to the continuing constitutional conference, which I hope will arrive at a formula that will make it easier for the people of every province of Canada to feel at home in all other parts of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: The minister from Manitoba, the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Richardson), speaks in the same accents, because he said recently that he is more concerned with interpreting western Canada to Ottawa than he is Ottawa to western Canada. I agree heartily with that statement, because we sometimes feel there is difficulty in communicating a viewpoint which some of us who come from western Canada regard as being peculiar to the west. I do not mean that westerners are peculiar, but they do have a peculiar viewpoint in this respect.

During the course of the debate it has been suggested that westerners are bigots in matters pertaining to civil liberties, cultural and linguistic equality and all the other matters raised in the debate. I deny this most vehemently. Members from western Canada are, above all else, most tolerant. Because we were raised in a climate of minorities we have achieved an amazing degree of the spirit of Canadianism out of a diversity that appears on the surface almost insurmountable.

In bringing these remarks to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me, in the light of Your Honour's comment, in the light of what happened at the meetings last week in Ottawa and the entente cordiale achieved by the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, that the provinces are quite capable of looking after their own interests in this respect. I would therefore leave them to take whatever action they feel is necessary.

I think our chief concern at this time, as we face a fundamental issue of confederation, is to emphasize the necessity of national unity. National unity in Canada can be achieved only out of great diversity and by emphasizing those things which all Canadians have in common. I trust that each one of us will be aware of the situation. We are forced by government action into a debate on a matter that is very delicate. It involves a confrontation in extremely sensitive areas, and it is my hope that as the provinces and Ottawa continue to negotiate they will work out a satisfactory formula in the spirit of the law rather than from the standpoint of the letter of the law that will take into consideration the rights of all the minorities in this great country of ours.

• (3:20 p.m.)

With those remarks in mind and so as not to precipitate a confrontation at this moment, and certainly not to dilute the spirit of good will and amity that has been generated thus far this afternoon, I ask for the unanimous consent of the house to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member leave to withdraw the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Dinsdale) withdrawn.

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Before Your Honour puts the next amendment, may I put forward for your consideration the question of the exercise of discretion which Your Honour has under the appropriate Standing Order with regard to the calling of votes on amendments which may be considered by the house from time to time. In

view of the date of adjournment, would Your Honour give some thought—and hopefully there will be some discussions on the matter among the house leaders—with regard to deferring the votes in one or two groups so that the house may know well in advance when the votes will take place. I ask Your Honour to consider this now before we come to the end of the first motion, and in the meantime I hope that the house leaders will be able to meet.

Mr. Speaker: I am in complete accord with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Peace River. It was my intention to suggest to hon. members that perhaps there should be an exercise of the Chair's discretion in this way and that the vote or votes be deferred until negotiations between the house leaders take place.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on another point of order, Mr. Speaker. I take it, because it was the procedure followed on the bill on the Criminal Code, that the amendments now on the order paper have been examined by you and are in order, so that we can prepare ourselves accordingly?

Mr. Speaker: I might say that if my recollection is correct in connection with the bill on the Criminal Code, rulings were made on amendments as they were reached, although we considered groups of amendments and rulings were made on those. But I might say, if it would be of assistance to hon. members, that these proposed amendments have been examined as closely as possible and in so far as the Chair can judge they appear to be in order. However, this should not be taken as a ruling because it may well be that hon. members on one side or the other may want to raise a point of order when these amendments are moved and, of course, arguments either for or against the procedural points would have to be considered by the Chair at that time. I might say that in a preliminary way it appears that the amendments are in order.

At present the Chair will put for the consideration of hon. members the motion proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan) moved:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting subclause (1) of clause 14 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) As soon as possible following the completion of each decennial census, or, in the case of the decennial census taken in the year 1961, forthwith after the coming into force of this Act, the Dominion Statistician shall prepare and send to the Clerk of the Privy Council a return certified by him showing the population of each of the provinces and census districts in Canada, categorized according to the official languages spoken as a mother tongue by persons resident therein as ascertained by that census, and as soon as possible thereafter the Governor in Council shall, pursuant to Part I of the Inquiries Act, appoint not less than twelve persons, being representative of residents of the several provinces, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, as commissioners to constitute a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board for the purpose of conducting an inquiry as described in section 15."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a comparatively simple but, in our opinion, very important amendment to the proposed bill. If hon. members examine clause 14 of the bill as it is now drafted, they will notice that the clause provides in subclause 1 that as soon as possible following the completion of each decennial census the Governor in Council shall, pursuant to Part I of the Inquiries Act, appoint—and these are the important words:

—not less than five and not more than ten persons, selected as nearly as may be as being representative of residents of the several provinces or principal regions of Canada—

It goes on to say that the Governor in Council shall appoint them:

—as commissioners to constitute a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board for the purpose of conducting an inquiry as described in section 15.

This board will be set up to conduct an inquiry into whether or not any particular area should be designated by the board as a bilingual district. The government, in its wisdom I suggest, during the committee stage of the debate on this bill accepted a proposal submitted by us that this inquiry should include at least one public hearing when the advisory board sits in the various areas to determine whether or not a particular area should be constituted as a bilingual district. Having conducted a public hearing, presumably it will decide whether or not a district should be established as a bilingual district. Our suggestion is that in carrying out a function as important as the actual determination of whether or not an area should be established as a bilingual district this advisory board should be composed of representatives from each of the provinces of Canada and from the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

We hear a great deal from the government these days about participatory democracy. Surely this is a way in which the provinces will now be able to really participate in the

determination of the question of whether or not bilingual districts should be set up in particular areas. I wish to remind the house at this stage that according to the report of the B and B commission eight of the provinces of Canada can have within them bilingual districts: parts of Ontario, parts of New Brunswick, parts of Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and possibly one district in Alberta. So that even today practically every province of Canada can be affected by the decision of the advisory board. This is why we say that in arriving at a decision as important as this one every province of Canada and the Yukon and the Northwest Territories should be represented on that board.

I agree that today there are two provinces—perhaps Newfoundland is a very good example—where there would not be a bilingual district, according to the provisions of this bill. But let us not forget that by reason of the mobility of the population we do not know whether in five or even less years' time Newfoundland may not also qualify as a province in which bilingual districts may be set up. Tremendous expansion is taking place nowadays in the Labrador area. It is possible that French speaking people from Quebec will see fit to move there. So Newfoundland may be affected by this bill at some time in the future even if it is not affected by it today.

• (3:30 p.m.)

We contend that in the interest of fairness every province should be represented on this board. I know it will be argued that it is sufficient to allow representation to regions of Canada. The bill now says the board shall consist of not fewer than five and not more than ten members. It does not even say that every region must be represented. I do not think this is satisfactory in the case of a board which will perform so important a function.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has stated that the proper functioning of this legislation will depend to a great extent upon the co-operation of the provinces. I agree. I hope this plan will function and I hope the provinces will co-operate. Indeed, I am confident we shall obtain co-operation from them. We seriously suggest that as a means of obtaining this co-operation every province should be represented on the advisory board.

It may be objected, as I mentioned earlier, that there are provinces which will have no bilingual districts, and that for this reason there is no need for them to be represented. It has even been suggested in committee that such provinces might attempt to boycott the idea of bilingual districts. I dismiss this suggestion as irresponsible. I am confident that the provinces are interested in the principle underlying this bill and that they will not attempt to boycott the setting up of a bilingual district if one were contemplated in accordance with requirements of the legislation.

We need the co-operation of all the provinces, and one of the best ways of obtaining it would be to make sure that every province is represented on the advisory board, the board which will decide whether or not a district shall be a bilingual district. The board will reach a decision of this kind presumably after it has conducted public hearings. What could possibly be wrong about requesting that every province should be represented on this board?

Acceptance of this proposition would not result in an unwieldy board. After all, a board with ten or 12 members is not an unwieldy body; much larger boards have been set up under parliamentary rules and are doing an effective job. Indeed, far from making the board unwieldy we would be making it participatory because every province would be represented, and this is as it should be.

I do not propose to speak at further length. I shall close simply by recommending the amendment we are proposing.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member put forward a similar amendment before the special committee which studied this bill. After a good deal of discussion, it was not adopted. The government feels there was a thorough examination—and a fair examination—of this bill by the special committee.

Twenty-nine amendments to my count were accepted by the committee. Admittedly some were introduced by myself. Between 10 and 15 were introduced from the government side, five or six at least were introduced on behalf of his party by the hon. member who has just spoken, and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) was responsible for the others.

We intend to take the position at this stage of backing the committee report. We feel that if the committee system is to expand and prosper, and if the effectiveness of the role of

the individual Member of Parliament is to be increased, the government and, indeed, all parties should pay the proper attention to committee reports. Having regard to what I believe was the good will from all sides shown during the committee proceedings, we intend to support this report.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister permit a question before he continues? It concerns the introductory remarks he has just made. He talked about making the committee system work and told us that various amendments were considered in committee, some of which were allowed and some of which were voted down. Are you really saying that any amendments which have been placed on the order paper by members of the opposition will automatically be voted down at this stage because they were considered by the committee?

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to do this again, but perhaps the hon. member will keep in mind that he ought to address his remarks to the minister through the Chair.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I might say that where an amendment in the terms proposed here, on report stage, has been proposed in similar terms in the committee and has been given thorough scrutiny and discussion, the government takes the position in the main that we should accept the committee report in that respect. It may be that some of these amendments were not proposed in the committee in which case there will have to be a fresh discussion in this chamber.

The purpose of this amendment is to make of the advisory board a strictly representative institution, one upon which every province and territory would be represented. This is underlined by the speech the hon. member has just made, and his reasoning is set out more fully in the record of the committee at pages 220 to 228. The amendment sets a minimum figure of 12 members but no maximum figure, and we think this is objectionable in the sense that it might conceivably lead to a very unwieldy board.

As the hon. member admitted, it is not at all certain that every province will have a bilingual district. Newfoundland and British Columbia would not if the recommendations of the B and B Commission are followed. The bill now provides that members be selected as nearly as may be as being representative of the various principal regions and provinces of Canada. In the bill as it reads there is already ample flexibility and room for ensuring that the regions of Canada are adequately represented. We do not believe that the bill would be advanced and the law improved by adding the inflexibility of a provision that each province be represented on the board. Those, in the main, Mr. Speaker, would be the reasons for which we would recommend to the house that the amendment be rejected.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. McKinley: Would the minister permit another question? I wonder whether the minister would try to persuade his colleagues in the cabinet to operate in the same manner when we reach the report of the committee on agriculture.

Mr. Horner: Transportation too.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I first say that I heartily disagree with the minister's statement that, because the house is faced with the report of a committee that has worked very hard on a bill, the house, the government or anybody else ought to accept the report—period. I think the minister cannot have thought about this matter very carefully because it seems to me to be a most illadvised remark.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: If the suggestion were followed it would totally destroy the value of this stage of a bill. Why have the report stage of a bill if the house has to accept automatically everything presented in the report of a committee? Obviously, in view of the new set-up of our committees the intention of the report stage is to give all members of the house an opportunity to deal with a bill and to move amendments. In this way the collective wisdom of all members of the house replaces the collective wisdom of a number of members of the house. This may not always be better wisdom but it does give wider representation. I hope that the minister did not mean what he said in this regard.

Second, I frankly tell the house that some of my colleagues in the New Democratic party caucus have a great deal of sympathy for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), though I am not one of them. I fully appreciate the sincerity of the thought behind this motion, but I suggest to hon. members, to my own colleagues and to others that the motion is really not a good one, and for two main reasons.

Let me take the more important reason first. There are some provinces from which it might be considered wiser to have two representatives on the advisory board. If I may, I should like to name those provinces. I think it would be very advisable for the future of Canada and for the workings of this advisory board to have Quebec represented by an English speaking as well as a French speaking member, and to have Ontario represented by a French speaking as well as an English speaking member. If you had only the one member for each province then obviously you would limit Quebec to one French speaking member, because the majority of the people in that province are French speaking, and Ontario to one English speaking member for the same obvious reason. In the case of these two large central provinces, where in Quebec there is a large English speaking minority and in Ontario a large French speaking minority, I respectfully urge the government to consider it advisable to permit each province to be represented by more than one member.

I also suggest that it may well be an additional advantage in regard to the working of the bill and the welfare of Canadians that instead of having one member for each of the three prairie provinces, if I may use that area specifically—, there be representatives on the board of some of the minorities who live in the prairie provinces. It may well be much more important to the working of this bill and the purpose the bill is trying to serve to have a member of Ukrainian or German background on the board rather than a member for each of the three prairie provinces where the general situation and attitudes are very similar.

It seems to me that to provide rigidly that there be one member from each province and from each of the two territories is not a good idea in terms of what Canada really requires and what the function of the board will be. It is not a board that will carry on inquiries over a wide spectrum; it will be concerned merely with the consideration of the census and matters related to the establishment of a bilingual district.

I can see arguments on the other side, and I frankly admit that I am not without difficulty in opposing this motion. I can well see, as some of my colleagues have indicated to me with a great deal of validity, that there will be great value in bringing on to the board representatives of provinces that are not likely even to have federal bilingual districts—

[Mr. Lewis.]

the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) for one pressed this point upon me—in order that those provinces are brought into the workings of the act in the way in which the hon. member for Cardigan intends. If one were to do that, the board would have a membership even greater than 12.

Personally—and here I come to my second reason for feeling unhappy about this motion—on principle I oppose the notion that every federal body and federal instrument has to be representative of each province and territory in Canada. I think it is about time that our federal institutions concern themselves with the quality of representation rather than with the geography of representation in every case. There are a great many institutions, including even cabinets, that could benefit from a little more quality and a little less geography. That is probably true of this cabinet, as it has been true of other cabinets.

Personally, I cannot support the amendment because of its rigidity and the requirement that there be one member for each province. If the government were to make allowance for the points I have made, which in my view are more important than representation from each of the provinces, then the government would have to add to the 12 members proposed by this motion. I think it is more important to have a representative on the board of the large minority group in Quebec as well as another representative of the large minority group in Ontario, along with people who can express the views and wishes of other minorities in western Canada that are larger than the minority that speaks one of the official languages.

With this kind of representation, which as I say is much more important to me than any sort of mechanical provincial representation, the board might consist of 15 or 18 members instead of 12. I am prepared to place the responsibility for these appointments where it belongs, on the government.

Perhaps this is another opportunity as we start our discussion of the report stage for me to repeat what I said in the first speech, I think, that I made on this bill and also two or three times in committee. This bill will be a blessing rather than a catastrophe only if the government acts in a way that is sensitive to the needs of Canada's future and the needs and wishes of Canada's people—all its people everywhere. This bill will be a blessing rather than a catastrophe only if the government

is aware constantly of the fact that its implementation will require some years of education, with positive attention being paid to the removal of misunderstanding and prejudices across the country. This bill will be of value to Canada only if the government is sensitive to the need to remove the fears of employees of the government and of its corporations and agencies, as well as those who may want to become employees of the government and its crown corporations in the future, and applies this law with sensitivity to the factors I have outlined.

• (3:50 p.m.)

This bill will work only if the government has sense enough to appoint members to the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board who will in fact be representative of the various sections of this country as well as the various minorities to be found right across Canada. This bill will be of value only if this government will have the intelligence and sensitivity to appoint as commissioner a person who understands what makes Canada tick and what are the various streams and currents in our country's life, and if it will avoid, as I have said more than once, replacing one injustice which we are trying to remove with a new injustice which will merely serve to divide this country all over again. No words in the bill will accomplish this.

Mr. Dinsdale: We must be concerned about the spirit of the law.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. The spirit of the law will be important. You may have 12 members on the advisory board to represent every province and territory and they may be a bunch of copper-headed, obstinate, adamant, insensitive people who will ride roughshod over the situation. If that is the case the bill will have accomplished nothing. It will not have given us anything of value.

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask the hon. member a question? How does he distinguish between the rule of law and the rule of a person who may be a dictator? As I understood him, he said that nothing has been written into the bill to protect any of us. Surely we prefer to be ruled by law and not to be ruled by people who may be dictators.

Mr. Lewis: It must be my fault that the hon. member for Calgary North did not hear me. Or perhaps he was listening to a more important conversation. I do not know. I did not say at all or suggest at all what he says I said or suggested. I said that the quality of the people who will serve on the board and act as commissioner is an important consideration.

Mr. Woolliams: I know.

Mr. Lewis: It is most important to see that the right kinds of people are appointed. It is the way in which the government will approach this matter and the way in which the minister responsible for implementing this law will approach it that is important. If the minister responsible for implementing the law, whoever he may be, is an obstinate, copper-headed bull in a china shop and appoints people who display a like attitude, then this law will be a disaster. But if the government and the minister and the people appointed all approach this law with the sensitivity it requires, then I believe we shall have taken a tremendous step in removing an important grievance from which some of our people have suffered for a century. That is why I support the principle of the bill.

To make further reply to the hon. member, I was trying to say that the quality of the people who take over the job of actually administering the law is not something you can write into the bill. Whether you have 10 members or 12 members on the board will not in the end make much difference if the kinds of people appointed are people who will implement the law in the wrong way.

I am prepared to place the responsibility where, in my view, it lies. Hon. members will be here as Members of Parliament and parliament will be here. If the government approaches this law in a way in which some hon. members fear it may—I have not seen enough evidence to warrant that fear but I am as watchful as any other hon. member—we shall take appropriate action. My colleagues and I will be as watchful as any members of the house to make sure that this law helps Canadian unity and does not hinder it, that it unites us and does not divide us, and that it does not place any Canadian at an unnecessary or unjust advantage vis-à-vis the government and vis-à-vis employment in the public sector, whether that employment is in the Public Service or in a Crown corporation. But the responsibility lies with the treasury benches. I am prepared to leave that responsibility where it lies and to speak to the people of Canada when the time comes if that responsibility is not carried out as it ought to be.

As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, I cannot support the amendment.

Some of my colleagues who are sympathetic toward it may well support it. It is not the kind of amendment on which the principle of the bill rests. I cannot support it for the two reasons I have given. First, it is rigid. It is wrong for federal institutions to be rigidly representative of geographic areas when they ought to be flexibly representative of the quality of the people of the country, as that quality is related to the purposes of this act. Second, I believe there are areas which ought to be represented by more than one member so that minorities as well as majorities can be represented in the province in question. Also, there are minority groups in this country which need to be represented on this board much more urgently than every one of a group of provinces displaying similar histories and similar attitudes on the part of their peoples.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, we are now considering an amendment put forward by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), to amend clause 14 of the official languages bill, as reported to the house by the special committee on the official languages bill.

This amendment concerns membership on a certain Bilingual Districts Advisory Board. To place the discussion in its proper context, I will recall that clause 14 of the bill, as brought back before the house by the special committee on the official languages bill, a group which, incidentally, deserves to be congratulated on its efficient work, a good demonstration of the importance of national unity at this time provides for the appointment of five to six commissioners.

The number is not specified. The text reads, in part, as follows:

> —not less than five and not more than ten persons, selected as nearly as may be as being representative of residents of the several provinces or principal regions of Canada, as commissioners to constitute a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board—

Now the honourable member for Cardigan has probably noticed that Canada includes not a certain number, but a definite number of provinces. He also noted that the census in Canada does not cover merely a few, but all provinces.

He probably felt—I imagine these were his motives—that the question of establishing bilingual districts was of concern to the whole nation and should not merely arouse the interest, but also require the participation of every Canadian province in this great undertaking of bilingualism throughout Canada, under the official languages bill. Consequently, he proposes to make a slight change in clause 14, to make it a bit more specific, which reads as follows:

• (4:00 p.m.)

> —appoint not less than twelve persons, being representatives of residents of several provinces, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, . . . to constitute a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board—

I heard the remarks of the mover of this motion, as well as those of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and, to my mind, their arguments were very weak.

From the parliamentary point of view and in the spirit of the official languages bill, I feel that the reply of the Minister of Justice—even though he did excellent work as well as the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier)—was unsatisfactory and weak in the face of the argument set forth by the member for Cardigan.

Let us say that I was more in favour of the motion of the member. After having heard the member for York South (Mr. Lewis), I no longer have any doubts; I am completely in favour of the amendment and hope the majority of my colleagues are also. The argument of the member for York South—who is bent on opposing the amendment—is weaker than that of the minister. In addition, the reasoning of the member for York South is wily and does not follow either the spirit or the letter of the amendment of the member for Cardigan.

I want to restore the debate in its true context, briefly. We must not fall into sentimentality. There has been too much of it with regard to confederation, bilingualism and Canada. That is why we are so far behind in solving the problem of national unity. It is time to come back to earth in order to build a great Canada where everyone's interests will be respected.

It is precisely in this perspective of respect for individual interests that I speak in this manner because, in short, the confederation is composed of different provinces which are rather different one from another geographically, culturally, psychologically and traditionally.

Therefore, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan is more in accordance with the image of Canada as it should be and as we all want it to be. Clause 14 of the bill seems to grant the governor in council a power which I would term discretionary in some fields.

I do not fear the governor in council—far from it—we trust him but since the making of national unity is a national endeavour as well as that of bilingualism, according to the wording of the languages bill, in which every province must co-operate closely, permanently, it goes without saying that each province and the Northwest Territories should have a representative on this Bilingual Districts Advisory Council in order to express the opinion of their citizens about the analysis of the results of the census which has just been taken, according to the preamble of clause 14.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of clause 14, one can read, and I quote:

As soon as possible following the completion of each decennial census, or, in the case of the decennial census taken in the year 1961, forthwith after the coming into force of this act,—

And here, Mr. Speaker, is what I would like to bring to the attention of this house:

—the coming into force of this act, the Dominion Statistician shall prepare and send to the clerk of the Privy Council a return certified by him showing the population of each of the provinces—

This is exactly how clause 14 begins—

—of each of the provinces and census districts in Canada, categorized according to the official languages spoken as a mother tongue by persons resident therein as ascertained by that census.

Following production of that return by the Dominion Statistician, it is proposed to entrust the Privy Council with the setting up of that Bilingual Districts Advisory Board which will conduct inquiries and gather statistical data in each province.

If we accept the introductory statement to clause 14, as the minister is urging us to do, the analysis of the statistics in each province would enable the government to follow population movements between censuses and to determine whether conditions have changed in bilingual districts and whether the creation of a new bilingual district has become necessary. It seems to me desirable for each province to be represented, but not, as the hon. member for York South suggested, by two citizens from Ontario because this is an English-speaking province, or by two persons from Quebec because this is a French-speaking province. It should rather be, as the hon. member for Cardigan pointed out, and rightly so, by one representative from each province, who could analyze the statistical data and determine to what extent that bill may apply.

Mr. Speaker, I should not like to delay the debate any further, but I wanted to make my views known with respect to clause 14. Even though we support that bill, in which we take pride, the fact remains that clause 14 leaves much to be desired. And I shall quote it in part:

—shall appoint not less than five and not more than ten persons, selected as nearly as may be as being representative of residents of the several provinces—

And I would like to conclude my remarks on this point.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice as I did the broadmindedness, the compliance of the government when it says:

—persons, selected as nearly as may be as being representative of residents of the several provinces or principal regions of Canada—

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is too vague. At times, five members will constitute the Board, at times six, seven or ten members. Who will decide? The Governor in Council. Who is interested in that question? All the residents of Canada, all the Canadian citizens, essentially, all the equal partners in confederation.

If the provinces are equal partners in confederation, Mr. Speaker, the number of members on the Advisory Board must not be determined, in the establishment of bilingual districts, simply upon the mood of the governor in council according to whether he will feel great one morning or will base his decision on the result of the census.

If the provinces are equal partners, if each of them has its say in connection with bilingualism, national unity, it seem obvious to me—and the government and its representatives should recognize it—that each province, in that capacity, should have its say, and not have the right to veto. It is not necessary to have, as the Secretary of State pointed out in the committee, another constitutional conference, a second parliament, or to duplicate the work of the committees, because this committee considers a very specific matter, that of the establishment of bilingual districts.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that the provinces must have their say, because it seems to me—and this is my last argument—that we are studying the Constitution at this time. Everybody hears of the famous constitutional conference. What outcry would be raised not only among opposition members but even among government members, if, upon creating such a constitutional conference, the government said: There will be between five and ten representatives of the various Canadian provinces at the constitutional conference.

Official Languages

• (4:10 p.m.)

In fact, the revision of our constitution must concern all the provinces which should be present as equal partners.

The establishment of a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board is, to my mind, a related question. There is no question of creating a second parliament or a second constitutional conference, but merely of recognizing bilingual districts.

Mr. Speaker, just as it would not be logical for a constitutional conference to invite only five to ten officials, at the discretion of the governor in council, neither would it be logical to ask only five to ten persons, at the discretion of the government, to sit on that Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.

In concluding, I would like the government to study the proposal of the hon. member for Cardigan. I want to congratulate him on his willingness to co-operate with the government, while attempting to improve the law which should serve the interests of all Canadians.

It is therefore quite logical and fair that each province be represented, as well as the Northwest Territories, on the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the house very long. I simply wish to start by complimenting the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) who has shown glimpses of the wit and discernment which I am sure will some day make him a great parliamentarian, particularly when he supports amendments offered by this party. I think he has put forward very succinct and valid reasons for his and his party's support of the amendment offered by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

I should like first to deal with the merits of the substance which have been more than enumerated by the hon. member for Cardigan and the hon. member for Lotbinière and point out two or three areas of discussion which may not have been dealt with. I must also say I am very surprised that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) made such a weak defence. He did not direct his attention to the merits of the substance of the matter. His defence in effect was a procedural one which I propose to demolish to the extent it has not been demolished by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis).

The hon. member for York South, who is the only member so far to take up the cudgels for the government or attempt to rationalize

the government's position, has made a very fine philosophical statement which is the sort of thing which might be offered during a lecture to justify under certain circumstances not having a detailed type of representation on certain federal boards. This might be delightful, but we must live with the situation as it exists today where secondary governments are now comprised of provincial governments to the extent that there are 10 of them in confederation. We can forget all about what the hon. member for York South said in that type of approach because we must get down to the realities of life in respect of this bill.

The government, for reasons which it must have considered adequate, has directed the attention of the advisory board by clause 14 and also clause 15, because we are referred to clause 15 by clause 14, to the need to negotiate with provincial governments. If the advisory board had been set up in terms of a direction to the Governor in Council to appoint an advisory board of not fewer than and not more than ten members and to refrain from in any way trying to identify the areas from which the personnel on the board should come, then the hon. member for York South in making his representation on behalf of the government would be making a fairly good case. But the government did not do that. The government did not stop there. A board is mentioned with representation from the several provinces or principal regions. There is an indication of a recognition of the fact that because of the peculiarities of this legislation and the way it is to be administered it is desirable to have this brought about.

The government recognizes the Canadian system half way. Clause 15 points out very plainly in respect of the advisory board:

> —and after holding such public hearings, if any, as it considers necessary and after consultation with the government of each of the provinces—

That is subclause 1. Subclause 2 in effect goes on to constitute the board as the agent for and on behalf of the government to negotiate draft agreements and to implement parts of the principles which are involved in this bill with the provincial governments. That being the case, the government itself in this bill has made the case for the proposal made by the hon. member for Cardigan; the government has justified it. I am not saying that each member from a province constitutes an ambassador or minister in negotiating separately and severally with the provinces, but

there is a case made by the government legislation for there to be a type of at least provincial representation, and of course I add representation from the territories as well.

I think the government has made the case for us by pointing out that there will be these instructions to the advisory board to negotiate draft agreements. I believe it is a condition precedent to the effective functioning of such a board that there should be from each province and each territory a person well acquainted with the conditions which prevail in that particular area who is prepared to carry his views and representations to the advisory board as he sees them so that when the board then negotiates with the provinces under clauses 14 and 15 it will have a point of view. Certainly after the discussions have been completed there will be a consensus, but that consensus cannot be brought about unless it has been brought forward through the representatives. For this reason I must dismiss the argument advanced by the hon. member for York South on behalf of the government. I hate to insist on using that expression, but it has been so apparent I must insist on it. I urge that the amendment of the hon. member for Cardigan, supported by the hon. member for Lotbinière, should receive the sympathetic consideration of the house.

I am pleased to collaborate with the hon. member for York South in attacking the minister for what I consider to be his inadequate defence. Knowing his capacity for delivering ingenious arguments I can only concede that his failure to deal with this matter on its merits indicates he understands that there is no defence on the merits. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I am sorry for him for having to put forward the weak fabric of defence which he did. If we accept at face value what the Minister of Justice said—and I agree here wholeheartedly with the hon. member for York South—the whole purpose of the committee system and report structure vanishes; it goes down the drain.

In the committee on procedure and later in the house—I am driven to resort to this because the minister raised the issue—we looked at the question of whether or not the discussion and vote on an issue in a committee would prohibit the matter being raised again in the house. It was decided by those hon. members who reviewed the procedures of the house that we should not follow the practice in other jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and that the disposition of an amendment before a standing committee would in no way prohibit an opportunity for that amendment to be brought back into the house at the report stage to be discussed, debated and the question put. I shall not go into the reasons for that because they are on the record. The reasons are adequate and should be final. If this is not accepted, then quite obviously the rather unique procedure which the house has devised for dealing with matters at the report stage will vanish; it will be of no use for any member of the house to put forward an amendment and bring it into the house for discussion at the report stage.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This will mean that the committees will be a battleground. That is what they should be in part—I do not deny that—but one of the most important purposes of the establishment of the committee system was to give an opportunity to the members to question, scrutinize, seek information and ferret out the facts and then come back into the house and put up the kind of argument in respect of important issues which should be put up, based on information they had been able to obtain at the committee meetings.

This has had an ancillary benefit which in my opinion is good. The proceedings of committees are not as partisan at all times as we find necessary in the house. I am not against partisanship. That is what we are here for in part, but the committees are not as partisan. I suggest to Your Honour and the members of this house that if what the Minister of Justice has suggested is accepted, and it will be accepted if it is voted upon and that is the only defence the government puts up, it will mean that the committees will become highly partisan. The issues directed to the committees will be issues dealt with by the government through constant and continuing consultation with its own members on the committee. The opportunity for a far more objective and reasonable examination will vanish, and great damage will have been done to what we are now groping in this house to achieve.

I hope the minister will reconsider. I think this amendment is a very reasonable one. I hope he will use the intelligence and wisdom I know he possesses and stand up and say that after reconsideration, having listened particularly to the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), he is withdrawing his objection and agrees that this amendment should carry.

Official Languages

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

I was on the committee and I realize that this amendment similar to the one that was defeated there. I believe that there might be some advantage in again calling the attention of the government to the point stressed in that amendment. As far as I am concerned, and for the reasons I have already put forward in committee, I shall vote against the amendment.

A while ago, the hon. member for Cardigan, behind the scenes, so to say, referred to what he called an irresponsible statement. I see that he is smiling. Evidently, I felt that his remarks were directed against me, since I was really the person concerned, but he did not see fit to point to me as such.

Mr. Speaker, it is always dangerous to quote words out of context and, in a way, I rise on a question of privilege, because I would like to clear up this matter.

When I spoke on the amendment in committee, in an attempt, such as I am making today, to reconcile the views of the hon. member for Cardigan and those of the government, I said:

> It seems to me that we are determining that there shall be one representative of each province, as well as one representative for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. The following situation could well happen with regard to the committee. The representatives of the provinces that do not have any bilingual districts or have very few bilingual districts would overwhelm the representatives of the provinces with several or even many bilingual districts.
>
> In this way they could,—

That is the representatives of the provinces that do not have any or have very few bilingual districts.

> —in this way, they could, simply through their numerical strength, thwart the will of the minority to establish bilingual districts.

That is the statement the hon. member was referring to a moment ago and he qualified it as irresponsible.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of committees is to consider, scrutinize in depth all the possible effects that any legislation or regulation will have, and it is in this spirit that I dealt with this subject. I did not say that could be done. I depend on the government's judgment to appoint committee members who will have an open mind and who will interpret the law not according to the letter but to its spirit. It is in this sense that I gave that example.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I do not hold to it too strongly, but here is what I said:

> In my opinion, we should try above all to ensure a representation of districts in Canada rather than of the provinces as such.

You will agree with hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that we are now moving towards regional rather than provincial representation, in many fields. I know that there are now many federal committees and commissions on which all the provinces are not represented, but which are working out well all the same. Those committees represent regional or private interests, and they have to settle regional or private problems. For that reason, there is no need for a representative from every province.

Furthermore, I said to the committee:

> —this is the important point.

Regional, instead of provincial representation.

> —on the other hand—

—and that is in keeping with what the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) said a moment ago.

> —I would fear this: if there were only 5 commissioners, for instance,—

As under the law the governor in council is authorized to appoint five to ten of them.

> —we could appoint two from Quebec, one English-speaking and one French-speaking, two from Ontario, again one French and one English, and one representative from the Atlantic provinces, which would make five.

A minimum of five on one committee.

> So, the West would not be represented—

There is in the West a significant French-speaking minority that would not be represented on that committee. And I just cannot see what there is to gain by appointing one representative for each province of Canada.

This is a struggle with numbers which would lead us nowhere. The hon. members of the opposition have all spoken—some with much eloquence—in favour of this legislation, and now they are all fighting over the matter of numerical representation.

It seems to me that it is wrong for them to insist on this, and I would urge them to vote for this legislation as reported on by the committee and to vote against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Lotbinière want to ask a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Will the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) permit a question?

Mr. Corbin: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fortin: In view of the fact that he recognizes that any member of a committee has the right and the privilege to look more closely into a subject, I would like to ask him if he does not recognize that hon. members should have the same right?

Mr. Corbin: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I did not quite catch the meaning of the question. Would the hon. member put his question again?

Mr. Fortin: With pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

In his speech, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria pointed out that on a committee, a member may look more closely into a matter, but at the same time he said that it was a pity that hon. members should dwell on such petty details as the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan.

So, I would like to ask him if he does not recognize that the house, too, has a right to study a matter thoroughly in the same way as he recognizes that the members on a committee have that right?

Mr. Corbin: I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, but so far, all the members who have taken part in the debate are those who took part in the study in committee, and they did not break any new ground. Thus, in my opinion, we are wasting our time.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I believe some aspects of this amendment have been overlooked in the debate so far and should be brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith). It was interesting to hear the speech of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I found it strange that a person with his background should rely so heavily upon the spirit and intent of the legislation rather than concerning himself with the law. Laws are made to safeguard justice, to ensure the fair treatment of all people. I ask the hon. member to think back several years to the time when the leader of a country did away with laws, forgot about the spirit and intent of the law and ruled severely against a minority group in that country.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member suggest that this amendment was really not necessary. He said the responsibility in this regard rested with the government and it did not really matter what safeguards were written into the bill because they would be no good if the spirit was not there. That was a rather interesting argument from one of his background. We have only to think of Hitler, who disregarded the laws of Germany and the safeguards written into them and ruled very severely against a minority group in that country.

It is my sincere belief that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) constitutes a definite improvement of the bill. As the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) suggested, clause 15 of the bill brings this question within the sphere of the provinces. Clause 15(3) provides quite clearly that the provinces shall be consulted in regard to this question. It may be necessary to draft an agreement with the provinces in order that the purpose of the bill is carried out. The hon. member for Peace River dealt capably and at length with this matter.

The bill sets out criteria which provide that the government shall to some extent listen to the views of the provinces on this question. The amendments sets out that there shall be at least 12 people appointed as commissioners of a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board. The amendment does not limit the number to 12. If the hon. member for York South believes that minority groups in the central provinces should have representation on the board, I interpret the amendment as allowing for more than 12 members to be appointed. If it is thought that a board of 12 would be unwieldy, I would remind the house that in connection with another bill we amalgamated three or four boards and created a board of 17 members. It was not thought that this was unwieldy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member's argument is valid.

This bill was considered by a committee of the house. I should like to quote a statement made to the committee because I believe it is in error. I refer to Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 1 of the Special Committee

on the Official Languages Bill. At page 51 thereof we find the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) making the following statement:

> Mr. Chairman, I might take a remark that might be useful to Mr. McQuaid when he drafts his amendment. There are only eight provinces who have bilingual districts according to the recommendations of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, which means that ten was deemed to be a sufficient number to have all the interested provinces in the group. Now, I just say this for information.

If this is the foundation of clause 14 of the bill, it is very weak. It is a weak foundation because bilingual districts were set out by the B and B Commission on the basis of census districts within the provinces. This bill does not do that, because clause 13 quite clearly provides the following:

> A bilingual district established under this act shall be an area delineated by reference to the boundaries of any or all of the following, namely, a census district established pursuant to the Statistics Act, a local government or school district, or a federal or provincial electoral district or region.

A school district may be a very small area containing few people. One can easily see that under this bill there will be no province in Canada, including the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, that will not have a bilingual district if the letter of the law is carried out and the criterion of a school district is used. The B and B Commission specifically spelled out that a census district was to be the criterion, and as a rule a census district is a large area. If, as suggested in Committee Proceedings No. 1, the foundation for clause 14 is based on that premise, it is a false and poor premise because clause 13 destroys the premise.

The Minister of Justice said this matter was debated in committee and therefore the house should agree to the findings of the committee. This is a very weak defence. Committees are appointed to investigate questions and obtain information regarding the application of a piece of legislation, but the final and conclusive drafting of the legislation rests with the House of Commons. It must forever rest with the House of Commons because here all the people of Canada are represented. Committees sometimes exclude certain groups of people, areas of the country and those who represent huge areas and think in specific ways. Therefore the findings of a committee are not binding on the House of Commons and should not be accepted by the Minister of Justice. Committees do not always consider

legislation in a fair and just way, and therefore legislation should not be based upon the findings of a committee.

The Minister of Justice, of all people, should not make the kind of statement he did. I know the minister attempts to be fair in most cases, and I am sure that on reflection he will regret having made that statement. Perhaps in the not too distant future he will tell the house that he has taken a different view of this question. It is my firm belief that the provinces have a direct concern in the legislation now before us.

• (4:40 p.m.)

It is all well and good for the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) to say that we are now getting around to the stage of dealing with Canada by regions. I noted the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to regions at the last federal-provincial conference. Dealing with Canada as a place divided into regions is, to me, in direct contravention of the B.N.A. Act. Certainly we have not yet reached that stage. We still have provincial boundaries, regardless of whether this is right or wrong. Perhaps the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria wants a union of the maritime provinces. I do not know his thinking in that regard.

An hon. Member: He does not want it.

Mr. Horner: If he does not, then why promote it? That is just what he was doing in his remarks this afternoon. It is my firm belief that each province wants a representative on the board who it feels will look after its interests. I also believe that each province should know who that representative is and whether or not he is protecting its interests. The decisions of the board will affect the province, will affect the provincial educational system and will affect the municipalities. Eventually, working agreements will have to be made with the provinces in the later stages of the application of this bill. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) knows that to be a fact.

It is my belief that a resident of the province can serve a useful purpose in participating in the discussions which the board will be having which will affect his province. Who knows a particular province better than a resident of it who is responsible to it? It is all well and good for me, a resident of Alberta, to be made responsible for the province of Ontario, of which, incidentally, I am very fond, but I do not think the people of Ontario

would particularly like me to sit on this board on their behalf.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Horner: Because I am not likely to know the province as well as someone who resides in it, and I would not know the specific areas which will be affected by this legislation as well as one who resides in that province.

There is no reason whatever why the government cannot accept this amendment. If they believe in a participatory democracy, if they believe in subclauses 2 and 3 of clause 15, there is no reason why they should not accept the amendment. If clause 14 is drafted on a premise which, as the minister suggests at page 51 of the proceedings of the committee, is based on the recommendations of the B and B commission that only eight provinces will have bilingual districts, then I suggest that that premise is false because clause 13 contradicts it. I see an hon. member over there shaking his head. I would like to hear him explain why clause 13 does not contradict that premise.

I read the report of the B and B commission in that regard. The report says specifically that districts will be established on census divisions and not according to the size of school districts, municipal districts or provincial or federal ridings, and this is what this bill deals with. If the government wants to promote the idea that it is interested in bringing this legislation into being and fully recognizes the uncertain mood that exists in this country with regard to this legislation, then in all fairness to the house it has no alternative but to accept the amendment. If the government wishes to disregard the suspicions about this legislation in these areas, if it wants to ride roughshod over these feelings toward the bill, then it must bear the consequences. If the government wants to choose representatives from the five or six major provinces and one member from the maritimes and one member from western Canada to make up the proposed membership of five up to ten on the board, then I believe it will only add to the suspicions that are rampant across the country concerning this legislation.

The minister can sit there with a studied look on his face as if he did not care about what is being said in the house. This legislation is under his jurisdiction and it is his duty to pay attention to the mood of the public of Canada as a responsible official and an elected representative. If he wishes to sit in sullen silence and disregard this amendment, then I can only conclude that he does not care. He is like Pierre, he does not care. As I have already pointed out, clause 14 is based on a false premise. Clause 15 directly involves the provinces, and there is no one in the house who can honestly say that his province does not want its own representative to sit on the board. It seems to me that the issue we are debating this afternoon is a very important one because of the unrest and the suspicions which exist in the country today concerning this legislation. The government has an opportunity to set those fears and concerns at rest by accepting this amendment.

I am pleased to see the Minister of Justice come into the house; I am sorry that I have nearly concluded my remarks and I would hate to have to repeat them for his sake.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Pelletier: Dispense.

Mr. Horner: Finally we have a comment from the studious minister. As I was saying before the Minister of Justice came in, I was disappointed with his remarks.

An hon. Member: Oh, no, not again.

Mr. Horner: I will try to be brief.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will read the hon. member's remarks in *Hansard*.

Mr. Horner: Is this bill a laughing matter across Canada?

An hon. Member: You are.

Mr. Horner: That is an interesting remark by the hon. member.

An hon. Member: Don't provoke us.

Mr. Horner: I do not worry about provoking hon. members. What I worry about is the representation that my constituents will have on the board and about the way in which the application of this bill will affect my province. I certainly do not worry about whom I may provoke.

I suggest that this amendment should be accepted. It seeks to amend a clause which is based on a false premise. As found on page 51 of the committee's proceedings the Secretary of State made the following statement:

> Mr. Chairman, I might take a remark that might be useful to Mr. McQuaid when he drafts his amendment. There are only eight provinces who have bilingual districts according to the recommendations of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, which means that ten was deemed to be

a sufficient number to have all the interested provinces in the group. Now, I just say this for information.

The Minister of Justice should know this because he was on the committee. He said that the committee's findings should be final in this regard. They are not final as is proven by the premise on which the clause is based. Clause 13 specifically spells out that a bilingual district can be as small as a school district and as large as a census division. The B and B Commission specifically suggested that census divisions are the only way in which it is possible to divide Canada into bilingual districts. To me this is the wrong premise. I believe that clause 15 involves the provinces, and the amendment to clause 14 vastly improves it. I urge the Secretary of State and the Minister of Justice to have a hurried caucus and to agree to support the amendment if they want at least to project the idea across Canada that they are concerned about the suspicions regarding the bill.

It was reported in the newspapers not long ago that the Prime Minister publicly condemned the press for not selling the idea of bilingualism to Canadians. I imagine he shrugged his shoulders and said that he did not do it as well as he could have but that the newspapers have vastly underplayed the issue and have not done a good job of selling bilingualism. In making that statement he admitted that there was a great deal of suspicion about the bill, but he felt it was a false suspicion. However, if he wishes to set that suspicion at rest, he can do so by accepting the amendment we propose as the first step toward alleviating that suspicion. Refusal to do so will only add to the suspicion in my mind and in the minds of thousands of people across Canada that the government wants to pull the wool over someone's eyes in connection with this legislation, that it does not want representatives from all the provinces sitting in on these meetings, that it wants to steer away from certain of the provinces, with the idea that only provinces agreeable to these proposals should be represented.

• (4:50 p.m.)

This is not the spirit about which the hon. member for York South spoke. It is not the spirit he suggested the government should show. Whether it likes it or not, the government is responsible to all the people in all the provinces of Canada, and unreadiness to accept this responsibility indicates that it is unwilling to pay any regard to the unrest and suspicion in the minds of many people across Canada today with regard to this legislation.

[Mr. Horner.]

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), let me say first of all that I know full well that the words spoken by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) were spoken with sincerity. He expects the government to stand up and be counted, and to maintain the respect in which it was held when the last election was conducted. At that time the government was expected, when introducing this legislation, to be truthful to the rest of the nation. I can assure the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) that what the hon. member for York South said very plainly was that as members of this house we would ensure that the rights of every individual in this country are well looked after. I am sure every hon. member of the house, particularly every responsible member, realizes that the hon. member for York South is fully aware of the situation in this country and that he fully understands the general principles of this bill, recognizing that this measure is something the nation must have.

Having said this, let me add that there are members of our party who do not agree that this amendment is a bad one. I am one who believes that the amendment is entitled to support. If we are to be a true democracy, the people of the entire nation ought to be represented on any board which is set up. In this connection I should like to refer to an editorial which appeared in the *Western Producer* of June 12. It outlines clearly the position we are likely to come to unless we broaden the representation on this advisory board. The article states:

> The controversy over the official languages bill indicates that Canada is not yet a nation in spirit. It is still a collection of regions whose isolation from one another is both geographic and psychological.

The editorial continues:

> There is evidence that much of this regional opposition has been based on misunderstandings. Also, many Canadians are preoccupied with pressing "bread and butter" problems such as inflation, housing and sagging wheat sales. Naturally, they regard cultural legislation as a luxury at such a time.

The government should realize that if it sets up a board of the kind proposed without making provision for proper representation from the provinces across this nation there is bound to be misunderstanding. It is bound to

result in a further lack of communication between the various parts of Canada, although the need for effective communication has never been greater. I am familiar with the situation in western Canada. Westerners believe the cabinet is responsible for a failure of communication in connection with the serious agricultural situation there. I do not propose to drag the subject of agriculture into this debate, but I think it can be used for the purpose of drawing an analogy. If the bill before us now is passed in its present form without provision being made for proper representation on the board we are asking for trouble over this issue just as we are asking for trouble, and do have trouble, with regard to agriculture.

I accept the principle of this bill in its entirety. Hon. members who are supporting the amendment are merely asking that there be true representation on the advisory board. I do not think this is asking too much. I was disappointed to hear the minister suggest that what was done in the committee would dictate the procedure at the report stage in the house. I may say I took exception to the small size of the special committee which studied this legislation. My personal view is that a committee as small in numbers as the one which studied this bill could not really be representative. I was also disappointed to find that the government had asked many younger Members of Parliament, people for whom I have the highest regard, to serve on this committee, because I realized that the dictation comes from the front bench. Those people should stand on their own feet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite has just said, in substance, that we younger government members receive instructions and even orders from the government or from the minister.

I wish to go on record as disputing the validity of this statement and I will even say that I personally presented an amendment quite out of line with the views of my government, which proves my ability to do my own thinking and to stand on my own feet.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: The hon. member is to be congratulated if he did propose such an amendment, but during the time I have been attending committee meetings I have seen too much evidence that members on the government side change their minds after decisions have been made. In this regard I need only refer to what happened in the committee on Transport and Communications. The evidence speaks for itself. I cast no reflection on individual members serving on committees but I believe that if this legislation is the most important which the government has to offer—and it seems that it is—hon. gentlemen opposite should have had their top cabinet men on that committee, giving direct expression to their views.

The west is vitally concerned, Mr. Speaker, about its representation both in Ottawa and elsewhere. The west is vitally concerned about the degree of recognition accorded it by eastern and central Canada in particular. Things are going on which make the west highly suspicious of anything the government does. I do not necessarily believe that any member of the cabinet would deliberately bypass issues affecting western Canada but in today's situation it is very important that every board, every committee and every advisory body set up by the government should be truly representative of the entire nation. If hon. members opposite are prepared to invite separatism they can certainly do it by refusing representation to the west on an advisory board such as the one the government is proposing to set up at the present time.

We recognize that the board will have considerable power. We recognize also that the commissioner to be appointed will have considerable power. The government has, I realize, written safeguards into the bill, but I think it is of great importance that the commissioner should be familiar with the situation in every province of this nation. Let us avoid a situation developing in which the west can say, once again: We told you so.

• (5:00 p.m.)

It is easy for me to address public meetings in my constituency and support the principle of the language bill, and this I do at every opportunity. But it is very difficult to convince the people in the west that their wishes are being taken into account. I urge the government to consider the points I have made and to ensure that the commissioner is fully familiar with the wishes of the entire nation, not just one particular segment of the country.

If we are to bridge the communication gap, I suggest, that the only way to do so is to adopt the amendment that is before the house at this time. I believe that the entire nation, but certainly the people in the west,

are quite unfamiliar with the circumstances surrounding the languages bill. Again I should like to quote the editorial in the *Western Producer:*

> —public misunderstanding and economic worries —the federal government must accept much of the blame. For months, the government failed to explain the need for the language bill and its limited scope.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the ministers who will be responsible for the implementation of this bill and the regulations to be drawn up after its passage to realize there is still a selling job to be done in the west. I am sure there are circumstances in that area completely unknown to the ministers. A situation that is really not improving can still be remedied. The general consensus in the west is that there is an appreciation of the two languages concept. People in the west appreciate the British North America Act and agree there is no reason the young people should not learn two languages. I agree that it is the young people who should learn two languages rather than starting at the top and working downward. This is a point I have made before. If the government is prepared to make the effort there is still time to reach a complete understanding on the languages bill, but to date nothing has been done.

I suggest that if this motion is defeated by the government, we may see a move toward separatism that will be unparalleled. I am sure that no member of this house wants to see that happen. Certainly I would be the last to do anything to incur the disfavour of the people of this nation. We should make all citizens feel they are part of Canada instead of dividing them between east and west.

Personally, I do not think the motion before the house is asking too much. I believe it will give the provinces of British Columbia and Newfoundland representation on the advisory board. Then if a bilingual district is ever created in either province, the representative concerned would be entirely familiar with the circumstances. He would be in a position to know the ins and outs and would have the experience so necessary in establishing a bilingual district under this bill. I can see no reason for members opposing the motion, particularly if they bear in mind that at the moment those two provinces do not have the required percentage necessary to establish a bilingual district. However, in the event that a bilingual district were created in the future, the representatives of the two provinces will be able to do a much more effective job than someone unfamiliar with the circumstances.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

Surely the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) is not asking all that much that it cannot be approved by the government.

My final words are that if we do want to create a communication gap one way to do so is to leave out two provinces from the ambit of any legislation passed by this house. All legislation passed by the house concerns the people of this nation, and in return for their tax dollars they are entitled to have equal representation on any advisory board that is set up by the government.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, all hon. members know that during the last debate I was in favour of the principle of the bill before us.

But at that time, I had mentioned to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) that the public should be as much informed as possible on that bill.

When I said that the minister had to inform the public fully on all aspects of the bill before us, I was right, because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) complained recently that the implications of the official languages bill have not been understood all across Canada. In fact, the previous speaker has just stated that the message has not been construed in the same manner in western Canada.

I know that the members of my party have also made this exception during our discussions on this bill.

I was not very impressed this afternoon by the warnings of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to the effect that the amendment moved by my colleague had to be defeated.

Indeed if the minister claims that committees are in a position to solve the whole problem, it means that the bill, at the report stage in the house, cannot be amended in any way. In my opinion, this principle expounded by the Minister of Justice is wrong.

True, the role of committees is to consider the legislation submitted to them, to do the research and to obtain the information. But hon. members also have the right, the duty and the responsibility, at the report stage to move amendments in order to improve the bill under consideration.

I wonder why the government rejects the amendment before us. It does not affect at all the principle of the bill, but simply purports to give the provinces responsible for setting up bilingual districts the right to appoint

representatives on the Commission and on the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.

• (5:10 p.m.)

As I said at the outset, the Prime Minister complained that the newspapers did not give adequate information to the people about the bill. At that time I had also told the Secretary of State that he should do all he could to inform the population about the consequences of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the Advisory Board living in the province involved will know best the problems of the bilingual districts. As I said earlier, I do not see what valid argument the government can put forward to reject the amendment we moved this afternoon.

Obviously, sections 14 and 15 must be seen in the same context, and if we want the population of the provinces which will have to take part in the establishment of bilingual districts to be well informed on the sitting up of those districts, the best procedure would be to appoint representatives of each province on the Advisory Board.

The hon. member for York South said this afternoon that for committees and commissions, we must stop seeking a geographical representation and we should particularly try to get men of ability. I told him that to take geographical boundaries into consideration does not exclude the possibility of making a good choice. To me, the argument of the hon. member for York-South is very weak.

Even if we ask for a geographical representation, so to speak, on this Advisory Board, nothing prevents us at the same time from appointing proficient people.

I would like to hear the Secretary of State put forward a more convincing argument than that of the Minister of Justice this afternoon to show us that our amendment is worthless.

The previous speaker of the New Democratic Party, as well as Créditiste members told us that our amendment was valid and should be incorporated in the legislation in order to ensure that the provinces will be adequately represented on the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a reasonable and logical request which would help the government to make the people better understand the substance of the bill now under consideration for the establishment of bilingual districts.

I therefore urge the Secretary of State to put forward more serious arguments indicating that our amendment is not worth anything, that it would not serve the interests of the provinces, that it would not facilitate understanding and the establishment of bilingual districts. I would ask all those who have heard the points made by members of this side of the house to consider them thoroughly before rejecting the amendment.

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to sit on the committee which studied this legislation, and I approved a very similar amendment that was being discussed: I should therefore like to support also the amendment before us.

Furthermore, I should like to start by calling your attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) which, in my opinion, are shallow, not to say irresponsible. Therefore, as the question of my colleague, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) indicated, if we do not have in the house the same opportunities to look fully into a bill or some clauses of a bill, we might wonder what we are doing here.

Ten or fifteen members of a committee cannot have the infused knowledge required to make decisions on behalf of 264 members, all the more as a member of the committee might be absent when a clause is being considered. As the N.D.P. and the Ralliement créditiste have only one representative each, it might happen that the views of their electors are not expressed on account of their representative's absence. And that can happen. Therefore, it is extremely important that we make a thorough study here in the house of some disputable points, for instance the one before us.

I cannot understand the position taken by the government. The very existence of Canada seems to be denied. The true nature of Canada appears to be ignored. Indeed, is not Canada a confederation of the ten provinces and the Northwest Territories? Is that not Canada? If so, then, let us take that fact into account while considering a legislation as important as we are led to believe.

Mr. Speaker, my argument is based on the fact that we have to ask ourselves what Canada is. Then, if Canada, from a geographical point of view, is made up of ten provinces plus the Northwest Territories, it is only normal that the Advisory Board be made up of commissioners from each province and the Territories. That would be quite normal.

The objection raised is that the western provinces, which do not comprise enough French-Canadians, would be more or less interested in the project.

Mr. Speaker, as we do not know what the future holds in reserve for us, in what direction the population might move suddenly, it is always safer to provide for all contingencies.

I remember what happened in committee in that respect and I should like to give the same example I gave at the time.

In Newfoundland, at the present time, the French-Canadians represent 7/10 of 1 per cent of the population and, therefore, it is impossible to establish in the province a bilingual district. On the other hand, in Labrador—a territory which accounts for a large portion of the Newfoundland territory and where a tremendous development project is being carried out at Churchill Falls, the labour force comprises 60 or 70 per cent of French-speaking Canadians from Quebec.

So, if those people decide to remain there, they become Newfoundlanders until such time as the geographical error placing Labrador in Newfoundland is corrected. At any rate, we are faced, in the meantime, with that situation, and a bilingual district may well be created in Newfoundland, in the Labrador region. Then, it would be perfectly normal that the Advisory Council include a member from Newfoundland as from every other province.

That is, I think, a more constructive way of promoting better understanding and, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has often repeated, all the more so as this bill is only concerned with federal institutions.

But, where the establishment of bilingual districts is concerned, territorial limits are involved and that comes under provincial jurisdiction. And, as there have always been conflicts, which have often proved to be unproductive, between the provinces and the central government, it would not be advisable to leave the door open to more, when this can easily be avoided.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The government appears to fear the reaction in certain parts of the country. If such fear is being entertained with regard to a bill that is considered to have priority, the following conclusion is unavoidable: either the country is not ready to accept such legislation, or the government is not daring enough nor dynamic enough to obtain acceptance of the two official languages. Possible reactions should not be feared, and I think it would be the best way to reassure those who, are now having difficulty in recognizing certain things, and I understand them very well.

Obviously, where there are very few French-speaking people, where other ethnic groups are much more numerous than the French-speaking minority, it is very normal that there should be strong disagreement and that the majority should not understand why a French-speaking minority should be given special privileges or rights.

Of course, one could build an argument around this but it is not the purpose of my remarks. I just want to come back to the amendment to say that I feel the government should accept it. I cannot see what difference it would make if it were accepted.

It is already provided that there will be from five to ten representatives. If this amendment were adopted, the number would be set at 12. I fail to see anything very serious there. I do not agree with the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria who kept harping on the matter of number. Indeed, he seemed to want to minimize that matter by saying that it was wasting time, that it was useless to dwell on a matter of number. I suggest it is much more serious than all that. I agree it is a matter of number, but it is also important to know what the number represents. It is not the number as much that is important, because it is already provided there will be as many as 10 representatives. Then, by including the Territories, we would want by this amendment to increase this number to 12, in order to reflect Canada's true image. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that is not dallying over numbers; it is an extremely important question. Representation on the advisory board must reflect the image of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising at the present time is simply to put on record certain references from Book I, The Official Languages, which is the first report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. I think there may have been some misunderstanding about whether the bilingual districts recommended by the commission would correspond in every case to a census division. Hon. members will find at page 107 of Book I a reference under the heading, "Determining Boundaries of Bilingual Districts":

To achieve this in a given area it is necessary to decide on rules for setting the boundaries of

bilingual districts. We shall use the census division as the statistical base for discovering linguistic clusters, at least in an approximate sense. It is not technically an administrative division, since it is used only for the census—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I would like to point out he is not in his seat.

Mr. Stanbury: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I continue:

—but it is a more accurate and stable base than most administrative divisions. One of its purposes is to report upon Canada's linguistic make-up; using it, we can follow locally from census to census the development of each official language group.

I now quote from the bottom of page 108:

However, none of these census divisions will necessarily form a bilingual district. Although the census division indicates the presence of French and English speaking minorities within a given area, it does not show their distribution. For example, two neighbouring divisions, A and B, might have official language minorities forming 20 and 3 per cent of their populations respectively. On closer examination we may find that the minorities are not distributed at random; for example, most of them might be living in only one part of the area. We can express the situation graphically as follows:

Then is shown a graph and the report continues:

If we chose the census division as the basis for creating a bilingual district, all of division A would likely become bilingual, and all of division B would remain unilingual. Our diagram shows that most of the members of the minority live in one section of division A and in the adjacent part of division B. Should official bilingualism be imposed on the unilingual parts of the former, and the bilingual fraction of the latter be ignored? We do not think so. In such a case, all of the area marked in black, excluding the rest of the divisions A and B, should become one bilingual district. This theoretical example—simpler than the actual situation in most cases—shows how the census division will help determine the bilingual district, although in the end the boundaries of the two might be quite different.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker. I put it on record simply to avoid any misunderstanding about the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take part in this debate and support the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) which has already received basic support from many members on this side of the house. Having delayed entry into the debate on the bill respecting the official languages of Canada, I now wish to take part at this point because I was one of those who had no hesitation on second reading in feeling that this bill was important enough to send it to committee for the committee to do constructive work and have it come back to the house with amendments to be dealt with here.

The committee has done constructive work. The bill is now back before the house with some amendments. As we begin studying these amendments it is, quite frankly, hard to comprehend the position of the government and, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), and the interjection of the parliamentary secretary, although undoubtedly meant to illuminate, really was not germane to what has been said in this debate about what this amendment does. It is difficult to comprehend the position of the government on this amendment. The government, for some reason or other, has dug in its heels and is suggesting that the present clause 14, appointing not less than five and not more than ten persons to a very important advisory board, reflects the true identity of Canada. The men who administer this act will really have to work.

As one catalyst taking part in this debate, I do so because of the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in the house this afternoon that because this amendment was dealt with in the committee the debate is *res judicata*. That argument is so weak and flimsy it amounts to straw and I will not waste any more of my breath on it. I hope when reading *Hansard* tomorrow I will be able to arrive at a different interpretation than I have placed on the minister's argument. However, that is not my main point.

I will refer later as to why we should be on guard about this type of loosely worded clause which affects Canada as a nation because this bill is called an act respecting the official languages of Canada.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) here. I was amazed to hear his reasoning. However, I will deal with that later.

Having dismissed the minister's argument as straw, I will now come to the whole purpose of this bill as it is being promulgated, proclaimed and debated in many areas of the country. The purpose of the bill is to unite the country from coast to coast. We all know, and would be naïve not to admit, that there are worries and concerns from coast to coast about the purpose and principle of the bill. My friends and colleagues from the west, including the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), as well as members from

Quebec, I imagine, have no monopoly on the concern and worry in taking a good principle and implementing it into legislation. Sometimes the difference between principle and practice is really the difference between the pulpit and practice. It is sometimes hard to practice what some people preach.

• (5:30 p.m.)

This bill refers to the official languages of Canada. When I last looked at the map Canada stretched from coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia. It did not consist of the maritime region, the Quebec region and the Ontario region. And when you get to Ontario do you take northern Ontario, do you take Toronto, Ontario, and do you take southwestern Ontario? It did not consist of the breadbasket of this land, the three prairie provinces, and it certainly did not consist only of British Columbia. It consisted of the ten provinces.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw, the hon. member for Crowfoot, and other hon. members and I are talking about a communication that is supposed to help unite us. All of us in this chamber recognize and appreciate that there is sincere concern about implementing this principle. So it is difficult to understand why the government is suggesting that we can have a board of not less than five and not more than ten which supposedly reflects the national boundaries from coast to coast. All this amendment suggests is that there shall be a representative from each province, the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories. The Secretary of State might have some objection in regard to the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories. However, basically coast to coast each province should be represented. This is the basic reason we exist as a nation and is the very fact of the existence of this nation called Canada.

The minister interjected with his argument of straw by saying that the matter is *res judicata* because it has been considered by a committee and thus cannot be considered in this house. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said that if we accept that type of argument the whole committee system will grind to a halt. I suggest that the face of the bill itself, the very title of the bill, the reason the Secretary of State went to western Canada to preach about the bill and the reason the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has given for introducing the bill, indicate that the purpose of the bill is to help make Canada one country from coast to coast. When the government suggests such things as participatory involvement, the politics of involvement and the politics of participation, why then when we set up this advisory board should we eliminate parts of this country, provinces of this country. This is beyond all comprehension and understanding. The very name of the bill implies ten provinces. I must say that so far as I am concerned, having had no discussion with the hon. member for Cardigan, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory might be in a different position, but those areas are part of this country too.

In respect of the argument of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) I should like to say I can remember a recent federal-provincial conference when headlines blazed out across the country saying that the Premier of Newfoundland, a province which evidently does not have a bilingual district, was in support of the principle of bilingualism. Abraham Lincoln said many years ago that it is easy to be tolerant and that the racial problem in the United States as he described it then was in direct ratio to the numbers in the country which had the problem. For Mr. Smallwood of Newfoundland, with no bilingual districts, it might be very easy for him to say, if you chose to believe him, that Newfoundland will now be bilingual.

Most of us saw Mr. Smallwood either in the conference or on the television screen. We were most impressed by his contribution to the earlier debates when without any hesitation at all he was one of the first premiers to endorse the principle set out in this bill. No one then suggested and no headline then suggested that we should discount Mr. Smallwood and his little province because that province is only one of ten and is situated on the east coast and does not even have a bilingual district. That in effect, with a little twisting but not much, is the argument of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria. He comes from New Brunswick and I come from Nova Scotia. New Brunswick has a very strong, healthy and constructive Acadian group reflecting one of the majority languages. But Nova Scotia also has bilingual districts reflecting both the majority languages set out in this bill.

I must say, without any aspersion on anyone who might be appointed from New Brunswick, that I would feel much more happy and much more involved and Nova Scotia would feel much more involved if there were a representative from Nova Scotia on this board to look after the boundary lines and problems in respect of joining up bilingual districts in Nova Scotia rather than have that

delegated to someone who, albeit well-intentioned, albeit objective, albeit a man of competence, reasoning and objectivity, would still be a New Brunswicker. Sometimes in Nova Scotia we do not accept holus-bolus what someone outside the boundaries of Nova Scotia proposes.

The bill is not based on regions. It is based on Canada. Canada consists of ten provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory. To go back to the federal-provincial conference when, quite rightly, the papers made much of Mr. Smallwood's position, Mr. Smallwood as a Canadian came forward and stated his proposition long before some of the other premier's did. No one then said that his words were hollow because Newfoundland does not have a bilingual district. Why, then, should a member rise in this house to say that the inoffensive amendment of the hon. member for Cardigan, suggesting that each province be represented from coast to coast, should not be accepted because we are going to revert to regions? This bill is supposed to unite the country. Yet in respect of the first amendment put forward concerning the board that is supposed to implement the bill and supervise it we are dividing the country.

The very words spoken on this side of the house reflect some concern that, instead of pulling this thing together and getting on with the principle and away from some of the nitty-gritty and some of the detail, the Secretary of State and others, perhaps ideally in the classroom and academically, think it might be nice to have the phrase "not less than five and not more than ten" to reflect the regions. One result of this, Mr. Speaker, will probably be that some members on this side of the house from east and west, probably because of the size of the areas they represent, will be left out of this advisory board. We would like to contribute and participate.

One thing that has been paradoxical in respect of this parliament since the election a year ago is that the politics of participation have become the politics of non-participation in so many areas.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: In the last election the Prime Minister did not promise much but I will give him credit that the one area in which he did promise something was that there would be an official languages bill. But he did not say there would be a board to which some provinces might contribute and to which other provinces might not contribute. He talked about participatory politics and said that this would help unite the country. I say that the very composition of this board cannot do anything but create division in the country.

If I had any doubt at all in my mind about this I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to look at the make-up and composition of their own cabinet. I am only sorry there are not more members from Ontario in the cabinet today because if I need any support at all for any fears or apprehensions I have about the loose and vague wording of this clause it can be found in the cabinet in which there are five members from Montreal and two from the city of Toronto. From the reading I have done I suggest that the ministerial representation is more out of balance than it has been since confederation. I suggest that on a population basis metropolitan Toronto is the most under-represented area in our country. Yet we are supposed to take this on faith and good will and close our eyes to some of the practices of the federal government, close our eyes to the principle of the bill, close our eyes to the title of the bill which refers to Canada, and say, "O.K., not less than five, not more than ten". On an amendment which is so simple on the fact of it I cannot understand why there cannot be some tolerance and moderation because what we have been told, and it is so, is that the advisory board will be so important to the success of the bill.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I hope that the minister will reconsider and that the government will do the same. What is the fear? The government appoints officials to various boards and has been doing so for many years. I understand these commissioners will be appointed under the Inquiries Act at pleasure. Perhaps one might interpret this as meaning that they will be appointed after a decennial census, but as I read the Inquiries Act they will only be appointed at pleasure. If something goes wrong the Governor in Council can always replace them.

It seems to me that government appointed boards have been operating fairly effectively in the last two years. There do not seem to be too many problems in respect of division of opinion, certainly very few about which the public hears anything. The amendment is an attempt to extend the clause to include all provinces, but it seems to have run into a roadblock. I sincerely suggest that unless there is a moderation of the clause by the amendment, which I submit is sensible and relatively simple on its face, then the many

fears that Canadians have in respect of the successful implementation of this bill will not be assuaged.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about this bill because I think it involves a matter which goes far beyond party lines. We are trying through this bill to make a series of judgments as to how best we can carry out the spirit of this legislation. As the last hon. member who spoke pointed out, this will add greatly to the unity of this country.

It is rather unfortunate that the committee had to be small and that we could not all be members. With a large number of us as members of the committee I think there might have been greater understanding, a greater exchange of opinion and views. However, that lack could not be helped. The committee had to be small for various reasons.

So far as the implementation of this measure is concerned, this is one of the most difficult, delicate and dangerous pieces of legislation we are likely to pass in this session. For this reason there are differences of opinion among the members of all parties. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) pointed out that among his colleagues there are those who do not see eye to eye with him in respect of this amendment. I am one of those members. I shall go into my reasons in just a moment. Surely even those on the government side must be prey to these anxieties and differences of opinion. The minister should not take pride in having assumed a stance and maintaining that this stance must be defended at all costs. I think it is up to us to pool our best thoughts and judgments as to the effect of this bill across the country.

Let me point out one of the dangers of the bill. We are inclined to believe that the big central provinces are the provinces mostly concerned and affected by this languages bill. Perhaps at this moment it is true that they are more directly affected. Consequently I go along with what the hon. member for York South said, that there should be provisions for two members, one English speaking and one French speaking, from each of the central provinces to make sure there is a complete representation of feelings on this board. It would be even better in my opinion if there could be members who spoke both English and French. In this way I think we would have good representation, and this should be our aim. There should be a complete understanding of the provinces on the part of those people who are chosen.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Let me turn now to my strongest objection. In our anxiety to make sure of complete representation for the central provinces which have these difficulties and have to work with this measure from the beginning, we should not be blind to the fact that it is equally important to make sure that the rest of Canada is represented on this board. This is not a matter which concerns only Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and parts of Manitoba. This question concerns all of Canada.

It is our hope that everyone in Canada will increasingly be able to feel chez soi, no matter what part of the country they may find themselves in. Mobility is increasing. It is our hope that the curtains, iron, bamboo and the rest, which have existed in various parts of Canada will be removed and that we shall become one people. I do not mean this in the melting-pot sense but in the sense that we shall be free to go back and forth across this country as our own.

I urge the minister to include a representative from British Columbia on this board. I come from a province which is as yet almost untouched by the necessity of dealing with this problem. That is precisely why I want British Columbia to be represented. As the years pass British Columbia is bound to be drawn closer and closer to the rest of the country. Some of us do not like to face the facts of our geography, but it is true that because of the geography of British Columbia we are already much too far away from Ottawa to obtain the best kind of unity. British Columbia is much too far away from the Atlantic regions to obtain the understanding we need. If there is more truth than poetry in some of the jibes that British Columbia is in danger of becoming a separatist province, the reason is in large part related to our geography. The Rocky Mountains are not only a geographical barrier, they are a psychological barrier. I want British Columbians to feel from the beginning of the implementation of this languages bill that they are in on the ground floor.

From the beginning the people of British Columbia should know what is going on and should feel that they are a part of this measure, even though this problem does not touch us at this time. If we are in on the ground floor the task of those of us who come from British Columbia will be much easier. It will be much easier to explain the languages bill to our constituents if we can go now and say that because of the composition of this board a representative from British Columbia will be included. The people will then have a stake in

this effort to knit Canada together. If we leave them out and have three or four members each from Ontario, Manitoba and—

Mr. McQuaid: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mrs. MacInnis: Yes.

Mr. McQuaid: In respect of the argument the hon. member is now making, would she admit that this also applies to all the other provinces in Canada and not just to British Columbia.

Mrs. MacInnis: I agree absolutely, yes. I had thought that these arguments had been made so well on behalf of the Maritimes and other parts of Canada that I did not have to include them in my remarks. I do not want to get British Columbia in first. I want to be a Canadian first among fellow-Canadians from Victoria all the way to St. John's.

I think the danger lies in the fact that by leaving out parts of Canada these people will feel to some extent that the bill does not apply to them, and it will become increasingly more difficult for those of us from those areas to explain why they should be interested. We must remember that taxes from British Columbia will help to finance the implementation of this measure just as will the taxes from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and all across Canada. We will pay these taxes gladly if the people themselves understand this measure and believe in it. Let me urge the minister to let us all be a part of this from the beginning.

Some of us from British Columbia and from the Maritimes know that it is not easy to get the co-operation of a lot of people in our provinces because they live too far away from the great French culture in Canada to understand it. Some of us have had the good fortune to be able to get a little entrance into this culture. We have enjoyed it and want to make it ours. I want to make it British Columbia's culture together with our English speaking culture, but it will be very hard to do this if there is not a representative of our province on the board which will be responsible for administering the official languages bill.

• (5:50 p.m.)

May I say one further thing, Mr. Speaker. These remarks may not come within the ambit of the amendment under discussion, but if I make them now it may save my speaking again. I believe that a great deal will depend upon the commissioner. I make this plea to the minister. I suppose the commissioner will be French speaking and I hope he will be bilingual, but let him be somebody who has lived for a little while in western Canada. The commissioner should be a man familiar with many parts of this great country. It is not enough that he be an Ontarian or Quebecker; he should have lived in the west for a while.

An hon. Member: What about the maritimes?

Mrs. MacInnis: I do not mind if he has also lived in the maritimes; that would improve the picture.

[*Translation*]

Now I would like to conclude by quoting some remarks made by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) who said: Everyone must be led to accept both languages. It is not the number that counts: it is the certainty that everyone will be included, that every part of Canada will be represented.

[*English*]

The hon. member for York South has rightly said we deplore the fact that in order that the program be properly administered it must be chopped up into provincial compartments. However, at this stage I do not think there is any other way of making sure that the program is properly administered. We must depend upon provincial boundaries and seek representation from within those boundaries. Some day these boundaries may fade away and become regions; I hope they will if this proves to be a better way of achieving the purposes of the bill. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again urge the minister to make sure that the province of British Columbia is represented on this board.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say on this amendment. I wonder why the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) does not simply say whether or not the amendment is acceptable to the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Two of my colleagues have spoken this afternoon on this matter and I have listened closely to what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), and some members from the Maritime Provinces.

The purpose of the amendment is to make the Board truly national so it will comprise members from across Canada. There should be at least twelve of them. If there are only five, some areas of Canada will not be represented on this Board.

The government, posing as the champion of national unity, from coast to coast, should accept that we stop discussing this question, and on behalf of national unity, that each province, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories be all represented on this Advisory Board. I do not quite understand the attitude of the Secretary of State. I am sure that he must want very much that this Board should reflect Canada faithfully.

So let us appoint no less than 12 commissioners. If we need 15, as suggested earlier by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, let us appoint 15. Two from Ontario, 2 for Quebec and so on for the other provinces.

According to some hon. members, the problem is related above all to our central provinces, but we say that it relates to all provinces. It was interesting to note this afternoon the interest hon. members were giving to this most important issue of passing the official languages bill.

When all the provinces feel at home, when they have their say in the matter, when a commissioner may express the opinion of the people of his province, I sincerely believe that national unity will be better understood, better implemented, better respected. Eventually, the unity must not be only that of Ontario or Quebec, but also that of British Columbia, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, Alberta, of all the provinces, of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

I endorse the opinions expressed by my colleagues, this afternoon, as well as those of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. She spoke as a staunch Canadian. Besides, she is proud to say a few words in good French, in the House of Commons, and I congratulate her. Moreover, she has national unity at heart, on behalf of her province, as we have it at heart, on behalf of our province.

[*English*]

Mr. Ritchie: May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to special order made on Friday last, June 13, the sitting of this house stands suspended until seven o'clock.

[Mr. Caouette.]

SITTING SUSPENDED

At six o'clock the sitting of the house was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 7 p.m.

Mr. Gordon T. Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to say a few words in support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). I feel that the government should give serious consideration to accepting the amendment in order to allay the fears and suspicions that the legislation, which is of an administrative nature, might be wrongly administered. I think the matter of bilingual districts on which this board will rule will be one of the most contentious and difficult portions of the bill to administer. I do not believe that the members of the B. and B. Commission were aware of the problems that these bilingual districts will cause, nor do I think that the government has thought very much about this problem.

Bilingual districts must of necessity be mostly in rural areas. I will have a bilingual district in my riding, and having considered the matter I should like to recount some of the problems that will most certainly occur. I feel that if the representation on the board is changed, there might be a better understanding and a better meeting of minds among people in the bilingual districts. In my area there is a provincial riding in which, according to the last census, 28 per cent of the population is French speaking. However, this district could be expanded to include the whole of the federal riding, about three quarters of the population of which would still fall within the 11 per cent requirement for a bilingual district. This means that many residents living as far as 200 miles away, and many ethnic groups speaking other languages than the two main official languages, will fall within the bilingual district.

Many problems are likely to occur. First of all, there is no definition of bilingual districts and much will depend on the interpretation of members of the advisory board. Right within the small area in my riding which will constitute the bilingual district there are people who are neither French nor English but of Ukrainian origin who will be subject to the proposed regulations. These people are already becoming very concerned about who will man the post offices and various federal offices and about whether or not these posi-

tions will be occupied by bilingual people from outside their community.

I should like to say a word or two about the difficulties faced by the census takers in deciding what is the mother tongue of the various people in the area. I can think of one particular family in my riding in which the father is French speaking. He married an English girl and their children speak English, so that the whole family now speaks English except when the father visits his parents. What will the language of this family be considered to be under the census? It is quite obvious that there is no rule about it and much will depend on the opinion and interpretation of the census taker.

I envisage also great difficulties in drawing up these bilingual districts. I am sure that a person appointed from each province will help in doing this. There is also the matter of provincial rights and provincial acquiescence. After all, there is no point in drawing up a bilingual district unless the province is willing to back up the area with a massive program of education to help out the minority group in retaining its language. During the course of the last ten years it has been my pleasure to interview, every day in the course of my work, two or three familes among the French minority community in my riding. I have always been interested in the language problem so I asked them to tell me what their reaction is to living in a largely English environment. I heard many interesting comments. Some of them wish to retain their French culture, others feel it is not worth their effort. One very interesting person, a woman with six children, said that she felt only English should be spoken as a main language.

• (7:10 p.m.)

When I suggested to her that to be bilingual was valuable and that one should not give up the possibility of knowing two languages, her answer was: We must live in an English world and my children must learn English in order to get jobs. So unless the provinces are willing to back up bilingual districts by massive programs of education there is a risk of creating intellectual ghettos. It is often said that the problems faced by rural people arise largely because of the lack of education. We shall be faced in the rural areas with the task of upgrading the educational qualifications of minority groups so that they may be equal to the challenge of the practical world of economics and of technology outside. If this amendment were passed, considerably more co-operation would be likely on the part of the provinces concerned.

Clause 14 states that five or more persons will be appointed to the board representative of the several provinces or the principal regions of Canada. The definition of a region is so vague as scarcely to be worth considering. Five people could be appointed from somewhere north of the Arctic circle and still represent various regions of Canada. They could be appointed from five suburbs of Toronto or Montreal, or from Winnipeg or Newfoundland. The phrase is so vague as to be of little value; it means that almost anyone could be appointed. The government could appoint five people from one particular region, despite the fact that this would nullify the idea behind the clause which, I suppose, is to give representation to people familiar with the problems which the institution of bilingual districts is likely to raise. If we are to have a board, let us at least have one whose members are familiar with the difficulties likely to be encountered in each of our provinces; let us not have one on which members from eastern Canada are called upon to determine whether and in what circumstances bilingual districts should be set up in western Canada.

It has been said that the government will use its discretion well, and appoint a representative group. The minister may very well do this. The minister will not always be in his present position. Some other minister, some other government, will be in power, and they may think upon different lines. It seems to me, therefore, that the present muddy definition embodied in the words "principal regions of Canada" should be spelled out in much clearer terms.

In some ways, this is an interesting experiment, a most unusual case of a minority forcing its culture, to some extent, on the majority. This may be disputed. French Canadians may say it is time their culture was recognized, and that in the past severe discrimination has been shown against them. They may honestly feel this to be so. But regardless of whether they do or not, many people will not accept their contention. This attitude is creating the risk of division in our national life, and the situation is likely to become worse as time goes on. When families find that their sons and daughters are not able to enter the civil service or the armed forces as easily as once was the case, passion and unreason take over. Sometimes the antagonism is unreasonable, but it is genuinely felt.

The attempt to force a minority point of view on to the majority will be resisted

strongly regardless of its legality or even of its righteousness in the opinion of the minority. For this reason, the manner in which the act is administered becomes all important. I strongly suggest the government could help toward the better administration of these provisions by appointing a member to the board from each province. The provincial members could act as watchdogs; they could help the board by setting guidelines. I do not know whether or not this experiment will succeed. This is an issue which will be with us for many years, indeed, for the lifetime of many of us in this chamber. I urge the government to consider seriously the amendment which the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) has put forward, believing that if adopted it would go some little way toward improving the bill and making it more acceptable to people in various parts of Canada.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I want you to fully understand that I support this amendment presented by my hon. friend from Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). I was disappointed in the statement by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) this afternoon as to the degree of consideration he felt he could give to our amendments at this time in the light of the committee's recommendations. If this is the practice which is to be followed, if the government is unwilling to accept any amendments after a report has been made by a committee, then I suggest that debates here in this chamber are no more than an exercise in futility.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) told us that the outcome of this legislation would depend upon the goodwill and good sense of the governments who administer it. He referred particularly to the advisory board. He was treading on safe ground there. It was rather like coming out in favour of motherhood. After all, what government or business is not better served when intelligent people administer its affairs? But following his argument through, the implication is that we could do away with many of the safeguards we possess.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize that there would still be robberies and murders whether we had a police force or not, but most of us still believe we should have laws and means to enforce them in society as it is today. Representation of the provinces on this board is, or should be, one of the most important features in this bill. If we do not accept the amendment put forward by my hon. friend

[Mr. Ritchie.]

and fail to give each province and territory in Canada representation, we shall find ourselves contributing to regionalism and even to separatism.

In the past the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has come out in favour of the one nation concept. He has declared himself in favour of a just society. There has been some doubt as to the character of the one nation or of the just society, but it is difficult to imagine what benefit would result from lumping Canada together in regions, perhaps giving the prairie provinces one representative or giving other regions more than that. Certainly, the rejection of this amendment would only assist greatly in the cause of those who would divide the country. It would definitely bring on more regionalism than we have at present.

• (7:20 p.m.)

One of the members in the course of the debate quoted from Volume I of the B and B commission report. Let me quote from page 109 of Volume I of that same report as follows:

> If we chose the census division as the basis for creating a bilingual district, all of division A would likely become bilingual, and all of division B would remain unilingual.

There is a graph on this page to which the report refers. It continues:

> Our diagram shows that most of the members of the minority live in one section of division A and in the adjacent part of division B. Should official bilingualism be imposed on the unilingual parts of the former, and the bilingual fraction of the latter be ignored? We do not think so. In such a case, all of the area marked in black, excluding the rest of divisions A and B should become one bilingual district.

In effect, this shows it would not only be possible to set up bilingual districts with a 10 per cent minority but it would be possible to set up an adjacent bilingual district with a possible two or three per cent minority group. I think this is one weakness which certainly deserves consideration. Certainly, when we could have bilingual areas as small as school districts, being two or three per cent of the total area, it would be possible to have adjoining school district areas on a bilingual basis in other provinces. These would then become a provincial concern because education is within provincial jurisdictional. In light of this fact, it would seem almost impossible to even entertain the thought of not giving every province representation on this board.

Let us compare this situation with the regional concept as it relates to the agricultural industry. Some 90 per cent of the problems of that industry today stem from exactly the same concept proposed in this clause. We have in this house political representatives from agricultural communities. The number is certainly not numerically equal to the number of representatives from other segments of our society. As a result, the views and pleas of the representatives of agricultural areas are often virtually ignored. I should like to appeal to the minister to take these views into consideration.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should just like to speak briefly in support of the view expressed by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) against the amendment. I find it difficult to do so after listening this afternoon to the eloquent speeches in favour of the amendment by my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and others. I certainly would not want to widen the differences between my colleagues on this very sensitive subject.

I think it is possible to exaggerate the importance of this amendment. The bilingual districts advisory board I am sure will carry out its functions which, as I understand it, are to determine whether or not a district shall be bilingual. It does not matter much whether the board is set up under the formula in the bill or under the formula advanced by the amendment. After all, the bill does enjoin the Governor in Council, in setting up the committee, to take as a basis for selection a representation as equally proportionate as possible in relation to residence in a particular province.

Indeed, such an injunction is probably unnecessary because it would be a very unwise cabinet that did not advise the Governor-General to take account of the different regions in different provinces. This has been the traditional way of doing things throughout Canadian history, without tying anyone down to a rigid formula. Although I say it is possible to exaggerate the importance of the issue of the amendment to the original bill, it seems to me if there is a principle involved here it is the principle that we should, in setting up federal boards and federal organizations, have regard primarily to qualifications. We should have regard to the necessity of not setting up rigid provincial representation. We should not get into the habit of thinking that a board or tribunal set up by the Parliament of Canada is not truly representative of the interests of various provinces because it does not happen to have a representative of any one particular province.

• (7:30 p.m.)

It would be desirable, and I am sure the Governor in Council will bear this in mind, to see that a province like British Columbia—for which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway made such an eloquent plea—was represented on this board. I am sure the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) will take her plea into account in recommending this to his colleagues. I agree thoroughly with what the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and some others have said. Much will depend on the calibre of person who is appointed commissioner. I do not think too much will depend on how we select the members who are to sit on the bilingual districts advisory board. In setting up a board like this we should not even think along parochial lines. We should not be concerned primarily with whether so many of the board come from British Columbia or this province or that. After all, in this house there are many people who eloquently and admirably represent their own constituencies as well as their own provinces. In this house we think of ourselves first and foremost as Canadians. Our primary consideration is the welfare of all Canada. I, therefore, suggest that if we adopt the theory behind this amendment we shall not be adopting a truly federal approach to this question. Therefore, although I support the bill, I will vote against this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. All those in favour of the motion will please say, yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say, nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: As agreed earlier, this vote will be deferred.

Mr. Horner: Until when, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member will look at the Standing Order, he will see that that is in the discretion of the Chair. The suggestion was made this afternoon that there will be consultations between hon. members. Possibly all the votes could be taken together after we have considered the different amendments. This would be done for the convenience of hon. members, of course.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill S-21, an act to amend the Criminal Code, to which the concurrence of this House is desired. I also wish to inform the House that there is a message informing this House that the Senate have agreed to the amendment made by the House of Commons to Bill S-26, an Act to prohibit the Advertising, Sale and Importation of Hazardous Products, without any amendment.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan) moved:

That Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting clauses 28, 29, and 30 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"28. (1) An investigation by the Commissioner under this Act shall be conducted in private except as otherwise provided for in subsection (3).

(2) It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing but he may allow any person or any department or other institution concerned in an investigation, and shall allow any person or any department or other institution complained against in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

(3) The Commissioner shall not make a report or recommendation in respect of any person, department or other institution so complained against until that person, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint and has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in public or in private as that person, department or other institution may elect.

(4) Parliament may,

(a) of its own volition, or

(b) upon the recommendation of the Governor in Council, regulate the procedure to be followed by the Commissioner in the exercise of his powers and duties.

(5) The Commissioner may direct that information relating to any investigation under this Act be received or obtained, in whole or in part, by any officer of the Commissioner appointed as provided in section 21 and such officer shall, subject to such restrictions or limitations as the Commissioner may specify, have all the powers and duties of the Commissioner under this Act in relation to the receiving or obtaining of such information.

(6) The Commissioner shall require every person employed in his office who is directed by him to receive or obtain information relating to any investigation under this Act to comply with any security requirements applicable to, and to take any oath of secrecy required to be taken by, persons employed in any department or other institution concerned in the matter of the investigation.

(7) The Commissioner has, in relation to the carrying out of any investigation under this Act,

(a) the powers of a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act; and

(b) the power, subject to such limitations as the Governor in Council in the interests of defence or security may prescribe, to enter any premises occupied by any department or other institution of the Parliament or Government of Canada and carry out therein such inquiries within his authority under this Act as he sees fit."

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this amendment I shall repeat what I said on second reading of this bill. The bill itself is a purely administrative one. If you study it from clause 1 to clause 41 you will not escape the conclusion that the bill is of a purely administrative nature and lacks what is commonly known as legislative intent.

For a moment, I should like to refer to some provisions of the bill. In doing so, may I point out that all the powers contained in the bill are already possessed by the executive. Consider, for example, the power to issue and promulgate official instruments and documents bilingually. The executive already has that power. We must also consider in this category the power to provide bilingual services to the public. Those services already are being provided. Consider also, Mr. Speaker, the power to make agreements with a government of a province to proclaim the establishment of a bilingual district; the power to constitute Bilingual Districts Advisory Boards under part 1 of the Inquiries Act and to authorize a board to draft agreements with the governments of provinces. Consider also the power to establish an official languages commissioner. A commissioner can now be appointed under

the authority of the Inquiries Act. The Inquiries Act now gives the government authority to appoint a commissioner who is to investigate anything the government feels ought to be investigated.

There has been some minor and, I suggest, rather inconsequential effort on the part of the government to give the appearance that parliament as well as the executive is participating in this administrative policy. There is the provision, for example, that parliament shall hire and fire the languages commissioner through the Governor in Council. I think every hon. member of this house is well aware how empty any reference to parliamentary control is in this provision. If anyone were to study the bill in detail he would find that that is so. This is an administrative bill and it will, when passed, be administered entirely by this government. I am in favour of the provisions of this bill, mind you. All the same I suggest very seriously that unless this law is administered properly the government is going to be in very, very serious trouble. Except in very rare instances the manner and degree of governmental administration of this bill will not be reviewable in the courts. The government has attempted to meet this problem by creating an official languages commissioner who is to be the so-called languages ombudsman. He is to have some over-all say in the quality and effectiveness of the government's administration of this law.

It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to stress the importance of this official who is to be the commissioner of our official languages. What I think I should stress is the importance of our having some control over this man who is charged with such an important task. The way he performs that task will affect the destiny of Canada and touch the lives of a great many Canadians. It is in this area that I take exception to this bill. I take exception to the power that parliament has vested in this one man who is to be the commissioner of languages.

I want to deal for a few minutes with clauses 28, 29 and 30 of the bill, as they now appear. Clause 28(1) reads as follows:

> Every investigation by the Commissioner under this Act shall be conducted in private.

That is one provision I cannot swallow. For the life of me I cannot see why an investigation shall—not may—be conducted behind closed doors. This is a very, very serious matter. Our courts recognize today that this is a very serious matter. Even today, our courts hesitate before holding trials behind closed doors. The days of star chamber are over, Mr. Speaker. Unless there is some very good reason for not holding inquiries in public, they ought to be held in public. I agree that special circumstances may arise in which the commissioner, in his discretion, may decide that it is better to hold the inquiry in private. But for the government to enact a provision saying that the commissioner shall conduct investigations in private is tantamount to enacting a travesty of justice. I see no reason for this provision. Discretion should be left with the commissioner, of course. There may be cases where a person against whom a complaint has been made feels that in order to clear his name there should be a public hearing. He should have the right to ask the commissioner for a public hearing so that the public may learn perhaps that he has been unjustly accused of something.

• (7:40 p.m.)

I know that the government spokesman in the committee said that the commissioner is not conducting a court, and I agree it is not a court. But I do not agree that the powers of the commissioner are quite as frivolous or trivial as the minister would have us believe. I should like to put on the record a statement made by the Minister of Justice during the hearings on this bill in committee, as reported at page 367 of report No. 5. This is what the minister said the commissioner is empowered to do:

> The Commissioner is an investigator.

I think I will be able to show later on, Mr. Speaker, that he is very much more than an investigator. The minister continued:

> He proceeds in a purely administrative fashion; his object is not to prosecute or lay charges, or to assess blame or guilt. His job is simply to ensure that the departments of government, as institutions, are fulfilling the purposes and the spirit of this proposed act. It is not his function to decide or to adjudicate upon the rights or obligations of any individual. It is just not his duty and not in his power.

I should like to compare that with the statement made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) when he appeared before the same committee and spoke of the powers of the commissioner. This is what the Secretary of State had to say, as reported at page 35 of report No. 1:

> The specific task of the official languages Commission, as I see it, is to make sure that the provisions of the law are enforced, that nobody is lagging behind, that there is truly an effort to enforce this bill as efficiently as possible within the delay set by the bill for the government, in the last clause.

So, according to the Secretary of State, the commissioner is charged with the enforcement of the law.

> The advisory Committee on bilingual districts and the Governor in Council according to this clause have authority to determine the bilingual districts, while the Commissioner rather has the authority to make sure that this law is enforced.

I do not agree with the statements made by the ministers of the Crown. I venture to suggest there is not a man or woman in the public service of Canada today who is not going to be terribly afraid of the powers of this commissioner, and I think with some justification. This commissioner does not just conduct an investigation; he conducts an investigation with power to report and to make recommendations.

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that a complaint is made to the commissioner that a civil servant employed in the Post Office Department in a certain area is not carrying out the provisions of the act. Do you mean to tell me that that man will not be called on the mat to give an account of why he is not carrying out the provisions of the act? Of course, he will be.

The commissioner is empowered to make a report and also to make a recommendation. This is why I contend that this employee of the Post Office Department has the right, the inherent right of everybody who is charged with a serious offence, to be heard in public. Why should the charge be heard behind closed doors? The charge should be heard in public and the public given the right to listen to the case. In such event the person accused—I use that word advisedly because the man may be accused of not carrying out the provisions of the act—will be satisfied that he is being given a fair hearing and can rest assured that those interested are able to hear his side of the case.

The government has seen fit to prescribe that the commissioner shall conduct his investigations in private. No discretion at all is left to him; he must conduct his investigations in private. The motion before the house, which I hope will meet with the approval of all members of the house, provides that if a man whose conduct is being investigated requests that the inquiry be conducted in public, there shall be a public hearing; that he shall have the opportunity to present his case not only to the commissioner and the chosen few who might be invited to hear it, but to everybody who may be interested. I think this is only fair and in accordance with just practice. I think hon. members will find that the courts are very reluctant to conduct hearings behind closed doors; a very strong case indeed has to be made before a judge will decide to exclude the public.

I draw the attention of the house to clause 28 (2):

> It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing—

I ask the house to note those words.

> —and no person is entitled as of right to be heard by the Commissioner—

Did you ever hear, Mr. Speaker, anything so ridiculous? Surely, if a man is going to be charged—and I use that word advisedly—as a result of a complaint laid against him, then according to the principles of justice he should be entitled to the right to be heard. How can the government possibly take that right from him?

No doubt the minister will reply that the commissioner is not conducting a court or conducting legal proceedings. I agree. But again I remind the members of the house that this commissioner has the power to make recommendations and to report. I do not think anyone would seriously challenge that there is not a man or woman in the public service today who would not be terribly afraid of the tremendous powers of this commissioner.

The government then tries to correct the situation by making this provision in the clause:

> —but if at any time during the course of an investigation it appears to the Commissioner that there may be sufficient grounds for his making a report or recommendation that may adversely affect any individual or any department or other institution, he shall, before completing the investigation, take every reasonable measure to give to that individual—

—the chance to be heard. This provision does not help a person against whom a complaint has been made because it uses the words "if...it appears to the Commissioner" during the course of an investigation that there are sufficient grounds for making an adverse report. At that stage it would be too late, I suggest, for the man to be heard.

• (7:50 p.m.)

Why should he not be there from the very beginning? After all a complaint has been made against him. Surely, it is only fair and just that he should be entitled to sit in on the hearing from the very time the investigation begins. But, no; it is only if it appears to the commissioner—he is the man who will exercise the discretion and who will perhaps suddenly make the decision in the middle of the

hearing—that he may have to make an adverse report against this individual that the individual would be called in three quarters of the way through the proceedings. Surely, that is not the time to call in a person against whom a complaint is lodged. Did you ever see a court of law conducted in this way where an accused is called in about three-quarters of the way through the trial? Surely not! There is absolutely no justification for a provision like this. The amendment which we are suggesting tonight tends to correct the injustice in so far as public hearings are concerned and in so far as the right of the person against whom the complaint is lodged to be there from the very beginning and be represented by counsel if he so wishes.

Surely, a person against whom a complaint is made has the right to be at the hearing from the very beginning so that he will be in a better position to prepare his defence. Is there anything unreasonable about a request like that? Is there any particular reason that the government cannot go along with a request like that? I suggest there is absolutely none. What are they trying to hide? Why do they not want this man to have the right to be there from the very beginning? These are the questions to which I would like to have answers.

We asked these questions in the committee, but the officials and the ministers who were present at the hearings were not able to give us adequate answers. All they would tell us was that these are not judicial inquiries; that they are courts of procedure. I agree, but without fear of successful contradiction I say that this may affect an individual's employment in the civil service. If a complaint is successfully raised against him it could mean his employment and his very livelihood. That is the reason we say he should have an opportunity to be heard and that is the reason we say he should be called in from the very beginning, not when the commissioner makes up his mind that perhaps he might have to make an adverse report against this man.

It cannot be done in that way. Our system of justice does not work in that way. I implore the members of the government to try to correct this obvious injustice. You have the power to do it. I believe this will be of great concern to the people of Canada if you deny these people the right to be heard, a right which is not denied even to the worst criminal brought before our courts. We are not asking anything unreasonable in this regard. We are asking only that a man be given the right to be heard, that he be given a fair trial and that justice be done.

Now, let me refer to clause 30 which reads as follows:

> The Commissioner has, in relation to the carrying out of any investigation under this Act, power
> (a) to summon and enforce the attendance of witnesses and compel them to give oral or written evidence on oath, and to produce such documents and things as the Commissioner deems requisite to the full investigation and consideration of any matter within his authority under this Act, in the same manner and to the same extent as a superior court of record;

This commissioner is given the same power to conduct an inquiry as is given to a judge of a superior court of record and yet a person who may be affected is not given the same right to be there and be heard. How can this procedure possibly be justified. Clause (d) gives the commissioner the power to administer oaths. Then, clause (c) reads:

> —to receive and accept such evidence and other information whether on oath or by affidavit or otherwise as in his discretion he sees fit, whether or not such evidence or information is or would be admissible in a court of law;

Mark these words, "whether or not such evidence or information is or would be admissible in a court of law".

Mr. Woolliams: Good gracious.

Mr. McQuaid: If there was ever a travesty of justice this is it. Why should this commissioner, in whose hands lies probably the livelihood of a public servant, not be bound by the regular rules of evidence. As I interpret this clause this man can be compelled to give evidence against himself. Did you ever hear anything like that in this day and age?

Mr. Horner: That is the just society.

Mr. Woolliams: The Pelletier society.

Mr. McQuaid: This will not go down well with the people of Canada. We implore the government to amend it. It will not destroy the principle of the bill. Personally, I am completely in favour of the principle of bilingualism—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McQuaid: —in so far as it affects the government service in bilingual districts. But I cannot for the life of me go along with this proposal, and I do not think any man who gives it any serious throught can go along with it. In our amendment, we are suggesting that this man should be given the power that

is given to a commissioner under the Inquiries Act. Heaven knows, they are wide enough. But at least they have been in effect for some considerable number of years. I do not know when the Inquires Act was first passed, but we have been working under the Inquiries Act for some considerable number of years. Certain practices and precedents have grown up in respect of this act, as they have in respect of other acts in our courts. The commissioner appointed under the Inquiries Act may not be legally bound by, but feels he is required to follow, the practice or precedent which has been built up over the years. We suggest that if this language commissioner were given the same authority as a commissioner under the Inquiries Act this should be sufficient.

Why should this commissioner have more authority? Why are we asking that this man have more authority than someone who has been appointed under the Inquiries Act? I want an answer to that question and I think the people of this house and the people of Canada want an answer to this question. Why is this man to be given more authority and more power than a commissioner under the Inquiries Act? The Inquiries Act in part I, section 4 reads:

> The commissioners have the power of summoning before them any witnesses, and of requiring them to give evidence on oath, or on solemn affirmation if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and orally or in writing, and to produce such documents and things as the commissioners deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine.

What more power could a man possibly want unless he wants to be a dictator?

Mr. Woolliams: That was Pickersgill's ambition.

Mr. McQuaid: Surely this power is wide enough. Then section 5 in this same act, the Inquiries Act, reads:

> The commissioners have the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases.

That is enough. Let this commissioner be bound by the rules of evidence, so that only proper evidence may be introduced against a person whose—and I want to stress this—very job may be endangered as a result of the inquiry. This is what I say is unfair. This is what I say constitutes an injustice. Let this man be given the same powers as are given to a commissioner under the Inquiries Act.

Again, under part III of this act, the commissioner may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this act, and shall allow any person against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel. However, I feel he should be represented right from the very beginning and not after half the proceedings have been held. The commissioner has been given a discretion. He may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this act—not shall allow—against whom any charge is made in the course of an investigation to be represented by counsel. That is fair and logical. Why is this government asking that the commissioner of official languages should be given any more power than that? It is unreasonable.

• (8:00 p.m.)

As I stated at the beginning, we do not want to get back to star chamber proceedings. We want things to be conducted in the open. We want people to feel that not only does justice appear to be done but justice is seen to be done. That is very important. As long as this provision is in the act, I earnestly suggest a person who is being investigated will not be convinced that justice is being done unless he is given the right from the very beginning to come in and state his case, if he has one to state.

These are the amendments that we are suggesting to this clause. These amendments will tend to strengthen this bill and convince people that something is really being done. I realize there are some serious exceptions being taken to the principle of this bill, but let us not pour salt on these wounds. Let us try to heal them. That is the reason we had a committee and are having discussions in this house. We are trying to correct, as best we can, some of the things that I personally see as gross injustices to which no civilized person living in Canada today should be subjected. I very earnestly suggest that the government and hon. members of this house should give very serious consideration to the recommendations we are making in this amendment.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In rising to support this amendment I wish to say that the speech to which we have just listened was probably the best speech that has been delivered in this House of Commons on civil rights for many years, perhaps since the time that great Liberal, Chubby Powers, delivered a great speech at the time the Civil Service was being investigated in reference to the security of the nation. When people were arrested on that occasion they were held in

custody, without the right to counsel and were denied the rights that apply to the average Canadian in accordance with the traditions we inherited.

I must to come to grips immediately with two problems. I am sorry the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is not here at the moment because it shocked the sensibilities of every member of parliament on this, and I am sure the other side of the house, when he said today that because this bill had been examined by a standing committee of the House of Commons the amendments proposed by the government and certain other members were accepted. The bill, therefore, should be merely rubber stamped and nothing should be said from this side of the house.

I want to explode once again, as I will do every time I rise in my place in the years that may remain to me, because the committees set up under the new rules were given tremendous power. They were given the power of parliament. At one time in this house every clause of every bill was examined by the Committee of the Whole House. All members could examine each clause as the bill was piloted through. That power has now been handed to a standing committee of the House of Commons. What applies to other committees also applies to this committee, and that is why it is necessary to move these amendments at this time.

In standing committees, a government chairman governs the committee, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) controls the members of the committee. It is an instrument of the government; no more, no less and no better, as far as jurisdiction is concerned. The Minister of Justice said this afternoon that because this bill was examined carefully by a committee, there can be nothing wrong with it. What the minister meant to say was that the government was going to oppose forcibly these amendments, either by silence, because we appear to be on the side of right, or by voting as a block because their committee, controlled by the Prime Minister, said Canada is going to get this kind of bill. That was a shocking insult to parliament from one of the great lawyers and great brains of our country. It forces me to rise in my place and ask the Minister of Justice if that is really what he meant.

Whose job is more important than the job of hon. members in this house? Their job is to get across to this nation that the procedure in which we are now engaged in parliament is just a procedure to give the appearance that the right things are being done. The Minister of Justice said today that because this bill had been examined by a committee, a committee controlled by a government chairman who is controlled by the government, that amendments of any importance were moved by the government and government members. The minister said that was good enough and members really have no function here. That was his real message.

I was somewhat shocked to hear a member of the New Democratic Party, for whom I have a lot of respect, oppose the fundamental concern of these amendments. I agree with this statement that the administration of the law depends on the character of the person administering it and his ability to weigh justice in its highest sense. A Commissioner of this type will be necessary if this bill is to be implemented properly in the province of Quebec as well as in those provinces in which French Canadians live and where English speaking Canadians and those of other ethnic origins live. I agree with that, but I remind the hon. member of the N.D.P. that he need only look to Europe in our lifetime. When the rule of law fails to govern and when we rely on the rule of people, the niceties of character or personalities of human beings, what happens to civil rights? I was born in an atmosphere where the Magna Carta hung on the walls of the bedroom, living room, dining room and rumpus room. I cannot accept the hon. member's argument or philosophy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: As our party's leading speaker said earlier this evening, we already have a man who has been given complete power. Why has he been given this power? I say with all the sincerity I can muster, and with sadness in my heart, that I do not have confidence that this government, governing with this kind of excuse, will not do something I do not want to see happen. I sat with the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. We saw Mr. Pickersgill pilot a bill through this house. He rushed it, pushed it, and said that we did everything to block its passage. I never believed at that time that Mr. Pickersgill was negotiating with his government and parliament for a $50,000 a year job to set himself up as the Czar of transportation. I cannot believe that the Secretary of State, who has the kind of reputation and name—

Official Languages

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I rise on a question of privilege.

In spite of the great tediousness of the speech of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), I managed to keep awake. Even if we have to keep our ears open, I think we have a right to shut our eyes.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: I am glad I have flushed him out, Mr. Speaker. I cannot believe that the Secretary of State is setting himself up as the Czar of culture and language in this nation, because these things affect not only French speaking and English speaking Canadians but persons of every ethnic group. There will be no appeal from decisions of the board. Because of the power that will lie in the hands of the Secretary of State, I do not have confidence that the bill will be administered according to the civil rights to which Canadians have become accustomed.

I hope that the men appointed to the board will administer the law with equity. I hope they will interpret it with justice, because the bill deals with a matter of great sensitivity in this nation. It is all-important that the men appointed to the board be of this calibre. They will have control over not only human behaviour but the rule of law. I have always maintained, with regard to the appointment of judges, that the character and type of men we appoint to the bench is just as important as their knowledge of the law. The men appointed to this board should be fenced in and controlled by traditions that have been crystallized into the rule of law that protects the civil rights of the citizens of this nation.

The government says: Don't worry; we will put the right type of man in charge of this program. There will be nothing to worry about. I would be concerned about the board even if a benevolent dictator were appointed to it. What will be the situation in the future? I was raised in an area of Saskatchewan in which half the people were French Canadian and the other half came from countries throughout the world. If I were a spokesman for the province of Quebec I would say this is a most dangerous situation; one man should not be given the kind of power the bill proposes to give.

Since confederation we have had governments in which were members who have represented areas where French speaking Canadians have been in the majority. I ask, Mr. Speaker: What will happen if we have on this board people who do not weigh the niceties of equity and justice and do not understand the jurisprudence under which, we live? The majority of the population of part of Zealandia, Saskatchewan, is made up of French Canadians. Do we want on this board people who would do those things that would not be fair and just in respect of minority groups? If one man is given this kind of power it is neither fair to the majority or minority of an area, or even to the small ethnic groups which are to be found in some regions of the country.

I agree with the hon. member on this side of the house who said that a fundamental principle of natural justice is that a man be heard in his defence. This principle applies to our ordinary rule of law when a man is being investigated in connection with a suspected offence. I have always had great respect for the R.C.M.P. and our system of justice. A man is told that A plus B equals C, and this is the evidence against him. The person suspected of having committed an offence can then retain counsel to represent his interests. That principle of our law is not embodied in the provisions of this bill.

Under our system of jurisprudence every Canadian has the right to a fair hearing. It is the right of every individual to know the evidence against him, so he may answer it. There are in our public service and crown corporations men of honesty and integrity; the majority of our public servants have these attributes. No one elected as a member of parliament can tell me, however, that there is not across the nation anxiety on the part of some of our public servants. The fundamental principles of justice contained in the Inquiries Act should apply to this legislation. We will be setting up under this bill a commissioner who will be all-powerful; he will be able to use all the powers of a trial court, which are very great when the state moves to prosecute an individual.

The board appointed under this bill will have the power to act as a result of evidence presented to it. In addition to that, the board will be able to use hearsay evidence. It will be able to break every rule of evidence, although these rules are based upon fundamental principles of justice. Our laws were designed to provide justice to the individual and protect him. A person considered to be in violation of this federal statute, when passed, will not be permitted to be presented at the hearing of his case. He will not be permitted

to know the evidence that has been gathered against him. In my opinion, this procedure offends the principles of natural justice which we have inherited. Our system of justice has made this a great nation; the system of justice in the United States has made it a great nation. Every commonwealth country has inherited the British tradition of justice and this has made them great nations.

I make this indictment, even though we have been told that the bill was examined at great length by a committee of the house. That committee had on it a majority of government members, and therefore it was prejudiced in favour of the opinion of the government. Let us lay it on the table; governments since confederation have taken advantage of their majorities. Government members are asked to support the government. If they fail to do so they defeat themselves, because they have to go back to their constituents in an election. Because of the great pressure upon them, government members stand together. This is why they vote in the same way. It is the reason government members are disciplined at the present time. It is true not only of the Liberals but of any government. They will stand together. When you have a minority government you have to indulge in hanky-panky in the backrooms. We saw this happen under a former Prime Minister when the government was forced to seek the support of splinter parties in order to stay in office. In that situation it is the tail that wags the dog, and not the dog that wags the tail.

A person should be informed immediately a complaint is made against him. If there is a hearing before a board, he is entitled to be present at the hearing and, if he wishes, to have counsel or a person trained in the law to defend him. The rules that govern an inquiry under the Inquiries Act should be invoked in respect of this legislation in order to protect Canadians. There should be the right of appeal from a decision of the board. In order that justice be done, a person should know what evidence there is against him and he should be represented at any hearing into the complaint made. If I may use the phrase of an hon. member who spoke earlier, this bill is a travesty of justice.

Why are there not more government members in the chamber? They were here today when their photographs were being taken. They are the executive of this nation. We are only the opposition. If we believed this was a good bill we would pass it and either be at home reading or dealing with matters in our offices. We are not the government. I say without any reservation or equivocation that it is a disgrace that so few ministers and members of the government party are in the chamber to listen to this argument.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Last Friday when I was in the House of Commons I was saddened to hear the bells ringing for some 40 minutes until enough government members arrived to support certain legislation which they were trying to implement. This was on a Friday afternoon, but nothing appeared in the press to tell the Canadian people how irresponsible this government was on that occasion.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: Why is the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) not here when a matter of such importance is debated?

An hon. Member: He does not care.

Mr. Gray: Where is your leader?

Mr. Woolliams: He does not happen to be the Prime Minister at present.

Mr. Baldwin: He is on his way.

Mr. Woolliams: That is the only defence that the members on the government side have. I have told them that they are the executive and they are running the country. Our job on this side is to suggest amendments and to oppose measures when we think they are wrong. Our job here is to drive government members into positions into which we believe they should be driven when anything needs to be done.

An hon. Member: There will be a day of reckoning.

Mr. Paproski: And it won't be long.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we are still dealing with the amendment before us, to amend clauses 28, 29 and 30, or if we are getting into a general debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must say I had the same misgivings, but I realize this is a matter of great importance and the hon. member is speaking with great feeling. However, I invite the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who is familiar

with the rules, to restrict his remarks as much as possible to the amendment before us. That, of course, applies generally to all hon. members, and I think it is in the interest of our proceedings that we all observe this fundamental rule.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason I raised this question is that this amendment is so fundamental to the civil rights of Canadians. What is the use of me making a speech tonight when the government refuses to listen? They sit in their offices and they refuse to listen to the evidence we put forth on the dangers of this bill. I can put it very simply. When I was a young man I learned something very quickly. I learned that if you wink at a pretty girl and she does not look at you, you are wasting your time. We may be wasting our time talking to the empty benches of the Liberal party. Members of the government are irresponsible in their failure to be here tonight during the debate of such an important measure. May I bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that I am now well within the rules when I speak. It is hon. members opposite who are the executive, and this is their responsibility. Who brought in this language bill? It was not the Conservative party, nor was it the N.D.P. or the Créditistes. It was the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: And they should be here to listen to the arguments and suggestions for amendments which will protect the minorities, the majorities and the ethnic groups in Canada. In that way, they have failed in their responsibility. I think I have made my point on this amendment, and I need not say any more.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Paproski: Here comes another one who will follow suit.

Mr. Lewis: —I intend to deal with the amendment to the bill that is before us. I want to say that it is easy for members of this house to emphasize and to repeat that they are in favour of the principle of this bill, then speak of ways which will make this bill unworkable in the minds and hearts of the Canadian people.

Mr. Paproski: The great Saviour has spoken.

Mr. Lewis: Hon. members have been making all sorts of remarks.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Paproski: Why don't you move over?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must remind hon. members that when a member has the floor he should not be subjected to repeated interjections. I think it would be in the interest of all members if we tried to observe that rule.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I do not mind the interjections if hon. members want to make them. I say that many barbs have been thrown in our direction because we insist, as I do, that we believe in the future of this country and in the need to remove a grievance which has haunted this nation for years. I intend to speak in favour of those things which will make this bill workable and desirable for the people of Canada, whether or not the government or the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) or anyone else happens to agree with them.

I heard a great deal about the rule of law in a lecture that was delivered, I presume, for me. Let me say that I am a lawyer of some years' standing, and although probably I am not the best lawyer, I have some knowledge of the law and I have some knowledge of legal philosophy and jurisprudence. I say, as a lawyer, that it is not only in the courts of a country that the rule of law can obtain and it is not only evidence which is taken according to certain rules that is admissible evidence before tribunals in democratic countries.

Members of the Conservative party look with horror at the part of clause 30 which says that the commissioner may take evidence, whether or not such evidence or information is or would be admissible in a court of law. Let me tell them that there are literally dozens of laws on the statute books of Canada, federal and provincial, which have precisely that provision. There are dozens of laws on the statute books of the mother of our democracy that contain this kind of provision, whether they are statutes pertaining to the labour relations board or any other board. The hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) says that I am wrong. Let me tell him—

Mr. Rynard: I just said that two bad laws don't make a good one.

Mr. Lewis: Let me tell him that the statute in Ontario—and I am sure it is the same in every other province—which set up his particular professional organization—if I remember correctly and I do because I appeared

before the council of the Medical Society of Ontario in defence of a doctor—also gives the disciplinary body of his professional organization the right to take evidence in ways other than a court takes it.

An hon. Member: Did you win the case?

Mr. Lewis: I happened to have won that case, but do not draw any conclusions from that. Winning a case before the medical council is not easy, as I know from experience. What I am suggesting is that it is easy to become eloquent about the rule of law and to make the assumption that the only way in which society can be governed by the rule of law is to make everything pass through the courts. I have great respect for the courts, as much as they deserve, but let me say that it is not in the courts alone that justice is done in a democratic society. Most citizens of the country do not reach the courts.

There are other agencies and other ways in which justice in a society can be obtained. It is not only through rules of evidence as they are applied in a court that you can obtain the truth. You can obtain the truth in some other ways as well. One of my major objections to this kind of approach on the part of some members—and I said this the other day in the special committee—is that if some of these amendments are accepted, only a lawyer or a judge would be qualified to become commissioner under this bill. Only a person trained in the law who knew the rules of evidence and who knew how to conduct that kind of inquiry would be able to be commissioner under this bill. I know a good many lawyers in this country and I know a few who might be qualified for this job. In my opinion most of us would not be qualified for this job. The narrow, legalistic training of a lawyer is not necessarily the best training for the job of a commissioner under this bill. This job should be open to any Canadian, whether or not he knows the rules of evidence. What he has to know are the rules of fairness. He has to know the rules of decency and the rules of honesty. He has to know the rules of objectivity. But he does not necessarily have to know the precise rules of evidence that govern a judge in a court in order to obtain the truth. Let me remind members of this house that there are many members among us who are not lawyers and there may be too many of us who are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I have just received some support from members of the Conservative party. I presume they are not lawyers. But seriously, let me remind hon. members that all of us sit on committees of the house and all of us have occasion to question witnesses before these committees. It has been my experience that those members who may not be lawyers are just as capable of getting at the truth as are other members of the committee.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Paproski: Would the hon. member permit a question? What witnesses were there to question in connection with the languages bill?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: You voted against witnesses.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on, now. I do not know whether I should take the time in which to answer these assinine interjections. I voted against hearing witnesses on this bill before the special committee because I know of no subject in the history of Canada on which more months of evidence-taking have been spent—evidence taken by the commission from one end of the country to the other. I know of no subject which has been more thoroughly discussed in this house. I am thinking of the discussion which took place on second reading of this bill. Members of the Conservative party took a great deal of time on second reading; they had a right to do so; I do not deny it. In these circumstances I felt, and still feel, that it would have been a complete waste of time, that it would have served an evil purpose rather than a good purpose, to churn the same thing over once again before the committee charged with consideration of this bill.

I was saying seriously—if hon. members want to listen or not it is up to them—that in years of experience in committees of this house I, as a lawyer, in no way thought that my training enabled me to ask questions of witnesses more effectively than other members who were not lawyers. I felt they were just as able as I was, perhaps more able, to get at the truth of what was happening. This rule of law business is something you can agree or disagree about but I suggest it has no relevance whatsoever to this amendment or to this part of the bill.

There is one part of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) which I support. I attempted to find a way of supporting it in the special committee and with this in mind I intend to

move an amendment in the next 10 or 12 minutes when I have finished my remarks. There is something about which I believe the hon. member is entirely right.

First of all, I should like to make some observations about the difference which exists between some of us as to the extent of the commissioner's powers. It has been said that tremendous powers are given to the commissioner. I am darned if I see what those tremendous powers are. He needs the power to inquire. Therefore, he must be given powers of inquiry. But the commissioner can only report and make recommendations. That is all he can do. The executive need not accept the report or implement the recommendations. Departments of government concerned need not accept the reports. He makes a report only in cases where some suggestion he has advanced is not carried out. He makes this report to the department or to the Crown corporation, and to the government and this parliament. It is laid on the table in this house and in the other place. What are his powers? We can easily mislead and frighten members of the public service by saying that this terrible man will have powers of life and death over their jobs. He will not. In my opinion it is a misrepresentation of this bill to suggest any such thing. The same people will continue to exercise authority as did so before, namely, the superiors in the department or in the Crown corporation.

It is they who will be responsible for implementing any suggestions made or for taking any disciplinary action they think necessary. It is not the commissioner. He has no power to implement any of his recommendations or to make decisions or to affect the position of any civil servant except by evidence of fact contained in his report. I plead with hon. members not to exaggerate the role of this commissioner. I visualize it as one of a conciliator. I visualize it as the role of a person—

An hon. Member: An ombudsman.

Mr. Lewis: Somebody said an ombudsman. I prefer to think of him as a conciliator—a person who, when he receives a complaint, inquires as to the nature of the complaint. It cannot be a complaint about a person at any time, as I see it; he can only look into complaints which say that the intent and spirit of this legislation are not being carried out in a department, a Crown corporation, an agency or other institution of parliament or government.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Mr. McQuaid: Would the hon. member not agree that even if what he says is correct, civil servants would be, at least indirectly, drawn into an affair of this kind?

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: I agree entirely with the hon. member, and if he will be patient for three or four minutes he will see that I entirely agree with him on this point. I expressed my agreement with this point in the committee, but I will come to that in a moment.

In my view the commissioner does not have the power he is said to have, and it is because of this that my attitude toward him is not the same. As I have said, I conceive his job to be that of a conciliator. He receives a complaint that the intent and the spirit of the act is not being carried out in a certain sector of the public service, and it is his job to investigate the facts and to see to it that the matter is corrected. I think in 99 per cent of the cases he will not be required to make any report. He will be able to persuade the people in charge of the correctness of his findings of fact and discuss with them what can be done to remedy the situation; and, as a conciliator often does, he will find the best solution and no report or anything else will be required.

This is why I am in favour of holding private hearings in most cases. I hope that in 99 per cent of the cases complaints involving a department of government will not even become public. They will be investigated and then conciliated or adjusted in the way civilized people should be able to arrange. I hope that reports of the commissioner will be the exception rather than the rule. This is why I think he should be given more informal powers than those given by the Inquiries Act. This is why I think clause 30 of the bill should remain unchanged; that the powers given to the commissioner should be provided in the bill. His right to take information or evidence in a way that is not usually admissible in a court of law is what will make his inquiry less formal, more workable and conciliatory, shorn of the trappings of an official hearing with all the fear that this produces in the heart of an ordinary person.

As far as clause 29 is concerned, what my hon. friend's amendment does is to leave subclause (2) and subclause (3) as they are, but to change subclause (1) in a way I cannot accept. At the moment clause 29 (1) provides:

> Subject to this act, the Commissioner may regulate the procedure to be followed by him in carrying out any investigation under this act.

Again, the procedure is quite informal. According to my hon. friend's motion, he wants to provide that:

Parliament may—

My hon. friend says "may", but he would not have inserted that word unless he intended parliament to do so.

—(a) of its own volition, or

(b) upon the recommendation of the Governor in Council, regulate the procedure to be followed by the Commissioner in the exercise of his powers and duties.

This parliament, as a parliament, is going to lay down the procedures to be followed by the commissioner. I cannot accept that. It seems to me a heavy handed way of doing something that everybody desires to be thoroughly informal in most situations.

We agree with the hon. member for Cardigan that the only place where formality is required is where a person, department or institution is adversely affected by an inquiry into a complaint, and a report and recommendation is made as a result of that inquiry. The report would naturally contain a reference to an individual, or to an institution or department. I suppose it would state that that individual, institution or department was failing to abide by the law, and would make a recommendation that may adversely affect that individual, institution or department. As I agreed with the hon. member in the special committee, I agree with him now that in such a case there ought to be opportunity given for a full hearing, not merely at the discretion of the commissioner but at the election of the person or department concerned. That hearing ought to be held in public, again at the election of the person or department concerned.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), the following amendment, which although it sounds a little complicated will, I think, become clear if I have a minute or two to explain it:

That the motion be amended:

(1) by deleting the words "clauses 28, 29 and 30" in lines 2 and 3 and substituting therefor the words "clause 28";—

In other words, I am suggesting that clauses 29 and 30 be left as they are and that clause 28 be amended.

(2) by deleting the numeral "3" in the sixth line and substituting the numeral 2;—

In a further part of the amendment, I intend to combine the present subclause (2) and subclause (3).

(3) by deleting subclauses 2 and 3 and substituting therefor the following, as subclause 2:

"It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing, but he shall not make a report or recommendation adversely affecting any individual, department or other institution until that individual, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint against him or it, and has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in public or in private and to be represented by counsel as that person, department or other institution may elect"; and

(4) by deleting subclauses 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Three things seem to me to be necessary. First of all, particularly an individual but also a department or other institution who may be adversely affected by a report or recommendation should, before such report or recommendation is made, be given the opportunity to be heard in public or in private, as the elect, and an opportunity to be represented by counsel if they wish.

Secondly, what I submit is needed is that this person, department or other institution should be liable to be subjected to a report or recommendation before all this is done. I submit that the words "any person or department so complained against" could open the door to every complaint leading to a public hearing, and this would be far too wide. What we want to do in this situation is to give the opportunity for a hearing, rather than adopt the wording my hon. friend proposes.

Thirdly, I am grateful to the hon. member for Cardigan for the language that he used in his proposed motion, because it gave me the opportunity to solve the verbal problem I had in the committee to find a way of tying the public hearing to the person, department or other institution adversely affected in a report or recommendation.

I do not think I should take any more time of the house, Mr. Speaker, and I move that amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Speaker: In spite of the hon. member's very clear explanation of his amendment, it is somewhat difficult for the chair to reconcile the amendment with the motion it seeks to amend. However, it appears to be in order in so far as I have been able to ascertain at the moment. Unless strong objection is raised at this time or later on, I think I have to put the amendment to the house and I will hear debate thereon.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I did second the motion and I should like to say a few words in support of it. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) has very clearly and eloquently put forward the reasons for the amendment that we are proposing. I too have spent a good deal of my professional career in the defence of civil liberties. Indeed, I feel second to no one in this house in my devotion to fundamental rights and human freedoms. However, I have found that it is possible to employ a phony rhetoric about these issues. It is possible to fail to use a moderate and sensible judgment as to the balance between different and opposing principles.

The first principle—and this has been illustrated many hundreds, perhaps thousands of times in every civilized country of the world—is that there is a need for administrative tribunals, that these administrative tribunals must not be courts or similar to courts. They are needed because expertise in specialized subjects is required that the courts fail to have. There is a need to find the facts in a different way from that used by the courts. As I say, there are innumerable illustrations of where this is necessary. Such tribunals must have a concentration of function which is entirely different from that of the courts. There are innumerable illustrations of this. It would be folly to set up these tribunals, and then to cripple them by tying them down with legal procedures, appropriate indeed to courts but totally inappropriate to these tribunals which have a very different task from the task of the courts.

Yet on the other side there is another principle, or another series of principles. The principles I have enunciated might be called the principles of expediency and efficiency of tribunals. However, these must be balanced against certain fundamental rules. These include the preservation of the rights of the court to ensure that statutory tribunals do not exceed the functions conferred on them by the statutes of parliament. Another one is that no one should be condemned, punished or deprived of his rights or reputation by any such public or administrative tribunal without first being given a hearing and without first being given the right to counsel as well as the right to know clearly the nature of the case against him. The present legislation amply illustrates both these principles. The legislation clearly restricts the functions of the commissioner, important though they are. It restricts them within limits which a court can enforce. If the commissioner steps outside these functions or exceeds them, the courts can act quickly.

• (8:50 p.m.)

It will be necessary for the other side of these functions to be emphasized, Mr. Speaker. The amendment of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) emphasizes the other side of those functions, as did in a partial way the motion of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). As the hon. member for York South was careful to point out, in carrying out his many functions the commissioner will need to act with tact and to use persuasive instead of dictatorial powers. He will have to avoid exercising powers which will have an executive effect. In certain cases it will be a great mistake to hamper the commissioner by requiring him, when complaints come before him, to call in counsel and set up a public hearing. The amendment preserves the basic principle which was referred to by the hon. member for Cardigan, that principle being that, so far as is reasonable, the commissioner shall not take away any man's reputation or rights without giving that man full opportunity to be heard in public. That is an important principle and it is not contained in the bill as presently drafted.

I say to the minister that such omission is a serious defect in the bill as it present drafted. I hope the minister is paying attention to what I am saying.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): He is not.

Mr. Brewin: I say there is a serious defect in the bill because the commissioner, as the bill now reads, may bring in a report affecting the reputation of an individual without there being any right to a public hearing.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Say it again; the minister is not listening.

Mr. Brewin: It may well be that in certain cases an individual may prefer a private hearing. On the other hand, if an individual feels that to vindicate his character it is necessary for him to be heard in public, there should be a right to a public hearing. I am afraid I am repeating myself but I do so in the vain hope that my words will penetrate to the minister. I repeat. The bill contains a great defect in that the commissioner may do something affecting a person's reputation without there being a right to a full hearing. For the government to say that hearings shall be conducted in private is inadequate in these

circumstances. I appeal to the government to reconsider this provision. There is time for it to give consideration to the amendment this party has moved. If accepted, the amendment will bring about two results. It will preserve the rights of an individual who may possibly be affected by the report of the commissioner and, at the same time, preserve the efficiency of the commissioner himself. By accepting our amendment the government would go a long way towards removing the fears and suspicions which, as some eloquent speakers in this chamber have pointed out, this bill has created. Those fears and suspicions could be removed without in any way impairing the effectiveness of the commissioner who has important functions under this extremely important bill.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, at this point of the debate, I feel certain things must be said.

I do not wish to refer, to be sure, to the amendment just moved by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), since there is another amendment before us, and it is the one, of course, I wanted to deal with since the beginning of the evening.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) has led to two interventions which, in my opinion, are of inequal value.

I will first refer most briefly to the second, by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). All those who heard it will understand my lack of interest in the ideas it expressed, since precisely they were few.

Besides, the hon. member for Calgary North has a remarkable characteristic, and I have always found him interesting in that his voice becomes all the louder as his mind becomes weaker. Now since his resonant voice was heard tonight, there is no further need for me to say what I think of what he said.

I looked for a really strong argument in the contribution of the hon. member for Calgary North and found that I was totally wasting my time. He made a number of emotional appeals which have nothing to do with the realities of the bill, and when he suddenly attempted to present an argument, on one of the rare occasions during his speech when he tried to think things out, it was entirely besides the point. Indeed he then used the terminology of criminal courts and he dealt with the Commissioner of Languages as if he were an examining magistrate, a chief of police and a presiding judge all at once, three figures to whom the Commissioner bears no resemblance whatsoever.

That is why my remarks will rather deal with the speech of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). He also, quite to my surprise, spoke on a highly emotional tone. It is all the more amazing as it does not happen very often. I was under the impression that he managed to convince himself that we were studying a piece of legislation likely to encroach on, or lead to encroachment on all civic liberties, on all human freedoms, without any exception.

He first quoted, giving the impression that this was the most scandalous thing, that part in the act where it is said that any investigations the Commissioner of Official Languages has a right to conduct will be held behind closed doors.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the investigation had to do with a criminal case, perhaps—and not only perhaps, but certainly—all the words spoken by the hon. member for Cardigan would take their full meaning.

But since it is not the investigation of a criminal case, but strictly and only a matter for the Official Languages Commissioner to get information himself in order to report to parliament, the situation is entirely different. Therefore, it is perfectly normal that the legislator should be careful in making the procedure easier and in avoiding for the commissioner the procedures to which the regular courts are subjected to because the commissioner—I point it out once more, and not for the last time, is not asked to render justice. All he has to do is to find out facts and report to parliament.

In another argument, the hon. member for Cardigan said here again shouting scandal, that before the special committee which studied the bill, I myself had defined the function of the Commissioner and that in reply to a question, I had said that, in my opinion, his role was to make sure the law was enforced.

Armed with this quotation, which is accurate, the hon. member for Cardigan attempted to prove that the Commissioner was becoming a chief of police since he enforced the law. But as always, when a quotation is incomplete, there is the risk of misquoting, that is, of distorting the views of the person quoted.

Now this is exactly what happened. Because, I was explaining, of course to the special committee, after questions had been

put to me, that the Commissioner of Official Languages should be aware of the situation, should make sure whether the legislation was enforced or not, but that the only means—and this is important—to which the Commissioner can resort to enforce the legislation is to report to the house.

Can we really compare a report to the house with a sentence passed by a judge on an accused appearing before him?

The hon. member for Cardigan went so far as to say several times "the accused" shall appear before the Commissioner. This proves how much he misunderstood, if he understood at all, the wording of that legislation, because there is actually no mention of any accused in this bill, and the Official Languages Commissioner is not a judge. If anyone were accused, and if the Commissioner were a judge, then the remarks of the hon. member for Cardigan and even a few of those of the hon. member for Calgary North would have some meaning. But nobody is accused. It happens that the Commissioner, in the role of an investigator, first of all examines the situation and then, as he sees fit, reports to the Parliament of Canada.

• (9:00 p.m.)

When the hon. member for Cardigan talks of the "accused", perhaps he refers to another legislation or interprets this legislation in his own way; however, he does not speak of the legislation under study and which he wishes to amend. Likewise, when he denounces the dreadful powers granted to the Commissioner of Official Languages for Canada, I must admit that I am at a loss to understand what he means; in the same vein, perhaps we should decide right now tonight that the Auditor General holds dreadful powers and is an intolerable inquisitor, and, instead of wasting our time amending that official languages bill, putting aside current business, abolish the post of Auditor General, for he holds precisely the same type of powers that are given to the Commissioner of Official Languages, that is, essentially, the power to investigate freely and to report to the house or to a committee of the house on his findings.

I therefore do not understand why the hon. members of the opposition, who tolerate, and have done so for a long time now, an institution called the Auditor General, should all of a sudden become so concerned and should shout about civil liberties being strangled, because a Commissioner of Official Languages will have similar powers in an area which is not any more contentious, which cannot lead to any more serious situations nor to any worse difficulties than in the administration of public funds in this country.

Besides, having spoken of this accused person, who does not exist and who will never exist, and having said that this accused had no rights, the hon. member for Cardigan forgot to mention clause 32 of the bill and the amendment adopted by the committee, to which I refer the hon. member in case he has forgotten about it. I also refer all other hon. members to it, without reading it, because I want to be brief, as I consider that the work already done in committee should not be completely useless.

Unfortunately, the work of this committee becomes partly useless, because it seems that between consideration in committee and the report stage in the house, some opposition members forget everything that happened. So, the hon. member for Cardigan states that on the procedure under which the Commissioner will operate, he put questions to the ministers who were unable, in committee, to tell him why the procedure had been so conceived.

Once more, it is not the time to run through everything that was said in committee—because it would be to no avail to work in committee—I refer the hon. member to page 367, No. 5, of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill. He will find two full pages where my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) explained in detail to the hon. member for Cardigan, why the procedure is such as it is.

If the hon. member for Cardigan does not remember it, he could read the text over tonight before going to bed. I am sure that it will re-assure him and soothe his conscience since he told us earlier that it bothered him. He should then be able to sleep soundly. In fact, the answers given by my colleague the Minister of Justice are there, and I am surprised, once again, that the hon. member does not remember them. But I should not be surprised really since he does not seem to remember his own remarks to the committee.

Thus, carried away by indignation, he accused us, tonight of wanting to judge people behind closed doors. He made it an absolute crime. He allowed himself to be carried away to the point of telling us that everything should be carried out in public, whereas he said himself before the committee, and I refer to his remarks, on page 351, No. 4:

[*English*]

I realize that there are stages, of course. I mean there might never be a public hearing, there might never be a hearing. Perhaps the Commissioner after he makes a few preliminary investigations decides that there is just no substance to this complaint.

[*Translation*]

That means that in committee, the member himself visualized that the Commissioner could very well, in the interest of the persons affected—again, not the accused, seeing we are not dealing here with accused persons but people affected by the investigations conducted by the Commissioner—as I was saying that there could be cases where, in their own interest, the Commissioner should not make his findings public.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I should like to say that those powers which are described as terribly special or inquisitorial, dictatorial—I no longer know which adjectives to use, our friends opposite having exhausted all the adjectives of their vocabulary, with the verbal inflation which characterizes them—that those powers described almost as infernal and diabolical are exactly, according to the legal advisers of the department, essentially the same as those conferred by the inquiries act and the public service staff relations act.

We are therefore not dealing here with any new, special, dangerous, oppressive powers. They already exist in other fields of activity and, as the member for York South said, certain things lend themselves to scandal very easily, when we are dealing with the law on official languages, while the same provisions exist in many of our statutes to which the house raises absolutely no objection.

I should therefore like to say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that the spirit of the law, the powers conferred upon the Commissioner of Official Languages, the procedure provided for, smack in no way of the extraordinary or the scandalous. If there is any scandal, it could be in the sudden and so ill-advised indignation we witnessed here tonight.

As for me, I believe the proposed amendment is in no way justified and that the house must, at the time of the vote, reject it and restore the text of the bill to its present form.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to direct a question to the minister.

He did not say anything about the amendment I moved. Did he—

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I said at the outset that I would not speak to this amendment because I thought at that time that it would be against the rules. This amendment is not before the house at this stage, but when it will be submitted, I will speak to it.

Mr. Lewis: Was the minister here tonight, because it is my amendment that is under consideration now. The Chair said so.

Mr. Pelletier: Then, I made a mistake, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question. I have listened with a great deal of interest to his remarks, but could he tell the house why he has asked that the powers of this commissioner should exceed the powers ordinarily given to a commissioner under the Inquiries Act? Why is he asking that this man should have powers in excess of those powers?

Mr. Pelletier: The simple answer, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not. I take the advice of people more learned than myself, the law officers of the Crown, who say the powers are essentially the same.

Mr. MacEwan: The three wise men from Montreal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration which tends to amend the Conservative amendment reads as follows:

[*English*]

It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing, but he shall not make a report or recommendation adversely affecting any individual, department or other institution until that individual, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint against him or it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this implies once again that we are face to face with accused, with people called before the Commissioner as if he were a judge on the bench or an examining magistrate.

According to the description given in the act and the explanation of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the Commissioner is not precisely a chief of police or an examining magistrate nor a judge on the bench.

He will simply see to it that the legislation is enforced. If someone feels that his rights have been denied, he will be able to submit his case to the Commissioner who will then report to the government, to parliament.

In that respect, I think that the bill is clear enough and I wonder whether the Progressive Conservative members do not present amendments just to confuse people further.

Earlier, I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), mixing up everything, the bill with the absence of the ministers, and the vote Friday last when the bell rang for 40 minutes. However, the same hon. member forgot to mention that when the vote was taken, about half of the Progressive Conservative members sneaked away so as not to vote. There is something inconsistent about that. They say that they are in favour of the bill but they introduce all kinds of amendments as if they really opposed it. All sorts of charges or innuendos are spread to the effect that the French-Canadians want to oblige all English-speaking people to speak French, which is not the case at all.

And I shall give an example. When the official languages bill is implemented, it will not mean that everybody will have to learn both languages. Shall I say to my father who is 81 years old: Tomorrow morning because the languages bill has been adopted, you will start learning English. Since he has never spoken a word of English in his life, I think it would be madness.

It is the same thing as far as the other language is concerned. The bill does not compel the people to learn the other official language and the amendment now under study is simple. The law says that if somebody feels he has been wronged, he will make a report to the Commissioner who does not judge the situation but makes a report to parliament. This is where the decisions are made to ensure that both languages shall be respected according to the spirit of the law. The matter seems simple to me.

In the house, some members say they are in favour of both languages, but they move amendments which spread confusion.

If the amendment improved the bill, all right, but it does not improve it. It even says that the accused will have to resort to the Commissioner who will decide, in private, or in public hearings, what should be done in the circumstances. Such is not the duty of the Commissioner.

We are asking for something else. The bill provides for hearings held in private. Indeed many people will refuse to air their grievances in public. Others, for political reasons perhaps, will want to bring up everything in the open, in order to cause even more confusion and division. But if everything is settled elsewhere and reported to parliament, the house could always discuss special cases or cases which cannot come before the Commissioner. The present government can take steps to that end. The next government will also be able to take action and assume its responsibilities in that field.

I sincerely believe, that as the Secretary of State just said, that the Commissioner will not act as a chief of police, as an examining magistrate, or as a judge on the bench, and that no accused will appear before him. It will actually be people who will want to state their case but they will not be accused, they will state their case, and the Commissioner will consider it. He will be absolutely free to gather information from other people and when he submits his report, we will know, at least, what steps he has taken, and whether there has been any injustice. It will always be possible then for us to take action.

I do not feel this bill is a strait jacket for anybody whatsoever. I therefore wonder why the Conservatives move such an amendment, which is only likely to create more confusion and make us wonder whether they are really in favour of the two official languages.

They say here in the house that they are in favour of it and then they criticize the bill and make every effort to prevent the recognition of the two official languages in Canada. There is no question of forcing people to learn both languages or either of them; everyone is free. Then, let the Commissioner act according to the spirit of the act.

It seems to me that we have nothing to say or to add about that. We are against that amendment to the official languages bill, in Canada.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, because of a previous engagement which I could not break I was unable to be here earlier this evening, but I have had reported to me the rather emotional speeches of certain hon. members, particularly the speech of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I want to say again that this issue of the powers of the official languages commissioner was thoroughly examined before the special committee. I do not assert

in any way whatsoever that this precludes a full debate here in the House of Commons.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) interpreted my words quite correctly. If full scope is to be given to the committee system, some credence must be given to the decisions of the committee. Where a full inquiry has been made by a special and standing committee of the House of Commons, I believe that the house itself ought to pay due regard to it.

I want to restate, if I may in this full house assembled—I am delighted that the hon. member for Calgary North has returned to the house—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —from where he absented himself for a few minutes, as we all must from time to time because of other engagements. The hon. member will know exactly of what I speak. I think there is a misunderstanding, and I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) who set it forth.

An hon. Member: You missed his speech too.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, I was here for his speech. He set this misunderstanding forth in a clear fashion just a few minutes before the hon. member for Temiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) spoke. There is a misunderstanding about the powers and the purpose of the official languages commissioner.

Mr. Nesbitt: Some of us can still read.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Some of us can still read, but some of us can still perhaps not understand fully the words we are trying to digest, and I say that with the greatest respect to the hon. member.

Mr. Nesbitt: Thank you very kindly.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The official commissioner is not a court; he is not a party to a judicial inquiry; he is not a judicial tribunal; he is not a quasi-judicial tribunal; he is an investigator in purely an administrative fashion. He has not the power to assess rights; he has no power to assess obligations; he has no power to impose penalties; he has no power to assess guilt and he has no power to implement any of the sanctions of the Criminal law. He simply recommends. He reports only to parliament, and the only sanction in this bill is persuasion and public opinion.

There is no sanction against any individual whatsoever and no individual rights are assessed. This is the purpose of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Well, why not?

Mr. Brewin: It is perfectly true, as the minister has said, that this is not a court or a judicial tribunal, but I ask the minister whether he will agree that when there is power to make a report which might seriously affect the reputation of individuals dealt with in the report, should this not be a power in respect of which the individual has a right to ask only to be exercised after a public hearing?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will deal with that in a minute, but I will say it might be that reputations could be indirectly affected. This is why the government has opted for private hearings so that individual rights are assessed—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —so that the individual situation is assessed in order that reputations will not be affected, and I will get to that position in a moment.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The report is to be public.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We discussed this rather thoroughly at the committee stage, and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) knows of what I speak. I will deal with the point quite thoroughly before I take my seat.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister permit one question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister has said, if I understood his remarks correctly, that the commissioner would not be a member of a court of law or have those powers. I would ask the minister why this commissioner has the right to summons and enforce the attendance of witnesses, which is true of any court; compel them to give oral or written evidence on oath, which is true of most courts; to produce documents, which is true of most courts, and to use the same kind of evidence that is used

in court? The bill then goes on further to say that he can admit evidence that is not admissible in court. You have given him all the powers a court has yet you say he has not got the functions of a court.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He has no court functions whatsoever. He has the powers that are akin to the powers of an ombudsman. In fact, he is a linguistic ombudsman. He has no power to assess rights, or obligations, or duties on individuals. He will assess the status of access to the two official languages within the institutions of government. His power and his sanctions are persuasion and publicity; that is bringing facts to light to the minister of a department concerned, the head of a department and, more importantly, to parliament. He assesses no guilt and he attributes no blame. He makes an assessment as to what the situation may be and presents it to parliament. This language duplicates the statutary provisions, almost word for word, of the ombudsman legislation of New Brunswick, Quebec and Alberta. The power involved is the power to bring to light certain facts, not to decide civil rights or attribute blame or guilt.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister a question? Earlier this evening I tried to express my view of the commissioner's functions, and I put them very much along the lines the minister has suggested, but some of his statements worry me. In his bill in clause 28(2) there is provision for a report or recommendation which may adversely affect any individual, any department or any other institution. Should not the minister qualify his statement that this man cannot lay any blame? Obviously, the minister meant to say that somebody might be blamed in the report or recommendation of the commission?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In terms of reputation and in terms of blame the hon. member is quite right, but this situation is quite different from assessing or attributing guilt, inflicting penalty or deciding civil rights. In terms of reputation and blame, clause 28(2) now says that if any time during the course of an investigation it appears to the commissioner that there may be sufficient grounds for his reporting or making a recommendation that may adversely affect an individual, a department or other institution, he shall before completing the investigation take every reasonable measure to give that individual, department or institution a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism. This is exactly what it means and what I have suggested.

Mr. Lewis: Why not give him the opportunity to be heard in public?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think that in all fairness the hon. member should allow me to develop the argument I am attempting to develop. I will deal not only with the motion proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), but also the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I think it is important when we analyse the powers and functions of the official languages commissioner to state quite clearly, as we attempted to do in committee and as I attempt to do now in this House of Commons, that he is not a judicial officer. He does not have the power of a court. He does not have the power to apply sanctions, to impose penalties. His only power is persuasion and to bring facts to light. His is an administrative, not a judicial, function. He does not decide rights. He does not assess guilt. He does not attach penalties.

Mr. Woolliams: What about an adverse ruling?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is not a ruling. He does not affect individual rights. His power is limited to assessing the equal status of two official languages as used by institutions, and through institutions by the people working in them. If there is blame, it is to be attached to the departmental head, the minister, but not to the individual. It is an institutional function, and not primarily an individual one. That being so, if the commissioner is effectively to perform his investigatory function, to ensure that the spirit and letter of this law is observed, he must have the power to summon witnesses and enforce their attandance.

Mr. Horner: And enforce.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): To enforce the attendance of witnesses; that is right. The commissioner must have the power to compel them to give evidence, because without this power he could not deal with the complexities of modern government. I believe those powers of forcing and compelling the testimony of witnesses are limited by the closing words of the clause which read "in the same manner and to the same extent as a superior court of record". This language imports all the privi-

leges and protections that are available to witnesses who appear before superior courts.

Because the commissioner is merely an administrative officer, because he reports and recommends but does not decide rights or obligations, does not assess penalties or impose obligations upon individuals, he is really in the same position as any investigator and is not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence. Indeed, this has to be so because he must be free, as the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) said so admirably in committee, to receive at times hearsay evidence and to receive and examine documents without having them proved as they would have to be proved in a court of law.

This is precisely why clause 30 authorizes the commissioner to accept and receive evidence and information that would not be admissible in a court of law. The same situation applies under the Public Service Staff Relations Act. The same situation applies under the acts establishing an ombudsman in Alberta, New Brunswick, Quebec and New Zealand. I say quite frankly that we have decided, as policy of the government, to set forth under clause 28 the power of summons, the power to administer an oath and to receive and accept evidence, so that those who have to administer the act, people involved in departmental responsibilities within the act, employees' associations and unions involved with responsibilities under this bill if it becomes law, will have a complete code in one statute outlining the power and authority of the commissioner. They will not have to refer to any other statute.

There is nothing in the Inquiries Act which goes beyond this bill. There is nothing of any substance in this bill that goes beyond the powers of the Inquiries Act. It is more convenient for the people who have to administer and fulfil the spirit and letter of this law to have the whole substance of the law contained in one document. This is because we will be dealing with people who will not be lawyers, who will not be sophisticated in legal interpretation—

Mr. Woolliams: They will not even know the law.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —and who will want to have the complete substance of the bill in one document and they have it here. I want to make it very clear that clause 30 does not involve any invasion of civil liberties. Every effort has been made to protect the individual. Clause 28 of the bill is completely specific. Its intent, first of all, is that with this type of informal investigation the spirit and letter of the law can be observed more effectively. We believe that when dealing with institutions an informal investigation is more effective than the formality of a court procedure, because we are trying to assess how institutions are complying with the spirit and letter of the act which is to equate the official status of two languages.

We have set forth in the bill that investigations are to be conducted in private. This is to prevent any individual suffering adverse publicity through innuendo, rumour or any sort of hearsay evidence. Clause 28 (2) specifies completely that if the commissioner feels there is any ground for his making a report that may adversely affect any individual or department, he has an obligation before completing his investigation to take every reasonable measure to give the individual full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism.

I should now like to turn to the wording of the amendment of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). Let us go through his amendment clause by clause. The first subclause of the hon. member's amendment goes to the question of whether the commissioner should under any circumstances conduct hearings in public. The policy of the government, which we have adopted and which we attempted to define in committee and now in this house, is that this type of administrative investigation, not a judicial investigation that will attribute guilt, assess rights and impose obligations, should not be held in public because of the risk to the reputation of individuals and government institutions. For this reason the commissioner's powers are those of investigation only. They do not trespass beyond the simple power of investigation. He is not a court. The right to be heard, the right to be represented at a public hearing, is in our view not entirely appropriate to these proceedings.

The bill provides, as I have already said, in clause 28(2) that the commissioner shall hear persons of departments when their reputation is impugned or when his recommendations may adversely affect them.

Subclause 2 of the hon. member's amendment reads as follows:

> It is not necessary for the commissioner to hold any hearing but he may allow any person or any department or other institution concerned in an investigation, and shall allow any person or any department or other institution complained against in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

This amendment was considered in committee. It was not adopted in committee because we felt it would not give the commissioner sufficient flexibility to dispose of frivolous, vexatious and unfounded claims without hearing those complained against. In other words, if in the commissioner's opinion those who presented the claim were doing so in a frivolous, vexatious or unfounded manner the commissioner should not, if in his judgment the claim fell into one or other of those categories, be bound to a hearing. We feel this is a useful proceding because a person in respect of whom a complaint is made in this type of frivolous proceedings, should not be involved in a hearing. We believe that this is a useful provision.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Clause 3 again deals with a public hearing, but I have dealt with that matter already.

Part (4) of the amendment of the hon. member reads:

Parliament may,

(a) of its own volition, or

(b) upon the recommendation of the Governor in Council, regulate the procedure to be followed by the commissioner in the exercise of his powers and duties.

Surely, the commissioner, and indeed all those who have the powers of a royal commission should have the power to make their own rules and to regulate their own procedure. We believe that it would be absolutely impracticable for parliament, for the Governor in Council or for some other body, to regulate the procedure under which the commissioner should operate.

Part (5) of the hon. member's amendment is already found in clause 29 (2) of the bill.

Part (6) of the hon. member's amendment is found in clause 29 (3) of the bill.

Part (7) reads:

The commissioner has, in relation to the carrying out of any investigation under this act, (a) the powers of a commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act;

And then it spells out the limitations in the interests of defence for security. This amendment also was considered by the special committee but was not adopted.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The Minister of Justice.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: We want to hear you.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I thank hon. members for their courtesy in allowing me, through you, Mr. Speaker, to continue.

That amendment was considered in committee and not adopted because we believe that the powers set forth in clause 30 of the bill amply cover all the powers set forth for a commissioner under the Inquiries Act. Because of the fact that this bill will have to be administered by laymen and by departments of government and will have to be reviewed by employees and unions which deal with the government, in fact by the people of Canada, we felt it more useful to specify and set out the powers of the commissioner rather than refer them primarily to the Inquiries Act.

Part (7) (b) of the hon. member's amendment makes no change to what is now clause 30 (b) of the bill.

Now, I should like to deal with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). As we see it, what this amendment attempts to do is to strike out the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) and to provide a substitute for clause 28 (2) of the bill. In our view that is the effect of this amendment. I wish to say to the hon. member that we do not believe his drafting to be as good as ours. Perhaps he took the advice of other counsel in his party. Nevertheless, I want to say to him that he does not achieve what he seeks to achieve in this amendment as well as we do in the bill.

Mr. Lewis: I will be glad to accept any improvement so long as the minister accepts the principle of my amendment.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The substance of the hon. member's subamendment, which is a substitute for clause 28 (2) reads:

It is not necessary for the commissioner to hold any hearing,—

The hon. member agrees with us there.

—but he shall not make a report or recommendation adversely affecting any individual, department or other institution until that individual, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint against him or it, and has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in public or in private and to be represented by counsel as that person, department or other institution may elect;

We feel that his proposed wording "given reasonable notice of the complaint" and "full opportunity to be heard in public" is not an improvement on the words that are already found in clause 28 (2) which read:

—to give to that individual, department or institution a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism,

The only change that the hon. member is attempting to make is in bringing in the concept of a public hearing.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): At the election of the person affected.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. member may perhaps agree that, apart from that concept, the existing wording of clause 28 (2) provides, in terms of a potential adverse ruling, as much protection as his amendment. So, we are left with his feeling that there should be a public hearing at the election of the person adversely affected.

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to continue with this argument, after which I will be glad to entertain his question.

I believe that the election for a public hearing was involved in a discussion in the committee. We are of the view that in the purely administrative process, which is not a judicial process, which does not decide rights or impose obligations, which is an informal process to attempt to assess whether the spirit of this act is being applied by institutions and government departments, it is only fair to have these informal inquiries performed in private because of a risk to a reputation, particularly in the event that the complaint may prove to be without foundation. When we were in committee I put to the hon. member the following proposition: Supposing a member of a department elected to have the inquiry made public and the whole chain of command and other individuals were involved. Would he not, by exercising that election, involve others in publicity which they could not later control in an administrative fashion? I am not going to resurrect that debate, but suffice it to say that we made that policy decision feeling that in these administrative spheres, since we were not involved whatsoever in a judicial concept, it was probably fairer to the individuals involved to have the administrative function performed in private. For that reason we rejected the suggestion and, since the hon. member did not pursue it in the committee, I feel we should reject it now. I know that the hon. member agrees with us that the essence of this bill cannot be enforced by court proceeding and by judicial inquiry, but can only be assessed by informal administrative proceedings affecting departments and not individuals. We want to ensure that in these investigations the individuals who work within these departments do not have their reputations blackened before the facts are completely assessed.

Obviously the results become public when the commissioner finds a transgression of this act. He then reports to the minister and to his department and ultimately to parliament. Before he can do that, any individual who is adversely affected has the right to a hearing before the commissioner. That is the reason for which we rejected the amendment in the committee. I can only repeat what I said during the informal discussion we had before the special committee. I believe the hon. member knows exactly the spirit of this bill. I have not finished yet, but I would be glad to entertain the question of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker, the minister allowed us to believe that clause 28(2) gives a person against whom a complaint has been lodged the right to be heard. This is at the discretion of the commissioner. But it may not be exercised until half the hearing has been completed. Does the minister really think it is fair that a person should be called in midway during the proceedings? What possible objection could he have to his presence from the very beginning, so that he could sit in on the whole of the proceedings? I am sure—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Since the hon. member does not have the floor he cannot make another speech. I believe he was given an opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In answer to the hon. member, all I can say is that the proceedings are not intended to try any individual. His rights, his obligations, any penalties under the law which may attach to him personally, are not in play in these proceedings. This is an administrative procedure affecting institutions only, and the individual is only indirectly affected. To answer the first part of the question, may I say it is mandatory upon the commissioner if it appears to him

that there are sufficient grounds for making a report or recommendation which may adversely affect an individual, to take every reasonable means to give that individual full and ample opportunity to answer any allegations. The words used in this connection are: "The Commissioner shall—" and so on. So my answer is that it is mandatory upon the commissioner if there is any evidence which may adversely affect anybody in his administrative inquiry, to allow that man to appear.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister a question? I want to ask him this—if Mr. Speaker will permit me, I have to explain it, first.

I agree it is mandatory upon the commissioner to give a hearing to a person who may be adversely affected. But I ask the minister, what is wrong about permitting a person who may be adversely affected by a report or a recommendation an opportunity to be heard in public if he so requests? In what way could this interfere with the informal workings of this bill? I personally agree with the minister that they ought to remain informal in all other respects.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Let me put it this way. If the performance of anyone is to be assessed under this bill it is institutional performance, and that performance can only be fulfilled by a heirarchy of individuals. Nowhere in this bill is there a penalty or judgment to be levied against an individual; if there is any judgment or assessment it is levied against an institution. Because we are dealing with institutions we have felt that until the commissioner has had an opportunity to assess the situation the people involved should be given the protection of privacy.

When somebody is affected he has a right to appear before the commission. If he were to have the right to elect an inquiry in public to put forward his defence—I use that word inadvisedly as he does not have to defend himself since he is fulfilling departmental policy —then he is likely to involve other people in the hierarchy of the department.

Mr. Lewis: As always happens when you are trying to protect your reputation.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Thus, by trying to protect his reputation—not his rights, because it is an institution which is subject to inquiry—he is likely to involve a chain of other people in the department, that is, involve them publicly. This is the rationale behind the government's approach and this is what led us to the judgment we have made.

Mr. Douglas: I think it is a dangerous one.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): To summarize—I realize I am imposing upon the courtesy of the house—

Mr. Horner: It is ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) will appreciate, even with his near-sightedness, that I have one more minute and that is all I am going to need.

I repeat. The powers of this commissioner are not judicial. As the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) said, he is not a policeman. He is a linguistic ombudsman. His powers are administrative only. They are limited to reviewing under the statute the performance of institutions. They have nothing to do with the performance, or civil rights or obligations of individuals, nor do they involve penalties.

Mr. Horner: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): For these reasons, we reject the amendment.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 19, 1969

The house met at 10 a.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions through the usual channels and I think there may be a general disposition in the house this morning to deal with the report stage and third reading of Bill C-197, item 79 on the order paper, before calling item No. 90, Bill C-207.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I think the simultaneous translation system is not working.

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: If there is general disposition to deal with those two stages of Bill C-197 without debate I would appreciate Your Honour's calling them first.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, there is general disposition. I understand that the bill in question involves a further amendment to the Criminal Code in respect of off-track betting. When the matter is brought forward the representative from this party, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), will simply indicate the reason we are agreeing to this rather unusual procedure at this time. Apart from that, we have no objection to what is being proposed by the minister.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That will be satisfactory to us, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) was our representative on the committee and, as everyone knows, he voted for the bill. If he had not done so, the bill would not be back here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, we can hardly comment on the minister's statement, since we did not hear a word of it. The simultaneous translation system must be in working order if we are to take part in the debate.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I can repeat the whole thing in French. The purpose of the bill before us is to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with off-track betting.

I consulted this morning the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) and he agreed on behalf of the Ralliement Créditiste to such procedure.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING PLACING OF BETS BY ONE PERSON FOR ANOTHER—REPORT STAGE

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-197, to amend the Criminal Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on Monday, June 16, 1969 be concurred in.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I be permitted to ask for the unanimous consent of the house to allow the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) to now explain why—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It can be done on third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it can be done on third reading.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, we will wait until third reading.

Mr. Speaker: This is a little early to start our proceedings.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) moved that Bill C-197, to amend the Criminal Code, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is a

little early, especially when you consider we are sitting late—ten hours a day.

• (10:10 a.m.)

The committee which studied this bill was composed of members from all parties. The bill was thoroughly examined. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, there was a vote on the bill. Without going into great detail I should like to point out why we agree with the bill. In respect of this matter some background was created by a decision of the Supreme Court of Ontario and other courts regarding off-track betting, which has caused what might be called a vacuum in the Criminal Code.

In fairness to the minister and the officials of his department, I would point out that the Attorneys General of the ten provinces asked that parliament approve an amendment which would plug this hole in the Criminal Code. There was in committee discussion as to whether the provinces should not be left in the position where they could draft rules and regulations controlling off-track betting, because on-track betting is allowed. The argument against this suggestion derived from letters many of the Attorneys General had received, some of which were read into the record of the committee proceedings. It was argued that if we adopted the suggestion we would make it easier for syndicated crime to move into Canada. There is some question whether that is correct and whether just as much crime moves into Canada because we drive bookmakers underground. We were told in committee that something like $2 billion is spent illegally in Ontario on horse race betting. We were also told that probably just as much syndicated crime will move into Canada if this hole is plugged.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) took his responsibility in this matter very seriously. He undertook to study the matter further and review and discuss it with the Attorneys General of the provinces with the idea of reaching agreement on the question. If agreement is reached, the law may again be changed and off-track and other kinds of betting legalized; but it would be legalized with the proper rules and regulations drafted in order to control the movement of criminals into this field.

I have personal experience in this matter, gained through my legal practice. I have dealt with cases concerning bookmaking. Off-track betting is carried out in every part of Canada. We are like ostriches, sticking our heads in the sand, because even if we plug this hole in the Criminal Code I do not think it will reduce by one dollar the amount of money spent on off-track betting. This has been my personal experience. The Canadian people are divided into three sections in this respect; there are those who are against off-track betting and live up to their principles in this regard, there are those who are against it but still bet off-track, and there are those who believe we should have lotteries and horse race betting on and off track. I say with tongue in cheek that we are a little hypocritical when referring to our standards in this regard.

I conclude on this note, Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Justice has on behalf of the government undertaken to review the situation and discuss it further with the provinces with a view to coming forward with practical, realistic legislation. Because of this we agree that the bill should receive third reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carried, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baldwin: That is the best speech you have ever made.

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

ATLANTIC REGIONAL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMPLIFY RATES LEGISLATION, TO REMOVE CERTAIN STATUTORY REDUCTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

The house resumed, from Tuesday, June 17, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-207, to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic region—Mr. Jamieson—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: When the house rose on Tuesday, June 17, clause 2 was under consideration. Clause 1 was allowed to stand. Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunately attending a committee—it may even have been the transport committee finalizing the report on this bill—and did not participate in the discussion under clause 1. As I understand it, we stood clause 1. I ask whether I have an opportunity to speak in a general way on clause 1 without getting into the specifics of clause 2. I ask the question because, as I say, I was not in the house when this matter was last discussed and

should like to deal with a few matters concerning clause 1 in a general way before we get down to specifics.

The Chairman: The theory is that the discussion should be restricted to clause 2 and the general discussion would be at the end, on clause 1. If the committee would like to reverse that procedure, I am in its hands; but that is the way I propose to approach the matter.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, in view of the hon. member's very real interest in this matter, I would welcome an opportunity to hear his general views, if the committee were so disposed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Then we will have a general discussion on clause 2.

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister and the committee for their indulgence. I would like to compliment the minister upon his initiative in bringing forward Bill C-207. He has noted that the bill has special reference to the constituency I represent and to the larger constituency of the Atlantic area. As the minister and people in the Atlantic area know, matters have been sort of left in the air as far as special assistance and/or a freeze on freight rates are concerned. The late lamented Bill C-182 introduced earlier this session provoked more by way of adverse reaction than it did by way of the resolving of problems.

With regard to the general principle of Bill C-207, I am in favour of extending assistance to the truckers. Assistance provided under the Maritime Freight Rates Act applies only to the railways. This bill at least recognizes that other modes of transportation, and trucking in particular, should also receive assistance. This principle conforms with the reports of commissions which have studied the problem. I refer to the study of transportation problems in the Atlantic region, the economic units study and the Atlantic premiers task force. These bodies submitted their views on the question of Atlantic transportation to the then minister of transport, the hon. member for Trinity.

I do not want there to be any misunderstanding in this regard. We on this side of the house are not against assistance being given to the trucking industry. The railways have in effect been favoured, and the truckers discriminated against, with subsidies from the federal government. I am disappointed however that Bill C-207 does not go far enough. I have read the minister's remarks of last Tuesday morning. That was another morning sitting. He said this is an interim measure and a more comprehensive plan would be developed and laid before parliament at a later date. On that understanding some of my disappointment is abated and diluted.

• (10:20 a.m.)

Hon. members who are not from the Atlantic area perhaps do not understand the particular problems there or the implications of the Maritime Freight Rates Act as it affects movement of freight both in and outside the Atlantic area. Quite frankly, there are many people in the Atlantic area involved in transportation who sometimes have difficulty, as do members of parliament, in understanding the full implications of the Maritime Freight Rates Act, which was enacted by parliament in 1927 and which, to the people in the east, is a confirmation of the undertakings that were given to the Atlantic area before they joined Confederation. We do not all have whiskers in the Atlantic area and we do not always talk about history, although we have many historic sites. I did not mention this historical fact for the purpose of simply narrating it but because, as the minister and as members from the Atlantic area are well aware, some members of this house have the mistaken impression that this is just another protest by the Atlantic area.

Although I admit that the federal government has not helped the Atlantic area with one or another handout, I wish to state categorically, in speaking about the general principle of the bill, that it does not follow the trend which was started by the Duncan commission away back in the 1920's and which is evident in the preamble of the Maritime Freight Rates Act of 1927, enacted some 60 years after Confederation. The Maritime Freight Rates Act was the real confirmation of the undertakings which induced the original four provinces to form this nation which now stretches from coast to coast.

It is in that context that we are speaking about Bill C-207. The Maritime Freight Rates Act gave assistance to the movement of rail traffic in what is known as the select territory. Generally speaking, the select territory is in the Atlantic area, but in effect it is territory south of the St. Lawrence and east of

Levis. Within that select territory rail traffic now receives a subsidy of what is in effect 20 per cent, and rail traffic that is westbound out of the select territory receives financial assistance from the federal government amounting to 30 per cent. The assistance is given on the premise and according to the principle that in a nation which stretches from coast to coast and which covers such vast and wide distances financial help must be given to carry goods from the Atlantic area into the marketplaces not only in central Canada but into the marketplaces of all of Canada.

It was on that basis that it was recognized in 1927 that something must be done. Confederation never would have come about the way it did had some undertakings not been given to the Atlantic area, which at that time had a profitable trade north and south to the New England states, partly because of sailing ships, which were the dominant mode of traffic at that time, but also because of a geographical position which lends itself to transportation north and south. Perhaps the same might be said about British Columbia where the freight traffic and business interests are more naturally directed north and south than east and west.

It was on this basis that the Maritime Freight Rates Act came about. We in the east feel that it is just as much our charter of human rights as those in the west feel about the Crowsnest Pass. The same would apply to the minister's own province where term 31 or 32 of the Act of Union brought Newfoundland into confederation in 1949. I know that at the time the minister was not swayed by the interests of Canada and by term 31 or 32 because he had some other views about Canada, views which were shared by a multitude of good people in Newfoundland. The fact is that two terms were written into the Act of Union—which unfortunately did not apply as firmly in the case of Nova Scotia in 1867—which guarantee transportation assistance to Newfoundland, because of the problems faced by that province being an island out in the Atlantic and even farther away than Nova Scotia from the markets in Canada.

So in the east we have the term 31 or 32 of the Act of Union, in the west we have the Crowsnest Pass, and in the Atlantic area, or the select territory, we have the Maritime Freight Rates Act. To me these are fundamental documents in any discussion of transportation problems in Canada.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Following that brief preliminary historical perspective, I want to get down to the specifics of Bill C-207 which in my view does not go far enough and at the same time opens up a door the result of which would be to nullify the principle of the charter of transportation in Atlantic Canada. This bill does not go far enough in doing no more than recognizing the National Transportation Act which, as the minister well knows, was passed by parliament in the last session under the then minister of transport who is now chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission, another able man and an adopted Newfoundlander, namely Mr. Pickersgill.

I was a member of the house and a member of the Transport Committee when the transport bill was debated. One of the fundamental principles of the bill, which is now an act, was that no mode of transport, be it rail or trucks, was to be subsidized by the federal government at the expense of another mode or, to put it another way, that transportation was going to have to pay its own way. I have described it in a very general way.

What happened then? Some changes in freight traffic took place in the Atlantic area. It was not too clear whether the Maritime Freight Rates Act covered some of the changes made in the rail traffic. The truckers quite rightly asked: Since it was specified in the National Transportation Act that no subsidy would be given to any mode of transport at the expense of another, why does parliament continue to recognize the Maritime Freight Rates Act which still gives a direct subsidy to rail traffic? This question was eventually considered by the government and the minister of transport of that day, the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) gave some thought to the implications. Eventually Bill C-82 was brought in to give temporary assistance in the east, but the truckers continued to be left out of the picture.

Under Bill C-207, as I read it, assistance will continue to be given to rail traffic, but the only assistance that will be given to the truckers is for movement by trucks out of the select territory. In other words, initially under this act truckers will not receive any help in their operations within the Atlantic area, as will rail traffic, but only for traffic movements that are westbound, in effect beyond and west of Levis. It is only in this way that the trucking industry will be able to pick up the benefit of the 30 per cent subsidy from the federal treasury.

I do not want to belabour the point, Mr. Chairman, because I was assured that this was an interim measure. Many truckers today feel that the measure has not gone far enough but that at least it recognizes the principle that trucking should receive financial assistance if rail traffic receives it.

• (10:30 a.m.)

Under the Maritime Freight Rates Act assistance was provided to the railways. This was one of the conditions of Confederation. The truckers naturally say the bill has not gone far enough. They have not been given the measure of assistance which the railways have received in respect of movement in the Atlantic area, but their hope is that once the principle is recognized in respect of westbound traffic the government may remove the discrimination which now exists. Traffic within the region is called intra-movement.

I do not think the bill goes far enough, because we all hope to develop a thriving trucking industry in the Atlantic area, and, frankly, on the basis of legislation of this type I cannot see any marked development as being likely. We do not have a large market in the region and our principal population centres are relatively small in size. Of necessity we use broken lots when freight is moved. The truckers can obviously carry a good deal in their new truck and trailer transports. I suggest that a system whereby full cars are sent by rail from Montreal, Toronto and other places to a central distribution point, from which they could be delivered by truck to individual consignees, would do a great deal to develop a better transportation system in the area. Yet movement of this type receives no benefit under the bill.

If it had been made clear, preferably somewhere in this legislation, that this was only an interim measure and that a comprehensive measure would be introduced in the fall I might not have said nine-tenths of the things I have said today. There is another aspect which causes me concern; one might regard it as the other side of the coin. The bill does not recognize the position of the truckers vis-à-vis the railway. There is still discrimination in favour of the railroad; there is not much doubt about that. The minister's answer will be, of course, that we are dealing now with an interim measure. When I look through the bill I see that clause five, when read in connection with clause six, will hopefully provide some assistance to the truckers. It seems to me that clause five deals with the power which becomes necessary if this is to be an interim measure. Clause 5(1) says that regardless of what is contained in the Maritime Freight Rates Act the Governor in Council may vary or remove the reduction in tariffs for the preferred movements of traffic prescribed; and so on. Reading clause five and six together I conclude that any savings would be used to provide supplemental assistance to the trucking industry.

The minister made a good speech, but I have difficulty in understanding why, if this is an interim measure, the minister needs this power given him in clause 5(1), because reading clauses 5 and 6 together, as I understand the legislation, the rate freeze is to be extended to March 23, 1970, which is nine months from now. Clauses 5 and 6 as I understand them do not come into effect until the expiry of the rate freeze on March 23, 1970 or earlier if the freeze is ended by proclamation. If there is no proclamation, then clause 5 does not even come into effect. Is that not correct?

Mr. Jamieson: No.

Mr. Nowlan: The minister suggests no. In that case I would be interested to hear his further explanation of clauses 5 and 6, because as I read them they do not come into effect until the rate freeze has expired, something which will occur, if this bill is passed, in nine months time unless the minister takes some other action by way of proclamation. I believe the purpose of clauses 5 and 6 is to make some reduction in tariffs and, out of this reduction, to give more assistance to the truckers.

Bearing in mind the amount of discrimination which still exists I suppose the trucking industry would like to see clauses 5 and 6 used to wipe out the interim subsidies to the railroads which this bill provides. What puzzles me, as the representative of a maritime riding and one who has taken an interest in the Crowsnest Pass situation—I was out there for seven years—is that there is no restriction whatsoever under 5(1) on the power of the cabinet to vary or reduce the tariffs on this preferred movement. As I read the bill it is not outside the realm of possibility that the cabinet could castrate the very core of the Maritime Freight Rates Act by eliminating tariffs altogether on this traffic movement, using as justification the argument that it was paying supplemental assistance to the truckers on a selective basis.

As hon. members are aware, the present Maritime Freight Rates Act can be changed only by legislation. I put it to the minister

that taking action on the lines I have indicated under clause 5 would be analogous to amending the Crowsnest Pass agreement; it would be like using the power given by order in council to vary or remove those rates which are of such importance to the west. It would be like giving the cabinet power to vary by order in council term 31 or term 32, if it wished to do so.

• (10:40 a.m.)

Frankly, I cannot agree to such wide power being given to a cabinet, no matter how laudable the purpose, without restriction or some time limitation. I find it even more difficult to accept the necessity for this power, in view of the statement of the minister himself who said that this bill is an interim measure.

I suggest, reading clauses 5 and 6 together, that unless there is proclamation beforehand, these provisions cannot effect the purpose outlined by the minister the other day, namely to grant selective assistance to a certain amount during the next nine months. Surely the government will have a comprehensive Atlantic transportation policy by the fall, and this is certainly within nine months.

The minister is aware of the ironic situation that the Transportation Committee faced. I am a member of that committee and the report on the trip to the Atlantic region which took place last February was given the finishing touches on the Friday that the bill was given first reading in the house. Although the bill and the committee report dealt, in part, with the same subject matter, there was not of necessity any relationship between the two. In fact, the bill was given first reading, second reading and then sent to committee of the whole before the report of the transportation committee was tabled the following Tuesday.

I do not want to become partisan or to digress at this point. We are debating a bill dealing with Atlantic transportation that is supposedly an interim measure, and as I say the bill was introduced before the committee report really came before the house. I appreciate the minister says that this interim measure had to be brought forward, and we ourselves wanted some action taken. But let me return to clause 5. I really cannot understand why the minister or his cabinet needs to strike, in effect, at the very core of the Maritime Freight Rates Act and vary or remove tariffs for preferred movements of traffic as mentioned in the bill. As I said earlier, this provision regarding rates was one of the conditions on which Newfoundland entered confederation, and any such variation would be analogous, in my view, to giving the government power to vary, for example, freight rates through the Crowsnest Pass or to varying term 31 or 32 by order in council. It really strikes at or castrates the very principle of the Maritime Freight Rates Act.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, reading these two clauses together, that they will not meet the purpose for which they are designed, because unless there is proclamation of the lifting of the freeze on rates they will not be able to take effect. If proclamation is given and the rates freeze is removed, then why does the government need the power to vary or remove the tariffs? Let the government bring in its new comprehensive Atlantic transportation bill. This is the major feature of this bill that I find difficult to accept.

Firstly, I say the bill does not go far enough in regard to the removal of discrimination between the railways and truckers. However it does recognize the principle of assistance to truckers, and I hope that this principle will be extended in the comprehensive policy of the government so that discrimination will no longer exist. I will not belabour that point.

My second point is that the bill may not have the result that is desired by the minister. I think the effect of clauses 5 and 6 taken together, and especially clause 5 (1), is to bring about a complete change in the principle of the Maritime Freight Rates Act by making arbitrary changes by order in council without recourse to parliament, as is presently the case.

I also appreciate that in their task force report the Atlantic premiers suggested that there be selective help. I think they went a long way to get rid of this blanket subsidy of 20 per cent for movement within the selected territory and 30 per cent for movement without the selected territory. I think many commissions have always found this to be effective as a result of across-the-board increases and such matters.

I am in favour of selective assistance, but the four Atlantic premiers were very firm about this in the brief that was requested by the hon. member for Trinity. The political affiliations of the four Atlantic premiers are well known; three support the government and one does not. But they did reach unanimous agreement, and the summary of their brief is to the effect that nothing be

done in regard to the tariffs for preferred movements until some federal-provincial agency is set up to assess the implications of any changes in such movements in and out of selected territories. Following that assessment the agency could then determine on a selective basis what to take from here and give there.

I think this is a real step forward and meets any objection that might be taken by those in the east because it removes the blanket subsidy principle and substitutes assistance that is granted on a selective basis.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Badanai): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired, unless he has the unanimous consent of the committee to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to make one additional point in conclusion before I move on to deal with some of the other clauses about which I should like more details. I thank the members of the committee for granting me their indulgence in order that I may continue.

Even those who come from the east find that this is a pretty complicated and involved subject. For example, reference must be had to three or four different acts in order to get the full impact of the provisions contained in clauses 5 and 6. The leaders of the four provinces directly affected by the provisions of the bill have stated they are in favour of drastic change. They want the blanket subsidy principle rescinded because it has been found wanting in certain areas. They now want selective assistance given to the truckers and the railways, with no discrimination.

I should like to see us carry out the principle enshrined within the National Transportation Act that we passed in the last parliament. The Atlantic premiers start in, as it were, not backside to, but I think frontside front, by saying that the government should set up an agency, certainly something far more substantial than the committee referred to by the minister in his remarks on Tuesday, which to me could be a most flexible arrangement, a body not cemented in any legislation, and certainly not in this legislation.

The Atlantic premiers asked for a comprehensive transportation policy. They want a federal government agency to look after the peculiar problems of transportation in the Atlantic region and to co-ordinate its activities with representatives of the provinces. Change is required. The blanket subsidy principle has created problems. However, before any change is made, let us assess the effect of such change on the business communities in the area, and, if beneficial, then grant selective assistance.

• (10:50 a.m.)

The minister says that he will not move in certain areas until the committee makes certain recommendations. I point out that the committee has nothing concrete before it. There is nothing firm about this bill; it does not lay any foundations. Since clause 5(1) is an interim measure which may not come into effect unless certain other regulations are proclaimed after a period of nine months, I question the wisdom of including it in the bill.

Surely the minister is now in a position to act on the useful and constructive committee report that was agreed to unanimously by all committee members and tabled in the house on Tuesday. That report contains the basis for transportation policy, I submit. A similar report has been in the hands of the minister or of departmental officials for many months. I say that you do not need clause 5. The government's attempt to change articles 31 and 32 of the contract, as a result of which the maritime provinces entered into union with the rest of Canada, is analogous to the former attempt it made to change the Crowsnest Pass agreement by order in council.

Surely no one can argue that articles 31 and 32 can be varied, affected or altered by order in council. That being so I do not understand the necessity for this interim measure. If the minister wants the wide powers ostensibly contained in clause 5(1), why does he not take the burr off his backside and bring in a comprehensive transportation bill in the fall. This bill will be sent to committee and, frankly, I am worried in case we shall have committeed this concept to death. The minister has the committee's recommendations; they are comprehensive. I should like to see some guarantee that we shall see a comprehensive bill covering this question in the fall.

I will not take up any more of the time of the house, except to say that I do not think the bill goes far enough in removing the existing discrimination between rail and truck forms of transportation. I agree that some assistance will be given to truckers. My real objection to the bill is that it completely undermines the transportation charter we were given under the Maritime Freight Rates

Act. That transportation guarantee or undertaking is one of the primary reasons underlying the fact that eastern Canada joined the rest of the country. It is a pretty good country but it will not get much better if the rights eastern Canada has enjoyed since Confederation are to be potentially chipped away by order in council.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I know that on Tuesday when we adjourned debate it had been agreed to stand clause 1 on the understanding that we would discuss the bill clause by clause. What stage have our discussions reached, now? Are we to have a general discussion, or are we to consider clause 1 and then continue with consideration of other clauses. I wish to know where we stand and where we may move amendments.

The Chairman: The understanding was, I think, that the general discussion would take place on clause 2. We are on clause 2 now.

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few brief comments on this piece of interim legislation. They will be of a fairly general nature. I think it is necessary for parliament to introduce this legislation at this time but I share the reservations about it which have been expressed. It empowers the Governor in Council to curtail some of the benefits which have been enshrined in the Maritime Freight Rates Act and to vary the provisions of pieces of legislation which could only have been varied in the past by parliament itself. No doubt later in this discussion the minister will explain why he thought it necessary to do this.

I now wish to make a few general remarks about the problems of the Atlantic regions, about their economic positions generally and about the relationship existing between these problems and transportation costs. Basically it seems to me that the problem facing the Atlantic provinces is this: Ever since Confederation, because of our tariff system—and I am talking about custom tariffs and not about rail or transport tariffs—there has been a tendency to concentrate our secondary industries in central Canada. As a result we, in the Atlantic provinces, have suffered over the years from this trend towards centralization. The maritime region, including Newfoundland, now finds that almost everything it has to sell has to be exported to world markets. I am speaking about our pulp, paper, minerals, fish and so on. On the other hand we have, in effect, become a captive market for the centralized industries of central Canada.

If this bill were to provide the assistance that would make it possible for secondary industries having markets in all Canada to be developed in the maritimes, I would support it 100 per cent. No doubt the idea behind this legislation is to put secondary industries in the maritimes on an equal footing with those of central Canada and to give them equal opportunities in reaching Canadian markets. I am afraid I must say, and experience bears me out, that this assistance will not be enough to accomplish that purpose. This bill will not put the maritime producer or manufacturer on an equal footing with the producer or manufacturer of central Canada so far as major markets are concerned. We cannot bring this about by simply reducing freight costs by 20 per cent or 30 per cent, or whatever the figure may be. The bill will be of assistance in those cases, confined to a limited segment of the whole spectrum of production and manufacturing, where industries in the Atlantic provinces can compete with those in central Canada. Therefore, any help that does not get us over the threshold, as it were, of making our industry truly competitive in the Canadian market generally is no help at all. Of course it will have a beneficial effect on our existing industries which are in a good competitive position vis-à-vis our competitors in the rest of Canada.

The fact remains that, despite this assistance, and for reasons having nothing to do with such assistance, industries in the maritime provinces have been limited to those industries capable of maintaining a good competitive position vis-à-vis the rest of Canada. When a more comprehensive program of permanent assistance to transportation in the maritimes generally is proceeded with, I should like to see the minister giving consideration to the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications which deals with road construction, the prospective construction of the Prince Edward Island causeway and so on. I hope he reviews matters of this sort from time to time and studies at least the problem of the maritimes in the field of transportation. In spite of the artificialities in this country from an economic point of view so far as customs tariffs are concerned, we ought to realize that the natural markets of the Atlantic provinces are to a great extent overseas markets such as the West Indies.

• (11:00 a.m.)

My contention is that a given amount of assistance in freight rates or assistance to the transportation of maritime products to natural markets such as the West Indies would do more and be of greater assistance to the industries in the maritime provinces than merely freight assistance from the Atlantic region to other parts of Canada as provided for in this legislation.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Chairman, I support the concern echoed by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley. In my opinion it is a very shoddy way of handling house business to have this bill before the house at this time when the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications is meeting at eleven o'clock. The other day the standing committee was meeting at the same time this bill was introduced. I believe all members of the standing committee are most concerned about hearing the debate on this bill. It is rather difficult to have a continuing effort on the part of all hon. members if this method of handling house business is to continue. I ask the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, to do something to provide other means of handling legislation that he will be bringing before the house because I am sure this also puts him in an embarrassing position.

My colleagues in my party stated our position the other day and I will not repeat it. The main concern of many people today is whether the benefits of any assistance given to any form of transportation will go directly to the users. Another concern has been expressed which I wish to repeat. In the event assistance is granted to the trucking industry, where trucking companies are owned by the railways there must be controls and safeguards in the legislation and regulations to ensure there will not be a monopoly in the setting of rates. I believe this matter has been fully gone into. It is a concern of many people in this country. If there is a monopoly and these concessions are made throughout the industry, they may overstep their rights in this regard. The minister in particular should watch this very closely.

I support the concern expressed by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley with regard to section 5(1) as outlined in the news release of the Minister of Transport. I shall pose two questions for the minister's consideration. I will have to read *Hansard* to find out his answers. In the third paragraph of the minister's news release he states:

> —it had been decided instead to ask Parliament to give the Governor in Council authority to remove this assistance on various commodities or classes of traffic as recommended by a new joint federal-provincial committee which will be set up for this purpose.

On the last page of the news release it is indicated:

> The new bill incorporates the substances of Bill C-182 introduced on March 19, 1969, under which it was proposed to extend for one year the existing freeze on non-competitive carload rail freight rates on Atlantic region shipments, but it provides that the freeze can be terminated before the end of the year by the Governor in Council.

I may be unjustly concerned about power being given to the Governor in Council, but I have always been of the opinion that those people most directly concerned with any legislation should have a say in any changes that may be made in that legislation. I am pleased to see there has been a recommendation to establish an Atlantic Region Transportation Board. I ask the minister to clarify why some other avenue of authority could not be utilized to determine the freight rates the minister referred to in his news release. I am sure he can make that point much clearer.

It appears that clauses 5(1) and 5(2) require to be looked at closely. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley has already referred to the portion which states that the Governor in Council may vary or remove. This merits some consideration and possibly revision. Possibly the minister will be prepared to accept amendments which may be forthcoming to clarify this picture. It poses some questions in the minds of some members of our party. The fear in this regard was quite ably expressed by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley. I mentioned previously that the Governor in Council has been given considerable power in these provisions. I ask the minister to clarify the concerns I have expressed when he replies.

It seems strange indeed that when the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications was in the east examining the over-all problem, an announcement was made in the house that the Prince Edward Island causeway would not be proceeded with. Maritime freight rates were considered by the cabinet and the minister without being considered by the committee. There is not much use in a committee of this house travelling throughout the country unless some consideration is given to its recommendations. I say in all sincerity there is no purpose in having

committees of this house if legislation is going to be introduced before the recommendations of the committee, whatever committee it may be, are brought in and hon. members are given an opportunity to discuss them in the house.

• (11:10 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dumont: Mr. Chairman, in the few brief explanations I would like to give and the questions I would like to ask the minister regarding this legislation on assistance to transportation in the Atlantic Region and concerning also the designated area of Lévis, I will say to the minister that there will be the utmost confusion if my proposals are not accepted.

In fact, the bill stipulates that the road connecting Lévis, in Quebec, with U.S. Route 201 in the State of Maine, is the border line, while the whole country of Lévis is a designated area. I know a Lévis manufacturer whose plant lies 200 feet from the traffic circle of Lévis, and any carrier who would pick up goods at a distance of 200 feet on the western side of the traffic circle, even if it is in a designated area will not be entitled, according to the definition in the legislation, to a subsidy.

Consequently, I would point out to the minister, that in my opinion, the entire county of Lévis, which is a designated area, should be included in the Atlantic area. I think that this step would prevent confusion, because as I said a while ago, there are some manufacturers on both sides of the Kennedy road and we would have a manufacturer on the western side who would not obtain a subsidy, while the one who is on the eastern side would get a subsidy for goods shipped by a trucking company.

We from the Ralliement créditiste are in favour of that bill and hope that it will soon be passed.

I got in touch earlier with representatives of trucking companies who sincerely regret, that submission, could not be filed in order to state the fair claims and the needs of the trucking industry—particularly in the designated area of Lévis, in direction of the Gaspé peninsula and the Maritimes—which is in a state of stagnation at the present time.

I do hope we shall be able to bring in amendments which will help the truckers whose business in Eastern Canada is now losing ground on account of unfair competition.

Those are about the comments I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, and I do hope, especially in the case of the Kennedy road, that the minister will agree to include the whole county of Lévis.

[*English*]

Mr. Bell: Mr. Chairman, first I want to place on the record my very serious personal objections to the fact that the Transport Committee is sitting in Room 307 in the West Block while the house is discussing important legislation affecting transport in the Atlantic provinces. This is outrageous. It is a situation that has not occurred in parliament for some time. To the new Minister of Transport may I say that one of his predecessors in office, Mr. Pickersgill, with all his faults would never have allowed this to happen. I do not know whether the minister himself is to blame—

Mr. Jamieson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and with the greatest respect I want to assure hon. members that I was completely unaware of this situation. So far as I knew this was a sort of extraordinary session of the house. I was not aware the Transport Committee was meeting at the same time. I am sure the hon. member did not mean to imply that I was.

Mr. Bell: Then I apologize to the minister, Mr. Chairman. It could be that as a new junior minister he has not been able to make his influence felt in cabinet circles. I know that the house leader has responsibility in connection with committee meetings, but I hope the minister will take a strong stand with his cabinet colleagues who may wish to shove him around. I hope he does not forget to take a tough line with some of these Upper Canadians when legislation is introduced respecting the Atlantic provinces.

I do not know whether it is an advantage to be from the Atlantic provinces and hold the transport portfolio, but for better or worse the minister now has that responsibility and it is a grave one. This is the first time I have had a chance to speak on the subject of transportation in the house since the new minister took office, and of course I wish him well. It seems that everybody does. To him I hold up the example of Mr. Pickersgill, and I say this in a serious manner. He was a good parliamentarian. He has the courage to take the bull by the horns and introduce the new National Transportation Act. That act was not what we in the Atlantic provinces wanted. For a number of reasons it did not deal with our problem. The minister has outlined those reasons. But Mr. Pickersgill did have the courage to face up to the national problem, to

work on it, and to bring about some action. This is what has to be done.

I see in this bill another avenue for the government to delay implementing those measures in the transportation field that have been promised for so long to the Atlantic provinces. In his speech the minister reviewed the history that is necessary to explain this legislation. His was a straightforward review.

I want to refer to one matter the minister did not go into which I think is pertinent. He did not mention the reason that we got into the problem respecting the freeze on freight rates. When the National Transportation Act was being considered many of us thought that was the proper time to provide for the extension of the freeze on maritime freight rates. This whole subject is a complicated matter. It includes the old roll-back, something I shall not even try to explain, and I hasten to add that I doubt that I could. But in any event a permanent extension was not included in that act.

At that time members of the Transport Committee were faced with the choice of writing the freight rate freeze into permanent form or covering it with a clause extending it for two years. The committee was divided. Some of us felt we should include it permanently so that it never could be taken away from us no matter what happened. Others felt that the freeze should be extended for two years, and that when the two year period had expired the pressure would be so great on the government it would have to bring in long-term legislation covering transport in the Atlantic provinces.

The two years were up in March. Nothing was done. I know it is not easy to come forward with comprehensive legislation of this nature on which there is very little agreement, even in the Atlantic provinces. But I repeat that nothing was done. We were stalled. Then Bill C-182 was introduced. I am not criticizing the new minister in this regard. I am just making the case that this is the old stalling technique in the form of temporary legislation.

From a quick glance at the bill I detect that the freeze on the rates will expire within a year from last March. We do not know whether the freeze will then be necessary as a result of this legislation and changing circumstances. But I know that the pressure we put on the government of the day to act on a comprehensive review of the situation will have been lost, and it could be that the stalling and the failure to act will go on for many more years.

This concerns me greatly, and I hope the minister will explain the situation. I hope he will even tell me I am wrong. I have objections to other provisions in the bill, and here I refer to the argument about the power given to the Governor in Council. But my main objection is that once the freeze expires we will have lost the pressure that we had on the government. It was an insurmountable pressure. The government discovered it to be so in March and realized it had to take temporary action. But it could be that we will all have long grey beards before we get the permanent legislation that will mean so much to the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my reservations about the procedure that has been followed during the course of this debate. When this bill was first introduced a few days ago its introduction was coincidental with a meeting of the Transport Committee. Granted the house was on early sitting hours, but the fact remains that somebody must be at fault. If it is not the Minister of Transport then it is the government house leader or the government whip. Someone should have taken precautions to see that this legislation did not come before the house when the Transport Committee was meeting or the meeting of the committee should have been rescheduled, because we find ourselves in the ridiculous position of discussing this important bill at the same time that the Transport Committee is meeting in the West Block.

Since this is the first transport bill that the new minister is piloting through the house, perhaps he will heed the comments that were made by my hon. friend from Saint John-Lancaster and by the hon. member for Moose Jaw. The minister knows that veteran members of the Transport Committee travelled through the Atlantic provinces to study the problem of transportation in that region and spent many hours attending numerous meetings of the committee. Out of respect to their work he should see to it that whenever he has a bill concerning transport before the house he takes the precautionary step of ensuring that the Transport Committee is not sitting that day.

• (11:20 a.m.)

It is interesting, and I think the record should show, that the house has before it at the present time in the form of government

order No. 68 the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. We spent a day debating that report and it is really very straightforward and simple. It is a unanimous report, and although I do not have it before me and cannot quote precisely it did recommend that the freeze be extended for another year. That recommendation was made to meet the deadline in March when the freeze was supposed to come off. It also recommended that the decision of the Canadian Transport Commission allowing the C.N.R. to abandon passenger service in Newfoundland be left in abeyance until the committee had a chance to make its final recommendations. The final recommendations concerning our Atlantic provinces transportation study are now before the house in the form of the twelfth report.

It should be noted here that a motion has yet to be moved for concurrence in the twelfth report. The motion for concurrence in the fifth report is now before the house in the form of government order No. 68. The point has been well made that this legislation should have at least been held until the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and the recommendations of the committee concerning its reference from parliament to study the transport problems of the Atlantic provinces had been made. This is what this bill deals with in part.

Having said that I should now like to refer to the minister's remarks. He has assured the house that this is an interim measure. I am very sceptical about interim measures, as I thought the minister was, because we have heard him both inside and outside the house criticize interim measures. He has applied to them the term "band-aid legislation". Here we have another example of band-aid legislation, but this is bad band-aid legislation because this measure, even if it is an interim one, is not good legislation. It does not do what either the Transport Committee or the government wanted to do, and it does not do what the truckers and the various people who presented briefs to the committee wanted the government to do.

It seems that for some reason the government and the new minister who must take responsibility for this legislation recently decided to bring in this measure in its present form. All the government had to do, which is really quite simple, was to extend the benefits of the Maritime Freight Rates Act to the trucking industry. That is very simple and straightforward, and that is all the truckers wanted. Perhaps the minister would be interested in what one member of the Maritime Motor Transport Association had to say in connection with this bill. He said that this legislation is not what the truckers wanted at all. He took the minister to task and said that if Transport Minister Don Jamieson brings in this legislation he will "have a battle on his hands". I should like to hear what the minister has to say about that.

Mr. Jamieson: I know the hon. member would not want to continue on a line that is inappropriate at the moment. I should like to read into the record a telegram I received. It states:

Maritime truckers support Bill C-207 in resolution passed last night.

Mr. Nowlan: That is not the whole telegram.

Mr. Jamieson: That is the whole telegram I have.

Mr. Nowlan: I will read you another one.

Mr. McGrath: I accept that, Mr. Chairman, but I was quoting from the Saint John *Evening Times-Globe* of Saturday, June 14. It carries a story about this legislation under the headline "Mixed Reaction Greets Freight Subsidy Announcement". I presume the Maritime Motor Transport Association has reversed the stand it initially took in respect of this legislation. However, that still does not satisfy me and I am sure it does not satisfy many hon. members because of the basic weakness of this legislation as a result of the limiting and conditional way in which it applies the benefits of the Maritime Freight Rates Act to the trucking industry. Perhaps we may have more to say about this when we proceed with the clause by clause study of the bill.

I do not like the way clause 3 is worded; I do not like the discretionary powers it gives the Governor in Council. When you are talking about the Governor in Council you are talking about the minister, and I do not think he should have the discretionary power to decide which truckers will get the subsidy and under what conditions the subsidy will be paid. I also have very strong misgivings and very serious reservations about clause 5. This brings a whole new principle into the application of maritime freight rates. They were ours by statutory right under the old Maritime Freight Rates Act. They will now be

ours by right but at the pleasure of the government. At least that is the way I read clause 5 which says:

—the Governor in Council may vary or remove the reduction in tariffs for the preferred movements of traffic—

He can do this at any time. These clauses of the bill, certainly clause 3 and the limited application of the subsidy to the trucking industry, do not represent in my view what the truckers wanted at all notwithstanding the telegram the minister has read into the record. Certainly it is not what the truckers wanted when they appeared before the Transport Committee, and that is indicated in their brief.

I can understand the minister laughing when he hears references to the Transport Committee because it has become a bit of a standing joke with the government. I can understand the humour with which he treats any reference to that committee, because this government treats all the committees of this house with complete disdain. They look on them as a complete joke. They look on committees of the house as merely the handmaidens of the government set up to carry out the will of the government. That is not what the committees were set up for in the first instance.

The fifth report of the Transport Committee is a very historic one because in my submission this will be the last time a committee of this house will ever bring in a report or a recommendation with which the government takes issue. From now on we can only expect committees to make reports to the house that the government agrees with and has had a hand in drafting. I understand that was said last night by the Minister of Justice.

The hon. member for York South said in a letter to his constituents that from now on no amendments would be accepted by a committee save those that the government had agreed to in the first instance. In other words, the committees of the house are just a joke, and unfortunately the laugh is on the opposition. We have given up our right in respect of supply. We have allowed the estimates to be removed from the house and they are now in the hands of committees with, in most cases, partisan chairmen who are there to carry out the wishes of the government.

Having made those few remarks about the now infamous fifth report of the Transport Committee, which is still on the Order Paper, and the twelfth report of the transport committee which contains a recommendation concerning the committee study of transport problems in the Atlantic provinces, concurrence in which has yet to be moved. I want to go on to another subject. I would like to make a few remarks which are of particular interest to the province that both the minister and I have the responsibility to represent in this house. When the truckers appeared before the Transport Committee in St. John's, and in Moncton, if my memory serves me correctly, in making a plea to have the benefits of the Maritime Freight Rates Act extended to the trucking industry they pointed out a number of very interesting things. For example, there was evidence to suggest that the railways were using the M.F.R.A. to subsidize their trucking fleets in the Atlantic provinces, thus constituting grossly unfair competition for the private enterprise truckers.

• (11:30 a.m.)

There was also a very strong recommendation concerning the passage of truck traffic across Cabot Strait on the Newfoundland ferry system. By virtue of the terms of union, rail freight moving across is treated the same as if the railway extended right across the gulf. But this privilege does not apply to the truckers. This places the truckers in a grossly unfair position and at an extreme disadvantage vis-à-vis the railways, because when going across the gulf they have to pay the regular commercial vehicle freight rate. As I say, the trucking industry is put at a tremendous disadvantage in terms of competing with the railways.

I would have liked these matters to be dealt with in the legislation. I hope the minister will refer to them when he replies to the questions we have asked. I will have more to say on the other clauses of the bill, Mr. Chairman, but before resuming my seat I wish to register my protest at the way the legislation has been drafted and the principle contained therein that the subsidy may be removed at any time at the discretion of the government. I also protest the discretionary powers the government, and the minister in particular, will have with respect to the application of the subsidy to the truckers.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks in connection with the bill. I thought it passing strange that the government should arrange to introduce the bill when the Transport Committee was sitting. This may be a mark of political

finesse on the part of the new Minister of Transport. If the Minister of Agriculture had done this to members of the agriculture committee we would have raised Cain with him. I think it was rather offensive to the Transport Committee to do this.

I was a member of the agriculture committee which recently toured eastern Canada, including the maritimes. On that tour we heard from individual farmers and farmers' groups complaints about the high freight rates in the maritimes. We were told of areas in which there is no competition in transportation and where the railway charges as much as the traffic will bear. Where there is competition, freight rates are quite a bit lower than they are in areas with no competition.

I wonder how this subsidy program will apply to the poor chap who lives in the country or in a small town and has to pay a higher freight rate than to the person who lives on a main, commercial route. The minister should look into the application of the subsidy in such cases. I do not think it is fair that just because one lives off a main route we should pay one and a half times what others pay for the same service.

I agree that the transportation situation in the maritimes is difficult because freight is sometimes moved by boat, sometimes is transshipped, etc. It is extremely difficult for a farmer to import fertilizer or sell his produce on the competitive market when he is faced with this type of situation. Having made that tour of the maritimes I understand why the people of the area will be unhappy if any of the guarantees they now have are taken away from them. Their experience since confederation has not always been the best. They are a captive market in respect of some commodities and receive no privileges to compensate for this.

I hope the minister intends to remove some of the existing inequities. I know the people of the region would be unhappy if any of the guarantees they now have were removed. They will be unhappy if any of the subsidies they now received are removed in the future. I believe that freight assistance and an adequate freight rates policy are the basis for good economic growth and development in the maritimes. If such a policy is evolved and consistently applied, I am sure the maritimes will benefit. I can understand the position of these people because of their past experience. I, too, Mr. Chairman, will be making a few comments when we deal with the other clauses of the bill.

[Mr. Thomson.]

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, I am at the disposal of the committee in this regard, but since the general discussion was on clause 2 I wonder whether at this point hon. members would like me to reply to some of the matters they have raised. It is entirely up to the committee.

Mr. McGrath: That would be very useful, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jamieson: I have listened with a good deal of interest and understanding—

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the minister but I should like to ask a question. If the minister replies to questions now, will it prevent his replying to questions asked as we deal with other clauses? I hope that is not the case.

Mr. Jamieson: I would assume not, Mr. Chairman, in view of our earlier decision that the general discussion would be on clause 2 rather than clause 1. But perhaps the Chair would be willing to rule on that matter. I think this is agreeable. I have no wish to cut members off from further discussion.

Mr. Nowlan: We do not want the minister to exercise the right of reply on clause 2 only, because we shall be asking specific questions when dealing with other clauses. I hope he gets the exercise of standing and replying to those questions.

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair can rule in advance that the discussion will have to be relevant to each clause.

Mr. Jamieson: I have listened with a good deal of interest and, I think hon. members would be willing to concede, understanding to the matters raised by hon. members. I say at the outset that I agree completely with the concept outlined by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley that aid to transportation and a rational transportation program are vital to the further development of the Atlantic provinces. It seems to me it is as important that we have this particular aspect of regional development involved in our thinking as it is that we deal with other matters which are important to national unity, such as the official languages bill which we will be dealing with later today. This measure has the same kind of significance to national unity and national development as other measures

which are more in the cultural field and in the general areas outlined in the official languages bill. Therefore I assure the committee that it is my intention to do everything possible to bring about an effective transportation policy for the Atlantic area, not merely because I happen to be a resident of that region and a representative of one of the four provinces in the region but because as a Canadian I recognize, as do hon. members opposite, the importance of this kind of legislation.

I think it is important, too, that we trace a little of the history of the bill before us this morning. It would have been far simpler in many respects for the government to do what hon. members in all parts of the house originally suggested, that is, merely maintain the freeze on freight rates for an additional 12 months. That was the position when I assumed the portfolio I now hold, and it was as a result of representations from members opposite and from others that it was decided—and I made the decision—that rather than take that simple course, which would have maintained and quite literally frozen the status quo for another 12 months, we would attempt, within the time frame that we had, to introduce some of the improvements which members of the Transport Committee and others had indicated at the hearings were advisable.

• (11:40 a.m.)

On the point about this legislation preceding the presentation of the 12th report of the Transport Committee, let me say that there was nothing occult in my powers to determine what the committee was going to produce. It was simply a matter of knowledge obtained from various members of the committee and indications from various people that these were the lines along which the committee was thinking, and rather than delay and perhaps face the prospect of not getting this legislation through at the present session I proceeded in the manner that I have.

When I decided some time ago that it was necessary to change the original bill and to proceed somewhat beyond the original proposal merely to freeze the rates for a further period of 12 months, one of the first things I did was to undertake discussions with the representatives of the four Atlantic provinces. I spoke with Premier Smith in Nova Scotia, with Premier Campbell in Prince Edward Island, with the hon. Mr. Higgins, the Minister of Economic Development in New Brunswick, and with Premier Smallwood in Newfoundland. I undertook to do this because of a commitment I had made at the outset that we would consult with them, and I did not want to go to them with a proposal which was cut and dried so that the whole consultative process would be merely a meaningless gesture.

As a result of the discussions that I had with the gentlemen to whom I referred I came back and made significant changes in what I had originally thought might have been an acceptable proposal. I want to say today—and I believe that all of the gentlemen concerned and their advisers will be prepared to confirm this—that this bill represents in very significant measure the result of the consultations which I had with the representatives of the four Atlantic provinces and, incidentally, to a lesser degree with spokesmen for the trucking industry.

The hon. member for St. John's East said, in that manner of his which seems to indicate so far that solutions are simple and can be drawn like rabbits out of a hat, that all we had to do—and this was the reason for the humour in my response rather than any lack of concern or interest at this moment in the work of the Transport Committee—was to extend the benefits of M.F.R.A. to the trucking industry. I suggest to the hon. member, and indeed I am sure he knows, that that simple solution is precisely the kind of answer that the Atlantic provinces spokesmen themselves do not want and, indeed, it is also to some extent at least a solution that the truckers do not want. Simply to extend the Maritime Freight Rates Act benefits to the trucking industry would not provide a viable and meaningful alternative to the arrangement that we have at the present time. The premiers of the four Atlantic provinces made a number of recommendations, all of which are being considered and will be considered at the same time as we consider the further recommendations which are contained in my own statement of a few days ago and those that were made by the Transport Committee.

When I made reference to this bill as being an interim measure, I want to assure the house that I meant that it is only interim in the sense that it represents a portion of a much broader concept that we hope to develop with the help of the very excellent report of the Transport Committee in the coming months and on which I will be working during the summer recess. There is no suggestion, and I want to make this perfectly clear to the house, that there will be any significant

change in any of the measures which either now prevail or which, I hope, will prevail following the passage of this legislation until and unless this more comprehensive program is brought forward and until there has been full-scale consultation with the premiers and the representatives of the Atlantic provinces.

I have made fairly general references throughout to the Atlantic provinces, but may I say to hon. members who represent constituencies in the province of Quebec, particularly that portion of the province of Quebec which comes within the select territory, that it is our intention as well—and we have already held preliminary discussions with the government of the province of Quebec on this matter—to invite the province to participate in this federal-provincial committee. It may be that they will wish to have a member on the committee, to which of course we will be more than pleased to agree. On the other hand, because their circumstances are somewhat different they may wish to have a different kind of representation. But in any event I believe that this measure will also be of significance to that portion of the province of Quebec which comes within the select territory because truckers within that region shipping outbound to other parts of Canada will now have benefits which of course they did not enjoy before.

In any event, let me reiterate the point that it is my intention and the intention of the government to ensure the maintenance of all of the significant portions of the Maritime Freight Rates Act not affected by this legislation until such time as this more comprehensive program comes forward. Does the hon. member wish to ask a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, perhaps the minister's explanation might help in the later stages of the debate. My question has direct reference to the minister's explanation of the interim aspect of the measure and the fact that no other fundamental changes will be made, as I understood him, until the whole comprehensive program is laid before the house. I appreciate the difficulties of preparing the plan and I also appreciate the fact that there have been consultations with the premiers. When we come to clause 3 I will want to read the telegram I received from the truckers which is an extension of the telegram the minister read. The purpose of my question to the minister is to clarify a point in my mind. In view of the fact that clause 10 specifies when clauses 5 and 6 will come into force, is my understanding not correct that clause 5 will have in effect no application for nine months?

Mr. Jamieson: Perhaps I might deal with the whole general area since there have been a number of comments regarding it. I refer to clause 5 and to the related question of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley. If hon. members will read the statement I made in the house last Tuesday, there are two references in it which are particularly pertinent to what I want to say. On page 10227 of *Hansard*, about the middle of the column, I made the following comment:

> In order to provide the necessary funds for those subsidies which will place truckers on a basis of equality with railways on outbound traffic, it is proposed to authorize the Governor in Council to terminate the so-called freeze at an earlier date than originally contemplated in Bill C-182, thereby removing another discrimination between railways and truckers.

In other words, what I said was that we will not maintain the freeze for the full 12 months. The reason I am reluctant at this point to state a specific date upon which the freeze may be removed is that it is my intention and the intention of the government to extend the subsidy to outbound trucking in advance of the lifting of the freeze, and it seems to me that there is a very good rationale for doing this. If, for example, we can arrange to get the necessary registration of truckers and common carriers by that date, I hope that we can provide the subsidy arrangement for outbound truck freight by July 15. If that is done, we will then see how long it takes for truck tariffs to be established before we move to take off the freeze on rail lines, and we believe that this process will have a salutary effect in terms of what the railway rates are likely to be. I hope this is a satisfactory explanation to the hon. member of why there is no specific date for the lifting of the freeze.

On the question of clause 5 and the powers granted to the Governor in Council may I say that, in my own view, this would not be perhaps the best way in which to approach this problem if we were dealing with the matter on the comprehensive basis to which we have all referred earlier. But if we were to say that it had to come into effect on a fixed date, that is, that any proposals with regard to the changing of the intra-traffic were to come into force on a fixed date, this would mean that we could take no action until the federal-provincial committee had completed a very comprehensive study, and this would mean in turn that the truckers

involved in intra-shipments, for example, would not be able to benefit from this arrangement for a considerable length of time.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Let me explain the rationale behind this suggestion. It is that the federal-provincial committee would be set up immediately. It would have the capacity to make recommendations on an ongoing basis. It might be that within two weeks of its first meeting it would make a recommendation that the intra-subsidy be changed or applied on some classification of goods. Then we could proceed under clause 5 to make good that recommendation immediately. What I visualize is that this committee will not be one of a type about which hon. members have had good reason to complain in the past—one which meets and continues to meet for a year or a year and a half with the result that in the intervening period nothing can be done. This committee will be able to make individual recommendations and these would be dealt with rapidly on an ad hoc basis. To make sure we can do this it is necessary to include clause 5 in the legislation.

I should like to refer hon. members to page 10228 of *Hansard* of Tuesday in which I said—and this is a key point; I hope hon. members will accept my solemn declaration on it:

> The government intends to set up such a joint committee without delay and undertakes not to exercise the power to be given to the Governor in Council to remove or reduce M.F.R.A. subsidies except to the extent that financially equivalent assistance is proposed by the joint committee and accepted by the government. This would be the first task of the joint committee.

Implicit in that statement is our undertaking that the amount of the present over-all subsidy will not be reduced. What we are saying here—and this is the reason for clause 6—is that the committee will meet and make recommendations to us periodically along the lines that the subsidy on X route, for example, which costs a certain number of dollars, might be used more effectively in another way.

The undertaking I give to the house now, as I did on Tuesday, is that there will be no implementation of this power without a recommendation having been made by the committee, and that any such changes will not result in a lowering of the totality of the amount paid by way of interim subsidy. This course is being followed at the suggestion of and, I believe, with the support of the four Atlantic premiers.

Many hon. members have discovered that the interim subsidy administered on a blanket basis is not the most effective means of providing assistance to transport in the maritimes. It is obvious there is greater need for some commodities than for others. It is conceivable that the amounts now being spent on this blanket subsidy might well be applied in ways other than the direct subsidization of transportation. It might be spent on assistance to shippers, for example. This is something we should bear in mind. Eventually, and ideally, we should bear in mind that the subsidy should go to the shipper rather than to the transportation technique or mode, but this is a complicated matter to deal with; it is not something we can deal with at this moment.

I hope we have put into this legislation adequate safeguards to deal with the fears which hon. members have properly expressed. I shall be particularly concerned to see there is no diminution in the total intra-subsidy. I thought the hon. member for St. John's East might have given me credit for the portion of my speech wherein I stated arrangements would be made for a comparable water carrier subsidy on goods moved by boat to St. John's and Cornerbrook. This is an important element within the whole package. I regard it as a vital one. Though we talk about this as an interim measure there is a good deal included which is of a permanent and highly significant nature in connection with Atlantic transportation.

On the matter of the outbound or westbound subsidy, provision is made for the committee to examine whether or not there ought to be a measure of selectivity attached to that subsidy of 30 per cent. The idea was expressed to me in the Atlantic provinces to the effect that here again there might be a significant waste factor. By saying simply that anything that goes out of Atlantic Canada to the west should get this subsidy we may be losing opportunities for improvement.

We have no intention at this moment of altering this basis of universality but I emphasize that the committee has the right to make recommendations on the matter of whether or not there should be more selectivity or whether the rates should be changed with regard to certain commodities.

An interesting point having to do with the constructive comments of the hon. member for Malpeque is the fact that I heard a great deal in the Atlantic provinces, including his

own province, about the possibility of providing assistance in connection with the transportation to the Atlantic provinces of various raw materials which might be the elements necessary to some kind of economic project. At present there is no such help given. If an industry requires to bring in raw materials it must do so on the same basis as does any other shipper. This is something I hope the committee will look at.

I should also like to say a few words having to do, again, with the 12th report of the standing committee. The joint federal-provincial committee is also being asked to look at the position of all modes of transportation. It seems to me there are legitimate complaints with regard to the treatment of certain kinds of shipments carried by what is called "the balloon trade". This covers commodities which have a good deal of bulk but little weight; at present they are being carried by air and by sea. There is authorization for this committee to consider all modes and determine what recommendations should be made with regard to assistance to air freight, sea freight or any other mode which might develop.

I believe I have answered in a general way the representations which have been made to me. The bill is designed to meet an immediate and urgent problem. I recognize that at the moment the truckers are under two impediments. They are under the impediment of the rates on incoming traffic and under the impediment of having to fight the railways on the M.F.R.A. basis. So the rationale of the whole program is to give the Atlantic trucking industry at least a reasonable break in terms of getting its products to market. We want to improve that situation. We have said to the Atlantic provinces: We accept your proposal that you should have a say in the question of other subsidies to be provided. I am giving the house a commitment that there will be no change in the rates under the M.F.R.A. unless the committee so recommends and unless the amount to be spent in some other manner is at least the same as the amount originally provided.

I should add that it is not enough to provide even a measure of equality for all modes of transport unless there is a good roads network. This is fundamental to the government's concept of regional development and expansion and we intend to continue to provide assistance in road building. This is not a matter which comes directly within my responsibility but I am in constant consultation with my colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Some work is being done this year. A very remarkable amount of work, when one totals it up, has been done over the last six, seven or eight years, including completion of the trans-Canada highway. We have spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on roads in the Atlantic area. No one knows better than I that this is still far from enough, and part of this total transportation package will have to be continued encouragement by the federal government of road construction in the Atlantic region.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

• (12 noon)

I would be the first to admit that this measure is by no means the law of the Medes and the Persians, that it is not a perfect piece of legislation. But I do say to hon. members that I have at least sought in prior discussions to take into account the representations that have been made to me by hon. members opposite, by the premiers of the provinces and by the industries concerned. In order to get this measure through and to show at least some progress in this vital field we have moved in the direction we have and brought forward this legislation today. I hope the measure commends itself to the committee, because I am sure that within the next three or four months we will come to see in a very real way the benefits of it.

Mr. Nowlan: Would the minister permit a question? I thank him for his explanation and answers to some of the queries raised on this side of the house. Frankly, if the bill were as plausible as the minister's explanation there would be no doubt in my mind about the intent and/or objective of the legislation.

Just for clarification I should like to pose a question that is in three parts. First of all, we are talking here only of interim subsidy payments and the shifting of those payments from the railways to the truckers on a selective basis. We are not talking about more money being paid under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, if my understanding is correct.

What I cannot understand at the moment, despite the minister's most plausible and constructive explanation, is the suggestion that the saving under the interim payment will be transferred in the form of a financially equivalent payment to an operator of some other mode of transportation or shipper or, to use the words in the bill, to a carrier, shipper or consignee. The difficulty I have with the minister's explanation, though this may be a

drafting problem, is that there are two undertakings. First of all, he hopes that by proclamation before July 15 the rate freeze will be cancelled, which in effect—

Mr. Jamieson: No, that is not right. However, I should let the hon. member finish his question.

Mr. Nowlan: In effect, the minister is going to end the rate freeze by July 15. As I understand it, this would bring to life the provisions in clauses 5 and 6. Is that correct?

Mr. Jamieson: That is partially correct, but the freeze will not end on July 15. I said that the date for ending the freeze will depend upon the time at which we can put the subsidy program for the truckers into effect. There is no direct relationship between the two. In other words, we can maintain the freeze for a period beyond the starting date at which the truckers are paid for westbound shipments.

Mr. Nowlan: Then I still have difficulty reconciling those clauses with clause 10, which provides that clauses 5 and 6 will not come into effect until, in effect, the freeze expires. What is the purpose of that provision?

Mr. Jamieson: I am not a legal mind in this matter but I think it is a question of the proclamation. We can announce the proclamation of the date on which the freeze is going to end, but we can advance it considerably beyond that point. In other words, the two will come into effect at the same time. Having come into effect in terms of the announcement of the total program, we can say that the freeze will end on date x but that the subsidies will start on date y.

Mr. Nowlan: That is the difficulty. I do not see how that can be done under this bill, no matter when the announcement. Naturally I accept the undertakings given by the minister, but there has already been one ministerial change in the short life of the present régime. There are also certain activities in Newfoundland that might attract the minister to return to the province and his undertakings, though given sincerely, are not cemented in legislation.

I still have difficulty reconciling the point I raised in connection with the operation of clauses 5 and 6 in view of the provisions of clause 10. However, I will leave this point for the moment because the minister may be able further to amplify the matter when he consults his officials.

The other point bothering me is that the minister has given this undertaking in connection with a financially equivalent transfer of the saving made under the interim payment. However, as I read this bill nowhere do I find,—though I presume if it is to be found it will be found in clause 6, wording quite as unequivocal as that used by the minister a few minutes ago. The clause says that under the regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council may authorize payment of assistance out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Jamieson: Which clause is this?

Mr. Nowlan: Clause 6(1). I presume that this is the clause that would deal with the transfer of the financially equivalent payment. The clause does not provide that there "shall" be such payment. Nowhere in the bill is it provided that the payment made to the shippers or carriers "shall" be equal to the amount saved. In effect, what we are doing is taking from Peter to give to Paul. However, nowhere in the bill is it provided that you give to Paul the exact amount that you took from Peter. The bill does not provide that the financially equivalent payment shall be made.

In addition, nowhere in the bill is there any mention of the federal-provincial committee; again in this regard we have the undertaking of the minister. If he is still with us working hard in the fall, perhaps this committee will come to fruition. However, if there is another portfolio change it may be delayed.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, may I try to deal with the second point first. A federal-provincial committee is being established in this matter because eventually it may well be that we wish to change the make-up and content of the committee once we discover how effectively it works on the basis of its present assignment. Therefore it was felt that rather than establish it in a statutory way it would be best to proceed as we have at the moment.

With regard to the hon. member's first question about the amount of the payment, may I refer him to clause 5(2) where he will note that there is a requirement on the transport commission. The clause provides:

> Where a reduced tariff has been varied or removed pursuant to subsection (1), the Commission shall for each calendar year or portion of a calendar year thereafter estimate the amount of compensation that would have been paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to railway companies in respect of the preferred movements of

traffic . . . and the commission shall certify to the minister the estimated saving to the Consolidated Revenue Fund—

In other words, under this provision we will know what the saving is going to be. Since the hon. member is a lawyer I am sure he will agree that we could not write into legislation that every single dollar will be applied in that precise sense. All I can say is that I think the clauses, when read in sequence, indicate the intent of the bill, and I have tried to reinforce that with my commitment today.

Mr. Nowlan: We are having a general discussion of the bill, though these are matters that I was going to raise when we reach clause 5. The difficulty about this formula is twofold. First of all, there is still no direction. The minister has said it is difficult to do this legislatively, but bills are either mandatory or permissive. They can provide either that things "may" be done or that they "shall" be done.

• (12:10 p.m.)

More important than that is the question of how you are to bring about savings under clause 5(2). How are we going to meet the situation? It is fair to ask this about an interim measure. The minister must know that ever since 1927, or ever since the end of the war, the Maritime Freight Rates Act has not met the problems of the Atlantic area. Surely after all the commissions, studies and premiers' task forces we could have come up with something better than this bill. It seems to me that here you have legislation saying that what you take from Peter you will pay to Paul. It is not good enough for the government to say that by shifting these interim subsidies around it will help the shipper, consignee or carrier. Under this bill we can see a situation in which subsidies are reduced.

Let us consider the provision saying that the commission shall certify to the minister the estimated saving to the fund. That is to be found in clause 5(2). Last year maritime freight rates subsidies amounted to $14 million. Let us say that this year, by shifting the payments around and by juggling a bit, the minister can bring about a saving of $4 million. Therefore we reduce the total amount paid by $4 million and pay out altogether $10 million. Let us say that something happens next year. The minister may go back to Newfoundland or be transferred to another, more challenging portfolio or, better still, the government may be defeated.

Mr. Jamieson: Then the hon. member will not have to worry.

Mr. Nowlan: But the people of the Atlantic region will still be worried. For any number of reasons we may get into a situation in which there cannot be implemented any comprehensive transportation policy for the maritimes. At any rate, let us say that in the second year of the shift, and remember we are dealing now with a base figure of $10 million and not $14 million, there is another saving or another shifting of $2 million. That will reduce the payment in the second year to $8 million, the $2 million involved here being paid to shippers, carriers or consignees in accordance with the select territory principle. In the third year the minister might very well say, "Let's cut everything down." We could very well face a situation in which payments are reduced not to $8 million or $10 million, but to $2 million. This bill has implicit in it that danger.

I say that if we are to improve on the Maritime Freight Rates Act let us bring in some real improvements. We have had the Maritime Freight Rates Act for 60 years and, as legislators, I do not think we should agree to any open-ended type of arrangement under which the amount of assistance could be reduced, say, to $2 million. I do not say the minister would do this intentionally, but that could be the result of a juggling of the administration.

Mr. Jamieson: With respect, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is making a good argument but in my opinion it does not have any substance. In the first instance, the outbound or westbound rate is still rigidly and emphatically included in the bill.

Mr. Nowlan: That is right.

Mr. Jamieson: On top of that we are going to provide 30 per cent for truckers going out. So there is no likelihood that the sum paid out will go down. That sum has to go up.

What I said so far as the interim subsidy is concerned—and I explained why we cannot spell this out in legislation; it must be self-evident—was that the step we are taking here represents to me one in a logical sequence. We say the amount must be determined and specified. Where there is any change in the interim, it must be determined and specified and it becomes a matter of public record that that amount has been specified. Then, too, we have a committee and we shall say to that committee, "You can take these moneys and

move them from project A to project B". Therefore the committee is the second safeguard. On it will be representatives of at least the four Atlantic provinces and, possibly, from the province of Quebec.

When my hon. friend says that we might be devious and try to get away with reducing the amount to $2 million, he is not making a realistic representation. Furthermore, we have provided in clauses 5 and 6 for the balancing of those elements which are necessary for these changes. We have also made sure that they can be applied to other modes, or in other ways. So I suggest with great respect that I cannot see any substance to the purely theoretical argument that my hon. friend is advancing. I am not going to say, and this bill does not say, that the same amount may be included each year. In other words, it is quite conceivable that the committee may recommend a shift in this system. I think it is useful to have that kind of flexibility. If an additional amount is required in the first year in order to achieve a permanent gain, there might be less money a year or two after that. But that is for the committee to decide.

I say that this is the best effort we have been able to come up with to meet the request of the provinces. All parties in this house have been accused of being arbitrary and of saying to the Atlantic provinces, "Take it or leave it." We are trying this means. Because we are breaking new ground, there are no precedents to follow. I am simply saying that this is our best effort and we will try to make it work. If it does not work I am certain I shall be hearing again from my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty in understanding and accepting the minister's constructive answers. Unfortunately there is a gap between his statements and the provisions of the bill. He said that the committee is to have certain powers and that it will initiate certain recommendations to the transport commission. The committee will say where the shift ought to be. I say to the minister that the provisions of the bill do not spell that out, and that is part of our dilemma.

May I revert to my theoretical discussion. I think the amounts paid are $8 million for outbound—

Mr. Jamieson: It is $8 million for inbound and $6 million for outbound.

Mr. Nowlan: It does not take too much imagination, Mr. Chairman, to dream up a situation in which the $8 million could be reduced to $4 million or even $2 million. Were the premiers involved in agreement with the principle that we begin with the figure of $14 million? I think the minister mentioned a 30 per cent subsidy for the outbound trucker who until now has not been covered. As I read the bill, it says nothing about shifting part of the $8 million—

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, this of necessity must be an open-ended arrangement. My hon. friend wants it to be open-ended on the one side and closed on the other. You cannot have it both ways. This is the option I present to him. If we are going to say that there has to be a fixed determination of the $8 million and that it cannot be altered or changed in any way, in other words, that that figure is sacrosanct, then we must say that the amount of outbound must have a ceiling on it as well. I do not think that would be in the best interest of the Atlantic provinces. We surely have to say that whatever amount of business goes out of eastern Canada by rail or truck, that business is to have a subsidy. The amount could be $14 million. Theoretically, I suppose it could be, and I hope it does get up to, $20 million. It would mean there would be more manufacturing and industry in the Atlantic provinces and the people there would be doing better. If we really want to circumscribe this, it is possible to do so. It is possible to say the amount shall be $8 million and that it will not be changed or varied one bit. That is not the practical way of going about it.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: I ask the minister to look at clause 6(2) which is germane to this discussion. It states:

The total amount of assistance—

That is the assistance on outbound traffic.

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Chairman. Where does the hon. member see outbound in clause 6(2)? Clause 2 has to do with reductions in tariffs. That is where we have taken it off of rail on the intra. It has to be applied in the same amount. It cannot exceed it.

Mr. Nowlan: I was going to say that the saving under clause 5(2), the payments that you are playing with, cannot exceed what the minister says. When the minister talks about $20 million, I want to know where he gets the open end.

Mr. Jamieson: When the hon. member began his speech he said there was a great deal of confusion in the Atlantic provinces regarding the outbound and intra. These are the semantics we are trapped in at the moment. All I can say to the hon. member is that I was in on the drafting of this bill. While I am not a legal person, I do understand its implications. I am now putting on the record what I understand it to mean.

As far as the outbound is concerned, there is no limitation on the amount that will be paid either to truckers or the railways. This 30 per cent is designated the same as for shipments out of the Atlantic provinces under the Maritime Freight Rates Act. There is no limit as far as that is concerned.

Insofar as the hon. member's question is concerned, a fixed amount is paid in any one year on intra. I am sure my hon. friend understands that. What I am saying is that the amount to be used for purposes other than an intra subsidy would not be less than the amount, insofar as the railways are concerned, if it applied only to the railways. It is the same sum of dollars, merely moving them from one to another. This does not apply insofar as the westbound 30 per cent subsidy is concerned. I hope that makes it reasonably clear.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Clause 5(1) seems to be causing all the trouble. This refers to what the minister is calling intra-traffic, traffic within the select territory. Intra-traffic refers to traffic such as that between Fredericton and Halifax. That is what I call intra-traffic within the territory. Outbound shipments would be from the select territory west.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member is quite right, Mr. Chairman. Traffic moving between points within the select territory is intra-traffic. Perhaps it might be more effective if we used the term westbound for any other kind of traffic, that is, traffic flowing out of the select territory.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Clause 5(1) states:

—the Governor in Council may vary or remove the reduction in tariffs for the preferred movements of traffic described in paragraph (a) or (c) of sub-section (1) of section 4 of that act—

That refers to intra only.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): It does not refer to shipments from the select territory west.

Mr. Jamieson: That is right.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not hearing the minister's earlier statement and the other statements. Consequently my questions may have already been answered. If that is the case, the minister can remind me. I wish to ask four questions.

First, I gather from one of the remarks of the minister that he hopes the provinces will agree to Bill C-207 which we are now discussing. I am aware of the fact the principle recommended by the premiers in their recent recommendations regarding transportation may be embodied in the bill. My question is whether the minister has given the premiers an opportunity to react to this legislation.

Second, the committee seems to be something like the premiers had in mind but it is not mentioned specifically in the legislation. How does the minister plan to set up this committee? Possibly the minister has already answered this question. Will the committee members be paid? What kind of representation does the minister hope the various provinces will have? Will the committee members be civil servants or other people who are already receiving pay? I feel these questions should be answered for the purpose of clarification.

My other two questions are very simple. I will not get involved in academic, theoretical situations and dialectics as some hon. members did. My question refers to trucking firms that are already doing business in the Atlantic provinces. An example would be freight being moved from Truro to another part of Nova Scotia or from Port aux Basques to St. John's. I previously wrote to the minister with a similar query. Will these firms be entitled to some assistance under the act as it is slated to come into existence, or through some future legislation the minister hopes to introduce?

My third question is with regard to the present subsidies being paid on eastbound freight. An example would be freight originating in Montreal and being shipped to Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland. Will there be a continuation of these subsidies? I do not know on what basis the subsidy used to be paid to Clarke Steamships. A specific example is that last year this company received a subsidy of $75,000 for moving freight from Montreal to Botwood. The reason I ask this question is that approximately two years ago the Department of Public Works built a beautiful structure, which was stated to have cost $2 million. The $75,000 subsidy was removed. It meant that approximately

100 people were affected directly by pay reductions in the area. It affected people right on the waterfront. All of this trade as well as the trucking operations in a large area slowed down immensely. The $2 million structure no longer is of any value. It has become a white elephant. Was this subsidy removed in order to be included in this kind of legislation? It does not seem to make sense. A facility costing $2 million was provided and then the subsidy of $75,000 to a shipping firm was eliminated. This caused a tremendous impact on the economy and the cost of living in that area. Why was this subsidy removed? Will it in fact be replaced under this legislation or is there any provision for replacing it?

Mr. Jamieson: I will try to deal with the hon. member's questions one at a time. I have already covered the matter of consultation with the premiers and representatives of the four Atlantic provinces. To the best of my knowledge, the reaction has been favourable to this proposal. It has been a matter of record for several days and I have not heard anything adverse with regard to it. In any event, it was the subject of earlier discussions with them so that they were reasonably well aware of what we were proposing.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I envisage that the committee will have representatives from at least the four Atlantic provinces. I mentioned earlier to Quebec members that we will make proposals to that province with regard to whether or not they wish to have a member on the committee or to make representations in some other way. But in any event it will be the provinces that will name their representatives to the committee. It will be chaired either by someone from the Department of Transport or perhaps even from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. In any event there will be federal representation on it to the extent that this appears to be required.

I gather that the hon. member was talking about trucking firms operating within a single province or the select territory. At present they, of course, are not receiving a subsidy. What will happen is that this committee will be empowered and is being asked to study what trucking agencies, what modes of transport, and what kinds of commodities ought to be considered for subsidy.

The hon. member, being from my own province, will know that a very significant amount of pulpwood and the like is today carried by truck. Is it a practical thing for the large paper companies to receive a subsidy? Many of us are inclined to think that perhaps it is not. This is the kind of thing that the committee will consider. This is why we are providing this rather than a blanket subsidy which would simply become a cream-skimming operation for certain operators. This will be on a selective basis, and I am sure the committee will hear representations from truckers on whether they should be included.

I am aware of the hon. member's problem and deep concern with regard to the port of Botwood and the matter of subsidizing freight into the province of Newfoundland. In the statement I made on Tuesday I indicated that we were in fact arranging for subsidies of very considerable magnitude for shipments from Montreal to Corner Brook and St. John's, and that these are two ports to which a very considerable amount of support is being provided.

This whole issue would take considerably more time than I have at my disposal today to go into in detail. The whole issue of whether or not we maintain individual ports because of the employment problems that exist there, or whether the rationalization of a freight and transportation policy requires that we do the logical thing, is one about which I suspect there will continue to be a great deal of argument. In the case of Botwood I am told, and I have every reason to believe this, that the shipper was not particularly interested in continuing into Botwood whether there was a subsidy or not. In other words, there was no considerable enthusiasm on his part. He was losing money on the operation and the subsidy per ton was very high.

In any event, it is our judgment that with the provision of very significant improvements in docking facilities at Corner Brook, and with very large harbour development at St. John's, which the hon. member for St. John's East had a considerable amount to do with, these two ports still appear to be the most logical points through which to funnel this kind of ocean freight into Newfoundland, particularly if one is concerned primarily about the cost of living. There is a dichotomy here, and I appreciate that this is a very difficult problem to resolve, because whenever something is moved from one port to another there is a vacuum at the first port, which in the first place may have had a smaller volume of traffic.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, these water subsidies have been considerably increased

this year. But it is unfortunate that this combination of the disposition of the carrier, who had very little interest in continuing the operation into Botwood, and the general centralization of distribution centres in Corner Brook and St. John's, means that the Botwood operation could not be sustained. I hope the hon. member will believe I am sincere when I say this. I take it that this would have been the case even if we had agreed to pay a subsidy comparable with that paid last year.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, the minister seems to be telling me that this is a dead case, that all is over and done with in the Botwood situation. I could debate this for quite some time and also deal with the attitude of the company, but would the minister give an undertaking at least to review the circumstances surrounding the case? We are talking about the whole of central eastern Newfoundland. We are not talking about one small port, or an area served by an adjacent port. This is the port of central eastern Newfoundland, and if the operation is closed down it will have an adverse affect upon the cost of living in the area. Will the minister give that undertaking?

Mr. Jamieson: I will be very glad to do that. I want to emphasize again that this policy is to be subject to review. I did not say the case was dead, although that is a reasonable interpretation. I question very much if a shipping company would be interested on a continuing basis in that kind of service particularly when I suspect that the amount of freight offering for that region is probably going to be reduced, and the present subsidy would have to be increased to a very much higher level. I doubt that the hon. member, as effective as he is representing his constituents, could then justify the cost of that subsidy.

I also have to point out, and I do not make this as a debating point, that what you lose on the roundabouts you make up on the swings. Freight that does not go into one port must go into another port. However, I will be glad to review the matter and go to Botwood with the hon. member and talk to the people there if he so desires.

Mr. Lundrigan: I thank the minister for undertaking to review or reconsider the situation. If he were in that area during the off-season I could show him some things which he does not know.

Much of the legislation passed by this house never seems to affect the people of Canada for whom it was designed, at least not as much as it should, simply because they are not aware of it. This is a communications problem. Some weeks ago we passed legislation amending the Fisheries Act. Since then I have received 15 or 20 letters raising queries about the provisions of the legislation. The people did not know what was in the legislation. We will have precisely the same problem with this legislation. Does the minister have plans to provide circulars, pamphlets or other material to indicate to the people who will be affected by this legislation, the truckers, the people within the region and so on, the benefits they will receive under the legislation?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have to worry about the truckers not being aware of it. I think they are well advised about it. But at the same time I will be glad to consider what ways we can use to make sure there is a more general awareness of what we are trying to do.

Mr. Peddle: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the title of this bill is, "An act to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic Region," and that clause 2 carefully states that select territory means the province of Nova Scotia, the province of Prince Edward Island, the province of New Brunswick, and then very carefully excludes the Labrador part of the province of Newfoundland. I am sure the minister has no doubt in his mind that Labrador does in fact belong to Newfoundland, and of course most definitely belongs to the Atlantic provinces.

Having just come back from spending the best part of a week in Labrador I realize the extent of the feeling of neglect which the people there have. Whether it is justified or not I cannot say at this time, but when I see a piece of legislation which is designed to help transportation in the Atlantic provinces and note that Labrador is excluded from it, I must make the strongest objection to this omission.

• (12:40 p.m.)

I know this bill is mainly for the benefit of outgoing freight, and there is not very much that goes out from Goose Bay, Labrador. I point to the minister that a pound of carrots costs 18 cents to bring into Goose Bay by Air Canada. I had hoped there might be something in the bill to recognize the problem of Labrador not only being cut off completely but having to suffer very seriously in respect of the cost of bringing goods in. My question

to the minister is, did he overlook this and would he be receptive to an amendment? If he indicates he might accept an amendment I would ask that this clause be held over until such time as I have prepared one.

Mr. Jamieson: This was not an oversight. The hon. member quite properly said the emphasis in this bill is on westbound traffic and on trucking, so it would not be of any great significance. I noted the omission immediately and discovered that this was done at the time of the terms of the union. There were reasons for it at that time which may not necessarily apply today. I do not believe anything very significant would result in terms of this legislation by including Labrador. I do not believe we could accomplish this by including it in the bill.

This problem would have to be directly related to the M.F.R.A., and we may run into questions as to whether it in fact constitutes part of the union. What I want to say to my friend is that I will direct that the federal-provincial committee which deals with the intra-matters—subsidies and the like within the region—give some consideration to this matter and extend some other form of aid, if not this form, to Labrador.

I may say there is a measure of that kind now through which considerable subsidies are paid on coastal boat shipments and that kind of thing which is outside the M.F.R.A. altogether. The best way to approach this, and I am in full accord with the intent of my hon. friend's statement, is to have the committee consider the matter to see which method would be the best. In other words, I think it might be a bit of a hollow victory to include Labrador now and discover there is nothing in the bill of any consequence in so far as benefits to the Labrador people are concerned. I will make that one of the terms of reference to the committee if the hon. member so desires.

Mr. Peddle: Would the minister compromise by saying "the province of Newfoundland" instead of "the island of Newfoundland"?

Mr. Jamieson: Such a compromise would, of course, do precisely what my hon. friend desires but which I have said is not a very useful gesture at the present time because this is expressly confined to the island of Newfoundland which is so designated in the terms of union. It does not appear to me that he would be able, and I would have to get a legal opinion on this, to alter it in that way in view of the fact it is constitutionally embodied, if you like, in the terms of union. I do suggest to my hon. friend that the method I have advanced would be the more beneficial one for the people concerned, that is, we should get the committee to take a look at what can be done in respect of assistance in terms of freight, etc. for Labrador.

Mr. Peddle: Could I ask then that clause 2 stand temporarily while I give the matter further thought?

The Chairman: Is it agreed that clause 2 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause stands.

On clause 3—*Assistance authorized.*

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the minister that the purpose of clause 3 is to provide temporary assistance to certain truckers, but we on this side are disturbed about this clause and the bill because so many things are temporary and will have very little effect. I suppose the purpose is to increase competition between various carriers in the hope that with competition the rates will be brought down. I suggest that this is why the truckers association's initial reaction to this measure was disapproval. This will bring very limited relief to truckers in this area, and it will only apply to those truckers hauling from east to west. It will involve only two carriers in the maritimes.

Mr. Jamieson: No, 16.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Are there 16 carriers hauling from east to west?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, at least 16.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): I will accept the minister's figure, but the reaction of the truckers was that this would give only very limited relief to the industry.

Mr. Jamieson: I can only say as I have said before that this has been thoroughly considered and will presumably help the truck carriers in the region.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Chairman, is the minister aware that if he gives more assistance in respect of vegetables coming from the maritimes the growers in Quebec and Ontario will be unhappy?

Mr. Jamieson: I am not sure of the gist of my hon. friend's question. There is no assistance whatsoever in respect of goods moving from western Canada into the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Thomson: My question referred to the reverse situation. Is the minister aware that if freight assistance is given in respect of products moving westward into Quebec and Ontario there will be opposition from the Ontario and Quebec vegetable growers and pressure to keep these freight subsidies from going into effect for that reason?

Mr. Jamieson: I suppose that is so, Mr. Chairman, but there has been a 100-year effort the other way around. There has been all manner of assistance provided in central Canada in respect of goods moving into the Atlantic provinces. Furthermore, there is really no significant difference here other than we are providing the same kind of assistance that has prevailed. We are simply making it available to trucking as well as to rail transportation. I do not think it will be significant in that way.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 4—*Reduced rate for compensation.*

Mr. Nowlan: My question is related to clause 4(2) which is intended to give some assistance in respect of express traffic westbound out of the select territory. I am looking for what is perhaps only clarification of this clause. Was this measure requested by the premiers in their brief or during discussions with the minister and will this benefit the railways or will it be passed on to the shippers?

I am informed that the railway people feel at the present time that although they do not get the subsidy, the E.T.A. 100 rate schedule reflects the M.F.R.A. outbound rate. In view of this I am wondering whether this assistance will be of any benefit to the shippers. If my information is correct that the outbound express traffic under the E.T.A. 100 rate schedule reflects in fact the potential effect the M.F.R.A. is going to have in reducing the rates charged by the rail company to the shipper, will this benefit in fact be passed on to the shipper? Has there been any discussion with the minister and the rail people about whether this actually going to result in a reduction in outbound rates to the shipper?

Since this is going to help the outward passage of express traffic, what is going to be the position of the railways in regard to the intra-movement of express traffic? If we do find that there is a reduction in the cost of westbound express traffic in view of the relationship between the E.T.A. 100 rate schedule and the M.F.R.A., will the railways then turn around and increase the express rate for intra-movement? How is that situation going to be covered?

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friend knows that you cannot take care of a thing like that in legislation. You have to take the whole freight tariff, the truck tariff, all the shipping and everything else and incorporate it in the act. I suggest the only thing we can do is make as much provision in general terms as we can and then hope, as my hon. friend said in his opening comments, that we wind up with a competitive system which will be the most meaningful way of correcting the anomalies to which the hon. member referred. I do not think I can answer him any more specifically. If he wants to spend a few hours or even days with the authorities on the question of broad tariffs—I am sure he knows how complicated they are—I could arrange it for him.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 5—*Power to vary or remove rates.*

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Chairman, when I spoke on this bill last Tuesday I said that I welcomed the introduction of the legislation because it was at least an attempt to correct some of the problems with which we in the Atlantic region have been plagued for the last 100 years. I also pointed out that I would accept the bill in principle strictly on the basis that it was an interim measure. I re-emphasize that today. This bill will give slight relief to certain shippers in the area, but it will do very little to correct or eliminate some of the transportation problems that have been with us for so long.

The reason we on this side of the house are suspicious of the so-called interim nature of the bill is found in the clause we are now considering. Many speakers have expressed the view that clause 5 is a bad one, that it sets a dangerous precedent. The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants on Tuesday expressed it very well when he said he objected very strongly to the inclusion of clause 5 in a bill

of this type because we are in effect eliminating a statutory right and substituting therefor an administrative decision.

For 60 years, from the time of confederation to 1927, we in the Atlantic provinces fought to have our right to Canadian markets recognized. This right was recognized in 1927 under the Maritime Freight Rates Act. There is now not only a constitutional obligation in this respect, but commitments made over 100 years have resulted in statutory guarantees being provided. Now, with one fell swoop there is included in the bill a clause which will wipe out all those rights we fought so long to acquire.

In his statement earlier today the minister admitted this was not the best way to handle the problem. That was the understatement of the afternoon. It certainly is not the best way to handle it; in fact, I think it is one of the worst ways it could possibly be handled. The minister has the report of the four Atlantic premiers. He told us today he had listened to the premiers and this bill is basically what they want. I point out to him that the four Atlantic premiers specified a different method of handling subsidies from that outlined in the bill. I am told this is one of the reasons for the long delay in preparing the report; the premiers would not agree to the report unless this specification were included. On page 14 of their report the premiers state specifically:

> To permit this transition without creating undue disruption of business or unnecessary hardship, the implementation of the revised act should be done gradually.

I think this is the crux of the whole thing:

> The selection of shippers qualifying for intra-regional subsidy—

They use the word "intraregional"; this is why I wanted to get these terms straight with the minister.

> —under the new policy must be completed by the agency before modifications in the Maritime Freight Rates Act on intraregional traffic are implemented.

In other words, as I read it and understand from having talked to people in the maritimes, their position all along was that the first step was to set up a board, to give the board authority to consider the whole matter of reduction of tariffs, to access where these subsidies could best be used to encourage industry, and when that had been done they would make recommendations as to how the subsidy system could be operated. I suggest to the minister that this bill is putting the cart before the horse. Under the provisions of clause 5 the government is given the right to eliminate or alter subsidies at will; they can eliminate the whole structure of subsidies which has been built up since the Maritime Freight Rates Act was passed.

As far as I can see, there is no provision in the bill as to how the board shall be set up, what its composition and powers will be. There should be provision in the bill to cover these matters. Clause 5 provides that the subsidies may be removed. The minister has assured us that they will not be removed. He has assured us that a federal-provincial board will be set up, and only on their recommendation will the subsidies be altered. But as the hon. member for Annapolis Valley pointed out, the life of a Minister of Transport in this government is not very long. All we have are the minister's assurances. A succeeding Minister of Transport may say: I am sorry, but he has gone; he is no longer with us.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, what guarantee do we have that the subsidies will not be altered or removed? All we have is a statutory instrument which provides that the subsidies may be taken away from us. In my opinion clause 5 is the bad clause in this legislation and should not be there. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer in very few words. My hon. friend cannot have it both ways. We could maintain the freeze for the rest of this year, and the truckers would get nothing. One part of the argument is that we are not going far enough or acting quickly enough to get the truckers under the scheme. We could apply the freeze immediately, and nothing would be done for the remainder of the year because we had moved in that direction. On the other hand, my hon. friend could see the wisdom of what we are trying to do and accept my undertaking of Tuesday, which I repeat, that there will be no attempt to remove or reduce M.F.R.A. subsidies except to the extent that financially equivalent assistance is proposed by the joint committee and accepted by the government. That is the alternative we have taken in view of representations made by hon. members, who now do not like this particular arrangement. I simply leave it at that, in calling it one o'clock, and say that you pays your money and you takes your choice.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order, please. It is one o'clock. Is it the wish of the committee that we continue for a few minutes?

Question of Privilege

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Chairman, you allowed the minister to make a statement after I had called it one o'clock.

An hon. Member: He was answering your question.

The Chairman: Order, please. If it is the wish of the committee I will call it one o'clock.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock the business now before the house stands adjourned pursuant to special order made Friday, June 13, 1969. I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—COMPLAINT RESPECTING STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE IN PRESS ARTICLE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time on a question of privilege in respect of which I have given appropriate notice. In view of the fact that it concerns the Minister of Agriculture, and since he is not in the house and I am not certain of the extent to which notice was given to him, might I simply bring the matter before the house at this time, indicating that as soon as the minister enters the chamber I will bring the matter before hon. members as I properly should.

An hon. Member: He is here, now.

Mr. Baldwin: As I indicated before the minister arrived in the chamber, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege in respect of which I have sent the usual notice to Your Honour. It is a matter which affects the Minister of Agriculture. In particular, it deals with a news report which appeared under date of June 21 in the *Financial Post* under the headline: "Will Ottawa aid grain growers?"

[The Chairman.]

Underneath is a further headline: "Government certainly will—if Bud Olson has his way." Above another portion of the article is a separate headline: "Here is how Olson proposal for aid would be operated." Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into the contents of this lengthy article. I will only say it contains reference to a number of specific proposals for dealing with the cash position and problem of western farmers.

Your Honour may tend to dismiss this question of privilege as a mere grievance because the minister saw fit to go outside the house and make a statement. While we do not condone this, I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday last a debate was launched in this house on a motion brought down by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands dealing with this very subject. The minister participated in that debate. I am not permitted to go into details, but in the course of his statement he gave no particulars, no information to this house which could be regarded in any way as resembling the type of proposal he made known to this newspaper.

Either the minister, when he entered into the debate on Tuesday, knew that this article was to appear and was aware of the information he had given, or else he gave this information to a newspaper after the debate had concluded. In either case I submit it constitutes an abuse of the privileges of this house. This question touches the practice of the present government ever since the session started. We were told last year during our debates on procedure that there would be so many days set apart for the opposition—a lesser number than were previously available—but that these would afford the opposition opportunity to set down motions and bring forward questions for discussion in this house. The practice about which I am now complaining has gone on continuously since the session started. It is part of what I suggest is a calculated effort to downgrade the functions and the role of the House of Commons and of parliament.

The practice of making statements outside the house instead of in this chamber shows a calculated contempt for the functions which parliament should fulfil. It is a practice which is constantly growing and I suggest that within a limited time this house will not be performing its functions in the way in which the people of this country expect them to be performed.

We shall shortly be met with a request from the government to agree to changes in

our rules. Let me say to the Prime Minister and to the cabinet that the conduct of which the Minister of Agriculture, the Prime Minister and other ministers have been guilty during the course of this session makes a mockery of their expressed desire to reform parliament; it is sanctimonious hypocrisy.

Let them not talk about reforming parliament in the light of conduct of this sort. Instead of being prepared to face charges properly made by an hon. member, the minister preferred to go outside the house and put on record specific answers to those charges, something which should have been done here in this house, and in this house only. That is why I raise a question of privilege at this time.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I heard the date given by the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Baldwin: June 21.

Mr. Olson: Well, according to my calendar it is two days from now that this newspaper will be published.

Seriously, I have not read this article. I certainly did not write the article. Whether it contains a lot of speculation or not is a matter about which I cannot give an opinion at this point. I suspect that it does contain a lot of speculation, perhaps a repetition of suggestions which have been made to the government from time to time by many farm organizations in connection with the subject matter.

I did not say anything more to the press, to the reporter from the *Financial Post*, or indeed to any other member of the press than I have said in this house.

I want to close by reminding the hon. member for Peace River that there is no one in this house who has more respect for this institution than I have.

Mr. Speaker: I rise to suggest to hon. members that it is perhaps procedurally incorrect to continue with a debate when there is no motion before the house. The hon. member for Edmonton West seeks the floor, but I wonder whether in the circumstances it might not be better to go on with the business of parliament.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): As a point of information, the minister is referred to in the article in question in these words: "Olson told *Financial Post*", and then the article follows along.

Government Policy on Uranium Sales

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, it would not be the first time that this minister and other ministers have been misquoted.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the business of the house today I wonder whether hon. members would allow me to bring to their attention the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a delegation of Australian parliamentarians. These distinguished colleagues are visiting Ottawa as part of a journey arranged through the auspices of the Speaker of the Canadian section of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. On behalf of my colleagues in the house I extend to them a most hearty welcome, and express the hope that their visit with us in this parliament in Ottawa will be interesting, pleasant and fruitful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate has passed Bill S-39, an act respecting Boy Scouts of Canada and to incorporate L'Association des Scouts du Canada, to which the concurrence of this house is required.

ATOMIC ENERGY

URANIUM—STATEMENT BY MINISTER RESPECTING GOVERNMENT POLICY ON SALES

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the house of the government's policy with respect to future sales of uranium to other countries.

On June 3, 1965, Prime Minister Pearson outlined to this house a policy regarding uranium exports which provided for such exports under safeguards to ensure that the uranium was used only for peaceful purposes, and which also provided for the stockpiling of uranium to enable operation of Canadian uranium mines to be continued while markets developed for this material.

Many significant changes have taken place since 1965 in the world uranium market. There is a growing world requirement in

relation to available supply and a demand for long term contracts. The increasing dependence on uranium fuel for future electrical power generation is providing an incentive for many countries to become concerned with uranium activities in other countries. At the same time the recent signing by many countries of the non-proliferation treaty will, we hope and believe, curtail the spread of nuclear armaments.

These developments will have an impact on the Canadian uranium industry. Accordingly the government is now setting out its uranium policy in greater detail to ensure that full account is taken of the Canadian public interest in these new circumstances.

The basis of Canada's uranium policy is stated in the preamble to the Atomic Energy Control Act, namely that—

> —it is essential in the national interest to make provision for the control and supervision of the development, application, and use of atomic energy, and to enable Canada to participate effectively in measures of international control of atomic energy which may hereafter be agreed upon.

To protect the national interest in the different circumstances which now face us we will henceforth require that all contracts covering the export of uranium or thorium be examined and approved by the appropriate federal agency before any application for an export permit is considered. The examination will cover all aspects and implications of the contract such as nuclear safeguards, the relationship between contracting parties, reserves, rate of exploitation, domestic requirements, domestic processing facilities, and selling and pricing policy. Approval will not normally be given to contracts of more than ten years duration unless provision is made for renegotiation of price.

Once an export contract is approved, export permits covering the actual shipment of uranium or thorium may be issued annually, provided the conditions of the contract have been maintained. Approval will be granted only for the supply of uranium and thorium for peaceful purposes to customers in countries with which Canada has completed a safeguards agreement or following the coming into effect of the non-proliferation treaty with customers in countries which have concluded the necessary safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Canada will permit stockpiling of Canadian uranium in foreign countries to meet the succeeding five-year requirements of each country to fuel existing or committed nuclear reactors. Additional stockpiling in Canada will not be precluded but actual export shipment will be limited to a moving five-year requirement of the foreign country. The shipment of small quantities of materials for atomic energy research projects will continue to be permitted without safeguards arrangements.

We will continue to require that all persons engaged in uranium or thorium mining in Canada be incorporated under federal or provincial legislation, that they operate under licence from the Atomic Energy Control Board and that they provide information as required under the regulations of the board.

The government believes that the administration of Canada's uranium policy in this manner, with regulations such as the foregoing, will enable the Canadian primary and secondary uranium industry to grow and take advantage of its opportunities in the world uranium market.

In the implementation and administration of these national policies, the federal government will maintain close contact with provincial governments on matters of common concern with respect to the uranium industry.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for the advance copy of the statement the minister gave us, in order that we could make a considered reply. Unfortunately the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), who would normally speak on behalf of the official opposition party, is not here to reply to the minister.

Arrangements to control the spread of nuclear weapons have been strengthened since many countries have signed the non-proliferation treaty, France and the People's Republic of China being notable exceptions. Perhaps one benefit to flow from bringing continental China into the community of nations—that could be done through means of diplomatic recognition or by bringing that country into the United Nations—would be the acceptance by that country of the implications of the non-proliferation treaty which would lead to a more effective control of nuclear power in the world.

It is noteworthy that since former Prime Minister Pearson made the announcement in the house on June 5, 1965, about the sale of uranium and thorium the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna under the aegis of the United Nations has grown in importance and usefulness. The key policy considerations are "control" and "peaceful purposes". The spread of dangerous, toxic sub-

stances is a matter of international concern. Recently the United States army tried to dump poisonous substances into the sea. Fortunately for the world the outcry from the people of the United States forced a change in policy of that country. It is all too obvious that we must continue our vigilance. Canada has made no effort to sell uranium that would not be used for peaceful purposes. There is far more involved here than money, and the government recognizes that.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to find that world demand for uranium is increasing. When there was a surplus of uranium in this country and when uranium mines were closing many of us were optimistic enough to think that because nuclear energy could be used in producing power, the demand for uranium undoubtedly would increase in the years ahead. That optimism has been fully justified. Many of us urged the government at that time to embark on a policy of stockpiling uranium. I am very glad to say that the government's decision today has been fully justified by the events.

The increasing demand for uranium, particularly for the generating of power, is creating a demand of which Canada can avail itself. We are one of the fortunate countries in the world which has large supplies of uranium. This will enable Canada to earn a good deal of overseas trade credits by virtue of the export of uranium. However, Mr. Speaker, I am certain the people of this country do not want to earn dollars at the expense of creating a nuclear monster.

The government has been very zealous over the years in making sure that no uranium was sold on the export market except for peaceful purposes. I am glad to see from the minister's statement that the government intends to continue that policy. I take it that no uranium will be sold to any country which is not a signatory of the non-proliferation treaty. The People's Republic of China and the Republic of France are not yet signatories. I know there was a good deal of pressure on the government to sell uranium to France. Fortunately that pressure was resisted. I hope it will continue to be resisted not only to those two countries, but to any other countries which refuse to sign the non-proliferation treaty.

There is one danger of which I hope the government will be fully aware, that is the danger of the trans-shipment of uranium. If uranium is sold to a country which is a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty, it should not be trans-shipped to some other country which is not going to use it for peaceful purposes. I hope the Atomic Energy Control Commission will set up the necessary machinery so that they can be fully aware at all times that the uranium which is sold to any nation is used in that nation, and is not exported to some other nation for the purpose of manufacturing nuclear weapons.

I hope as a result of the minister's policy that we will see a continued expansion of our uranium exports. I hope at the same time the policy of safeguarding the use of Canadian uranium against warlike purposes is carefully and zealously continued.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, we are very happy to be made aware of the agreements the government has reached in connection with the export of uranium, but we have certain reservations to make as far as ten-year contracts are concerned.

We hope the sales will be made only to countries who will use uranium for peaceful purposes. We also hope that the government made sure that uranium will not be transferred to third parties which might use it for purposes other than peaceful ones.

We believe this statement will be welcome by the Canadian mining companies and by the workers who make their living from uranium mining in this country.

Again, I say we are very happy about this statement and we approve of it.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING SELECTION OF EXAMINERS

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-208, to amend the National Transportation Act (Selection of examiners).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, the National Transportation Act appoints as examiners people responsible for investigating on behalf of the Commission matters concerning the operations of extra-provincial public carriers by motor vehicle.

This bill is designed to amend the act so that the Commission will give preference, in the selection of examiners, to the qualified personnel already available to provincial commissions, to avoid duplication of examiners and to take advantage of the experience already acquired at the provincial level. All members of a provincial commission could be designated for this purpose.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

AMENDMENT RESTRICTING APPLICATION OF LAW

Mr. Fernand-E. Leblanc (Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-209, to amend the National Transportation Act (Restricted Application).

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time, and ordered to be printed.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS IN RELATION TO HATE PROPAGANDA

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved the first reading of Bill No. S-21 (from the Senate), to amend the Criminal Code.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

MONTREAL—ST. JEAN BAPTISTE DAY PARADE —REPRESENTATION FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Since, at the very last minute, the authorities of the St. Jean Baptiste Society in Montreal have, by special delivery, sent to twelve members of parliament representing constituencies on the Island of Montreal, an invitation to attend the celebrations that will mark St. Jean Baptiste Day on June 24 next, and since care was taken not to invite the Prime Minister because, according to the experts of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, he does not even reside in the Montreal area, does the Prime Minister intend to send as delegate to such celebrations a minister from the Montreal area, for instance, the Secretary of State, to represent the federal government?

I am informed that in the Montreal area—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked his question.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister concerned has just advised me that he has not yet received that invitation, but even on the assumption that it is about to reach him I understand that other hon. members who have duly received it have turned it down, for they thought it came rather late.

Even if I wanted to send somebody to represent me, provided I am invited to do so, I do not think I would find any volunteer.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Has the Prime Minister inquired from the Department of External Affairs how many foreign countries will be represented at the celebrations organized by the St. Jean Baptiste Society of Montreal? Have those ambassadors received, according to custom and practice, the approval of the Department of External Affairs of Canada to attend them?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I must say in this connection that I have not asked the department to inquire, and I do not think that it should.

Yesterday, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Charlevoix, which I must admit took me by surprise, I said that I did not know that the ambassadors had been invited. I have learned since that the invitation had reached them before it became actually known that the organizers of those celebrations intended to exclude the federal government and the Prime Minister of the country.

Therefore, I think that in most cases—probably in every case—their good faith was abused.

I want to say publicly that I did not intend to blame them if they had accepted in good faith the invitation extended to them by the mayor of Montreal and the Society. But now that the facts are known and that it was obviously intended to systematically exclude the federal government and the Prime Minister of this country, they will have no doubt to make their own decision. Once more, I would like to explain to the house that in the event the good faith of those people was abused, I had no intention whatsoever of blaming them.

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Has the Prime Minister received this morning the visit of Mr. Marc Carrière, chairman of French Canada celebrations committee? If so, is he in a position to disclose the nature of their meeting?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carrière is in Ottawa for purposes that he knows better than I do. It is true that I saw him, but only for a few minutes this morning and he took this opportunity to explain why he had not invited me. This is all that happened between us.

PRIME MINISTER UNABLE TO ATTEND CELEBRATIONS AT ST. GEORGES DE BEAUCE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Has the Prime Minister made a decision regarding the invitation extended by the town of St. Georges de Beauce to attend the St. Jean Baptiste day celebrations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is much concern about me these days. I must say that before coming here I asked that the authorities of St. Georges de Beauce be officially informed that I regretted being unable to attend their festivities, that I sincerely thanked the people and the organizers of the celebration for their invitation, and that I hoped other more favourable occasions would allow me to visit the people of that region, for whom I feel an ever-growing admiration.

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the federal government seems to be kept out of the various celebrations scheduled by the St. Jean Baptiste Society, does the Prime Minister feel it might be proper for the federal government to organize its own celebrations on St. Jean Baptiste Day?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we might consider the idea; all parties work at it together, and I think we would have many spectators and participants for our celebrations.

[*English*]

STUDENT AID

INCREASED FEDERAL GRANTS FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the University of Toronto and York University have been compelled to reject the applications of more than 18,000 students who applied to enter those universities this fall? In view of the fact that the report of the university presidents indicates that many thousands of high school graduates will not be able to gain admission to university this fall, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government is giving any consideration as to how to deal with this problem, and particularly whether the government intends to increase federal grants for post-secondary education in order to provide accommodation for university students?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the N.D.P. knows, education is a matter of provincial jurisdiction and one in which the federal government has no constitutional competence. On the matter of shared grants with the provinces, the hon. member knows that we are now in the process of achieving ways under the constitution whereby the federal government with the consent of the provinces can participate in the type of shared grants to which he refers. Let me just remind the house that since the new arrangement made by the then minister of finance in 1966, the federal government has transferred several hundreds of millions of dollars to the provinces in the account of education.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact the Ontario provincial Minister of Education has advised these young people who cannot get into university to work for a year, and in view of the fact that the unemployment figure at the end of May reached nearly 5 per cent of the labour force, and the anticipated 250,000 students will be unable to get work this summer, has the minister any plans he intends to divulge to the house, either now or on motions, to provide employment for these young people, who will not be able to get into university this fall and who will be looking for work this summer?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In view of the hon. member's question to the alternative

minister, I would suggest to the minister that if he is going to make a statement of this nature it should be made on motions.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I then ask the minister whether he will make a statement on motions tomorrow, or certainly before the house recesses, in respect of this important matter?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter. My hon. friend will have noticed that the month to month increase in the labour force was considerable and that a very high proportion of that increase—about 81 per cent—consisted of persons under the age of 25 years. These number some 152,000. In the same period the employment growth month to month was 150,000. So in the past month there has been a very distinct—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member can see why the chair is always reluctant to allow replies to this type of question, which only lead to debate. We have heard a lengthy question and a lengthy statement. My suggestion is that this kind of statement ought to be made on motions rather than by way of an answer to a question.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Perhaps I may ask the minister this question: In view of the fact that the unemployment figure has risen by another 20,000 in the last month, does the minister intend to make a statement to the house before we recess as to what plans he has to provide employment for these students during the coming summer?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend had listened to my answer he would have noticed that in the past month the Canadian economy has shown remarkable strength in absorbing a very large number of young people coming into the labour market. If that trend continues for the next few months, and there is no certainty that it will, then—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has repeated the question, the minister has repeated the answer, and I now repeat the ruling.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

SHIPBUILDING

CANADIAN VICKERS—OFFER TO PURCHASE BY QUEBEC INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Can he tell us whether he has received from the Quebec Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce an official request for co-operation with regard to the sale of the Canadian Vickers of Montreal to the Quebec Société générale de financement?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Last Saturday in Montreal, when I met the Quebec Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, he mentioned his intention to get in touch with me shortly regarding this matter.

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

Has the minister wished for the closing down of the Canadian Vickers at the earliest possible date, in order to get rid of that cancer?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member cannot inquire about the wishes of the minister.

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I ask the hon. Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether he saw a delegation of the C.S.N., the union at Canadian Vickers, today and whether he was able to assure them that the federal government would assist in obtaining or giving contracts to Canadian Vickers pending the completion of the study in respect of a maritime fleet in which the government is now engaged?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I saw such a delegation. I had previously obtained information with respect to the number of ships the Canadian government was going to have built in the coming months. There was no indication that ship construction would be available in the short term ahead of us. The government also has a policy, dating back to 1965, on the necessity of bidding on such occasions.

Mr. Bell: Like the *Bonaventure*.

Mr. Pepin: I indicated to the group that I was not in a position to commit the government to any arrangement at the present time to keep Vickers open for ship construction.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister whether his attention was drawn by the delegation to the matter of the reconversion of some ships, and whether Canadian Vickers would not be a proper place to have that work done. It would keep the people employed for at least a year or so until the study is finished.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Since the minister met the representatives of the C.N.T.U. and that a task force will probably be set up to conduct a study, is he in a position to guarantee some work to the Canadian Vickers, at least until the report of the task force is received?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, during the discussions with the labour organization in question, there were quite a number of "ifs". If the federal government has ships to be built, if the federal government is ready to award contracts without tender, if the Canadian Vickers is ready to build those ships, if another group is ready to replace the Canadian Vickers, if... There were about seven or eight, Mr. Speaker, and things remained at that.

[*English*]

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. Will he make available to the shipbuilding industry a grant similar to that which he has made available to the automobile industry?

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

KENNEDY ROUND—PASSING ON OF LOWER PRICES TO CONSUMERS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Immediately following the presentation of the budget I asked the minister whether his department intended to introduce machinery which would require importers to pass on to consumers, in their entirety, the tariff reductions announced in the budget. He answered that he expected to make a statement shortly. Several weeks have passed, and I wonder whether he is now in a position to say if such machinery will be introduced in the very near future.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped the hon. member would have read the speech I made in this house on Monday.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did read every word of the minister's speech and there was not in it one word dealing with the matter I have asked about this afternoon. I again ask if he will indicate whether the studies in connection with this matter indicate that this can be done.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the minister a question and he has given me the smart alecky answer that if I had read his speech I would have got the answer to my question. I have read every word of his speech and there is not in it one word about the matter I asked about this afternoon.

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

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: We will wait for a little order, please.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: I have lots of time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have order. The hon. member would like to put his question of privilege.

Mr. Hees: I will, Mr. Speaker, as soon as I have a chance to do so. My question of privilege is that this minister is deliberately misleading the house. In his speech he did not say one word that has anything to do with the question I asked him this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have two rulings to make. The first is that this is not a question of privilege. The second is that the hon. member cannot tell another member that he is deliberately misleading the house. I am

sure the hon. member did not intend to use those words and would like to give an explanation which would be satisfactory to the Chair.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Hees: I will be very glad to comply with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw the word "deliberately". I simply say the minister is misleading the house. I ask him when he will take his job seriously, instead of sneering at the problems he was appointed to deal with, like the bumptious smart aleck that he shows himself to be every time he rises to speak in this house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether we could return to the question period. We have only 40 minutes, as hon. members know, and if we spend half this time on points of order or questions of privilege it is somewhat unfair to other hon. members. I hope the minister is not rising on a question of privilege also.

Mr. Basford: I was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member was. I hope he is not now.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

GRAIN

PRESS REPORT INDICATING ATTEMPT TO EQUALIZE CASH FLOW—REQUEST FOR QUOTA STATEMENT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he gave an interview to Mr. Hyman Solomon a while ago. Such an interview is reported as having taken place. Apparently this is a case of another Solomon come to judgment. Did the minister advise Mr. Solomon that there would be a fall-away this year in total farm cash income for all sales of wheat, oats and barley of $450 million. Also, did he use these words which appear in quotation marks in the newspaper article:

> What we will be trying to do is equalize as far as is possible the cash flow of farmers who are stuck with the kind of grain the market simply doesn't want at the moment with those who are lucky enough to have what the market wants.

Is this the plan of the government, or was it a midsummer night's dream on the part of the minister when he told Mr. Solomon this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure whether the question is in proper form; in fact, I have serious doubt about it. However, in view of the fact that the matter has already been raised by way of a question of privilege, the minister might be allowed to reply to the question.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, and to the second part the answer is also yes. But I would like to add that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce has announced a number of times in this house in response to questions, as well as the chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board, that they were going to equalize the quota.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister has been frank in that answer. I ask him, is the government going to bring in a measure before we adjourn, in order to equalize the situation in which farmers on the prairies find themselves because they have not the wheat that is required for export? Can they get relief now, or must they wait until fall?

Mr. Olson: The action of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Canadian Wheat Board with respect to cash advances and other things has already gone a long way toward achieving that objective.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did not the minister know when he made the statement to Mr. Solomon that further action was going to be taken, or was it a midsummer night's dream?

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that by very rough division approximately one-third of the delivery points are on a quota of three bushels to the acre, one-third are on four bushels to the acre and one-third on five bushels, will the minister make a statement to the house prior to our adjourning for the summer recess setting out how the five-bushel quota objective of the Canadian Wheat Board is to be achieved? We would like to know what the plans and programs of the government are.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give is, by the best use of transportation facilities. I have said on a number of occasions that I have been told by the chief commissioner of the Wheat Board that he would do his very best in this regard, and hopefully it could be done. He said that

quota equalization would be at the five-bushel level. This is the best information I have.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the statement he made to the *Financial Post* and the earlier statements he made this afternoon in the house. Would he indicate to what number of bushels per acre the cash program which he will initiate will relate?

Mr. Olson: That has already been answered by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that no answer at all has been given by the Minister of Agriculture, may I direct a supplementary question to him and ask him how the farmers will repay this cash flow, and will they be required to repay it at all?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is as well acquainted as I am, and that is fairly well, with how the cash advances are recovered.

Mr. Horner: I have a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There have been a number of supplementary questions. I suggest to hon. members that we might return to this important matter in a few minutes.

Mr. Horner: It is an important matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I realize how important it is, but perhaps hon. members might go on to another subject. Since the hon. member indicates that he has a very short supplementary question, he may put it.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just a quick, short supplementary question arising out of the reply given by the Minister of Agriculture. May I take it, then, that this cash flow program which he is about to initiate is nothing more than a cash advance to the farmers which will have to be repaid by them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure that this is a short question. It is certainly a short statement.

Mr. Horner: It is a question, Mr. Speaker. This is really what it is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—RED CROSS ROLE IN PROVIDING RELIEF

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct to the Prime Minister a question on the war in Nigeria.

As the International Red Cross has put into service a maritime route to Nigeria's capital, is it the intention of the Canadian government to ask the Nigerian government to extend such a route so as to assist Biafrans, through the Red Cross?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to rely upon the Secretary of State for External Affairs to answer that question, which I will pass on to him.

Mr. Dumont: It is merely a question of geography, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

PILOT FATIGUE CONSEQUENT UPON AIR CANADA STRIKE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the second Acting Minister of Transport, which I hope he will take as notice so that the Minister of Transport may make a reply tomorrow. The question is: During April and May did the Department of Transport or the Canadian Transport Commission permit extensions in the number of hours flown by pilots in Canada, and specifically, did any pilot obtain permission to fly up to 150 hours per month in order to enable air lines to put on extra flights to compensate for the Air Canada strike?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In my view the hon. member's question is of the type which normally should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Nesbitt: I rise on the point of order that Your Honour has raised. Ordinarily this matter would be placed on the order paper or brought up in committee when the estimates are being discussed, but may I point out to Your Honour that in view of the alleged termination of the present session of the house there is no opportunity to bring this matter up, since next Tuesday is a day for the Prime Minister's celebration about which he was talking. I have been informed that the extension of the number of hours flown is a great hazard to people flying in aircraft.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: If I were to accept the hon. member's point of order I would have to conclude that all questions can be asked. There must still be some rule applicable to questions asked at this time. I suggest to the hon. member that surely there is a possibility of obtaining the information which he seeks in other ways than by asking a question at this time.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am sorry to belabour the point, Your Honour, but in this case the lives and safety of passengers on Canadian commercial air lines are in jeopardy, and I feel this is a proper question to be raised at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL PARKS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—AGREEMENT RESPECTING FIRST PARK ON PACIFIC COAST

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I should like to ask him whether he has signed yet an agreement with the government of British Columbia for the establishment of the first national park on the western coast of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we have not yet signed this agreement but I think we will be able to sign it in a few weeks.

[*English*]

THE LATE EARL ALEXANDER OF TUNIS

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT FUNERAL OF FORMER GOVERNOR GENERAL

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister and ask him what arrangements have been made for Canada to be officially represented at the funeral of the former Governor General, Lord Alexander.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, final arrangements have not yet been made. We are not yet quite certain of the date of the funeral and of the arrangements which are being made in the United Kingdom.

Mr. MacLean: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the government to be represented at the funeral by one of its ministers.

Mr. Trudeau: Of course the government will be represented, but by whom is a matter which has not yet been decided.

AGRICULTURE

LABOUR FORCE FROM WEST INDIES TO ASSIST IN HARVESTING

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. During the harvesting of the vegetable, fruit and tobacco crops in 1968 our labour force was supplemented by people from the West Indies, and this proved to be a very satisfactory arrangement for our producers. In view of this does the government intend to follow the same procedure for the 1969 season?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, the same arrangements are in effect.

COMBINES

LUMBER—ALLEGED CURTAILMENT OF PRODUCTION TO ENHANCE PRICES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and ask him whether he has received a wire from the president of the regional council in Vancouver of the International Woodworkers of America complaining about the fact that the major lumber companies are deliberately curtailing production in an effort to put up prices. May I ask the minister whether he is initiating any investigation into these allegations?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have received such a wire. Quite frankly, I find it a little difficult to believe that when the British Columbia lumber production comprises a very small part of the international lumber production, and there has been a quite unexpected decrease in home construction in the United States, any curtailment would in fact affect the price level.

However, in view of the wire that I have received, the officials of the combines branch will look into the matter and, of course, if Mr. Moore has any evidence of conspiracy or collusion that would be helpful to my officials I would appreciate it if he would send it to

us. I am sure that we all hope that in view of the programs of the minister responsible for housing we will have a steady supply of lumber and building materials in Canada. I know also that there have been a number of wildcat strikes in British Columbia, and it seems to me that it would be helpful if we had fewer of those.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

TRADE

LOGS—MAINTENANCE OF BAN ON EXPORTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether he will look into the claim by the lumber companies that there is a shortage of logs, and would he undertake to see that the ban on the export of logs is being fully maintained in so far as British Columbia is concerned?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I think that is properly a question within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and of my colleague from British Columbia, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. I will refer the question to them.

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

POSSIBLE RE-APPOINTMENT OF FORMER OFFICIALS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question.

Since the former Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer) has stated that the recommendations of the Hellyer task force on housing concerning officials of his department were not accepted and that he recommended that the latter be reinstated or transferred following the appointment of the new minister, does the Prime Minister intend to study the possibility of finding new jobs for these senior civil servants when he appoints a minister?

[*English*]

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN MEETING OPERATING COSTS

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a question for the Prime Minister. Owing to the financial difficulties of the National Arts Centre, would the Prime Minister be prepared to make a statement in respect of the government's intentions regarding the subsidization of the operating costs of what the Secretary of State, the minister of culture, refers to as "that thing"?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

IMPROVED FACILITIES AT MONTREAL AND TORONTO

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. It is based on the welcome report that work is finally under way to improve the facilities of the main post office in Montreal. Can he advise when action will be taken to renovate another major confluence of the nation's mail, the main post office of Toronto, which has been neglected for the past six years?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications and Postmaster General): This work is already in progress, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—PAYMENT OF DRUG COSTS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. With the majority of the people of Canada now being covered by medicare, what steps is the government taking to ensure drug costs for those on incomes at the subsistence level and those who are sick and chronically ill?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked a question very wide in scope and one the answer to which I suggest would require the type of statement normally made on motions.

Mr. Rynard: Might I ask through you, Mr. Speaker, whether the minister will make such a statement tomorrow?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I do not believe I shall make a statement tomorrow. As far as drug costs are concerned, I would indicate to the hon. member that this matter is properly the responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As for those on low income—

Mr. Rynard: A supplementary question. Is this not analogous to giving a farmer a bright new gun to go out and shoot predators, but no bullets to go with it?

Inquiries of the Ministry

MEDICARE—APPLICABILITY OF PLAN TO NATIVE PEOPLES

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In the light of the complaint made by spokesmen for the Alberta native people, is it the intention of the government to honour the so-called Medical Chest Treaty which guarantees that the medical treatment of some Alberta Indians will be paid for by the federal government, and will such an arrangement be brought into effect in connection with the medicare plan as it relates to native people in Alberta?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I shall be visiting tomorrow the Indian community to which the hon. member refers and I shall be encouraging these people to participate in the Alberta medicare scheme.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received representations from the native people in Alberta and, if he has replied, will he tell the house the nature of his reply?

Mr. Munro: I have not to my knowledge received any official communication from them, though I am aware, from the news media, of the position they have taken.

CIGARETTES—NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fine example the minister has set in discontinuing smoking himself, and the fight-back spirit he has shown toward the cigarette companies, and in view of the fine example of C.T.V. and the C.B.C. in refusing to accept cigarette advertising, would the minister use his good offices to persuade the newspapers across Canada not to accept cigarette advertising?

EFFECTS OF CONSUMPTION BY HUMANS OF CAT AND DOG FOODS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that some of our old age pensioners are now reported to be eating canned cat and dog food to avoid starvation, will the minister tell us whether his department is conducting any tests or experiments to ascertain whether this practice is detrimental to health? I ask this question because it appears to me that if the government continues to tackle the problem of inflation as it has been doing up to now, many of us will be forced into trying the same thing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

BAIL—REQUEST FOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): I have a question for the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, of which I have given him notice. Bearing in mind the interest generated in our bail system arising out of the Montreal case, can the hon. gentleman report when bail reform legislation will be presented to this house?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): The Department of Justice is actively reviewing the whole question of bail and detention before trial, and is awaiting with great interest a report on this subject.

GRAIN

WHEAT—CONTROLLER TO ENSURE PROPER BOX CAR DISTRIBUTION

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is any consideration being given to the appointment of a transport controller to ensure there will be an adequate and equitable distribution of box cars in western Canada for the balance of this crop year, which ends on July 31 next?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Not by me, Mr. Speaker; but maybe other people in my department, or other departments interested, are doing so, and I shall inquire.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): A supplementary question directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware that that cash loan was only a small creek and that it has now dried up?

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

OFFER OF POST TO MR. PAUL GÉRIN-LAJOIE

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the meeting that took place yesterday between the Prime Minister and the former Quebec Minister of Education, Mr. Paul-Gérin Lajoie,—I am sure you will

excuse my curiosity—I should like to ask whether it is true that Mr. Gérin-Lajoie has been offered an administrative position in the federal government?

Mr. Speaker: I doubt that the hon. member's curiosity can be satisfied this way.

NATIONAL PARKS

QUEBEC—ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL PARKS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Can he tell the house whether the federal government plans to set up other national parks, especially in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest this question is very general in nature; it should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

FORESTRY

YUKON—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION TO CONTROL FIRES

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): A question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker. What action is the minister contemplating, in view of the serious forest fire situation in the Yukon?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the situation prevailing in the Yukon is very serious indeed and that there are now 500 employees fighting the 60 forest fires raging there. Fortunately, there is no loss of life to deplore and the seats of the fires are now under control, which will prevent the destruction of other villages and next, protect the best forests we have in the Yukon.

[*English*]

BRITISH COLUMBIA—WATER BOMBING AIRCRAFT FOR FIRE CONTROL

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, or to his parliamentary assistant. In view of the fact that we are facing the most critical forest fire situation in British Columbia in years, and in view of the report yesterday that all fire districts are critically short of aircraft, though a number of fires are burning out of control, I would ask the minister whether his department has been approached by the British Columbia government or its forest service department with a request for assistance in providing urgently needed water bombing aircraft. If so, how many aircraft have been sent to British Columbia, and are there any additional aircraft available for service in that province?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The department will be answerable for questions tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO RETURN OF MINISTER FROM SCANDINAVIA

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, and ask him this: When will the Secretary of State for External Affairs stop hanging around Scandinavia, hoping that some Chinese communist will kindly notice that he is there and speak to him, so that he may get back to Canada to do the job he was elected to do?

PRICE STABILITY, INCOMES AND EMPLOYMENT

PROCEDURE ON MOTION TO SET UP SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs when it will be the intention of the government to proceed with what is now government order 91, the motion to set up a special joint committee on consumer affairs, price stability and incomes?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): That is a matter for the house leader, and for discussion through the usual channels.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): May I be permitted to ask the Minister of Agriculture, as the acting government house leader, if he can tell us the business for the rest of this week and next week, and from then on?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I do not believe there have been any changes in the program which the leader of the house, the President of the Privy Council, announced.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION OF THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That consideration be given to the third report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development relating to the consideration of estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, which was presented to the house on Friday, May 30, 1969.

• (3:10 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion this house has had under the new rules to launch an inquiry into a report of a committee that has dealt with the estimates of one of the departments of government. I intend to direct my remarks primarily and almost exclusively to the problems of our native peoples in Canada, the Indians and Eskimos, people who have so many problems of which this house must be seized and with which it must deal.

As a foundation for my remarks may I refer the house to a very excellent work entitled "A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada, Part I", which is under the editorship of Mr. H. B. Hawthorn, a very knowledgeable person in this matter. On page 400 appear three paragraphs that I should like to place on *Hansard*. They are very short and I put them on the record because I think that the people of Canada, the members of this house and the government must base their approach to this subject on these paragraphs.

The first paragraph reads as follows:

In 1847—

I repeat that, Mr. Speaker—in 1847.

—Commissioners Rawson, Davidson and Hepburn, in a report on the affairs of the Indians in Canada, submitted to the Legislative Assembly, came to the conclusion—

Then the author quotes from the report.

—"that the true and only practicable policy of the government, with reference to their interests, both of the Indians and the community at large, is to endeavour, gradually to raise the tribes within the British Territory to the level of their white neighbours; to prepare them to undertake the offices and duties of citizens; and, by degrees, to abolish the necessity for its farther interference in their affairs."

And the next paragraph:

More than a century later, in July, 1964, the Indian Affairs Branch declared that—

Again follows a quotation from the report of the Indian Affairs branch dated 1964.

—"the basic objective of the federal government in Indian administration is to assist the Indians to participate fully in the social and economic life of Canada."

That is almost a direct repetition of what was said more than 100 years earlier. The author ends with this very simple paragraph:

Something has gone wrong.

It is very difficult for us to chronicle and to set out in considerable detail all the wrongs which have been done. I hope to limit myself to one in particular and I hope that the minister, who I am glad to see in the chamber, will pay some attention at this time to my remarks.

I think we should bear in mind that in their approach to this problem the original government, the British authorities, made the same approach in Canada that was made in their other territories. I state this fact in view of some to the difficulties we are experiencing today. An attempt was made in documentary form to give some recognition to the aboriginal rights of the first people of Canada to their property holdings and to their customs and traditions.

For the information of those who are interested in this matter, not only from the historical viewpoint but from the viewpoint of people who know that a great wrong has been done and that it is the duty of the people of this country to attempt to right that wrong, I should like to draw attention to a judgment of Mr. Justice Sissons, who was for many years not only a member of this house but a territorial judge in the Northwest Territories and whose known concern for the Indians and Eskimos of the territory led him in the course of his judicial functions to lay down a number of principles of which I think the people of this country should take note. In one case involving two Eskimos in the Northwest Territories Mr. Justice Sissons declared that the native habits, customs and traditions of the people would prevail in regard to recognizing the legality, first, of a marriage and, in a subsequent case, of an adoption. In the course of his judgment, Mr. Justice Sissons traced step by step and century by century the reasons for his judgment. He referred to the fact that Charles II introduced an edict instructing his people in Canada, including the Hudson's Bay Company, that due recognition must be paid to the rights of the native people of Canada. In 1763, following the war which concluded at that

time, a Royal Proclamation reinforced this by saying precisely the same thing.

In the event—and I am now dealing with the Indian people I know in western Canada—toward the end of the last century instructions were given by the then government to a number of commissioners to travel from the Lakehead west and into the north in an attempt to settle and quiet the claims the Indian people might have to their lands, the lands that they occupied, the lands that had been theirs till the white man came. As a result 14 treaties were executed by these commissioners. I ask hon. members, who should have and must have a vested interest in seeing that wrongs which have been done are righted, to examine not only those treaties but also the reports of the commissioners which accompanied them.

I am going to deal very briefly with treaty No. 8 and its adhesions, which cover the country I come from, almost 100,000 square miles stretching from the north to Great Slave lake, down to a latitude equal to that of Edmonton, and covering much of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories.

The commissioner wrote a letter dated September 22, 1899, which accompanied this treaty, and he referred to the problems that he and the other commissioners had in securing the consent to the treaty of the Indian people. He intimated that it was essential not only to set out in writing the agreements that constituted the treaty but that certain other concessions had to be made. He indicated that oral statements were made accompanying the treaty which must be taken into account. Included in his report was the statement that the Indian people were greatly concerned about the provision of what they knew as a medicine chest and the services of a medical man. The commissioner indicated that, in order to persuade the Indian chiefs and those who executed the treaty to sign the treaty, he had to give a verbal statement indicating that provision of this kind would be made. He went on to deal in the same way with matters of education, with traditional hunting, trapping and fishing rights, with provision in regard to agriculture. These, I think, were the major factors that were in the minds of the Indian people at that time.

• (3:20 p.m.)

It may be of interest to hon. members to know that the Indian people do not have the same concept of land ownership as do white people. In Indian customs and traditions there was a communal ownership of land. The land was held for all the tribe to hunt, fish and trap on. When agreements were executed, treaties signed and concessions made with the government it is well known, and this is corroborated by people who have knowledge of these things, that the Indians did not consider they were divesting themselves of all rights they had to the land. Instead they thought they were giving to the white man rights similar to those Indians had exercised in the past. Of course the white man has the idea that one owns land and by so doing excludes all others from owning it, and when any conflict arose between Indians and white men there was no question as to whose views would prevail. Even when treaties were entered into under which the government of Canada acquired title to all that vast empire lying between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains and stretching up into the southern part of the Northwest Territories, the Indian people did not believe they were divesting themselves of this land. They said to the white man, "Come in, enjoy it and share the land with us."

What has been the result of these treaties? As a result of decisions of the highest courts of this land and of the Privy Council, practically every concession the Indians thought they had wrung from the commissioners under these treaties has been nullified. The treaties are broken. I see the parliamentary secretary is here. I expect he recalls the Sikyea case. As a result of the decision in that case traditional rights to hunt which an Indian in the Northwest Territories thought he had were invalidated and nullified. The Supreme Court of Canada decided that the Migratory Birds Convention Act completely swept aside the full effect of the treaties. At the present time litigation is pending in Saskatchewan—it may have been completed but I do not think so—in which the native people of the province are attempting to secure a declaratory judgment to the effect that they are entitled to certain help with regard to medicines and hospitalization as a result of the undertaking, given when the treaty was signed, that a medicine chest would be provided to them. So it goes. The courts of this country have held in case after case, year after year, that the treaties which were signed are nothing but scraps of paper. No wonder that today throughout Canada there is unrest, anxiety, hostility, enmity, and a growing trend toward activism. Our native peoples are on the march. Time is of the essence and it is not on our side in this issue.

I regret that during the six years the party opposite has formed the government of Canada nothing has been done. I am confident that if appropriate steps had been taken five or six years ago much of the unrest and hostility being generated today would not be with us. I know the minister will say that a number of discussions and conferences have been held. I suggest that the minister and those of his colleagues who were present at these conferences could not help noticing the feelings of hostility and animosity which our native peoples are displaying at this time. This ball game is different from the one of 10 or 20 years ago. Today there are in this country young Indian people who are intelligent, eloquent and armed with facts that cannot be denied. They know they have a just case and they cannot be fobbed off with the kinds of promises that were made in the past. I fear that we are in for a very serious and difficult time, especially if one bears in mind that the rate of increase of Indian and other native peoples of this country is double that of any other group in Canada. What was a small cloud in the sky 20 years ago may shortly become a black storm which is liable to overwhelm us and do great damage to race relations in Canada.

Speaking as a lawyer and as one who has been in public life and a member of this house for over 11 years, I say there is no doubt that if this entire matter were to be considered on a contractual basis the Indian and Eskimo peoples could beyond any shadow of doubt allege and prove breach of contract. Any reasonable jury seized of the facts could come to no other conclusion. When you bring action for breach of contract and win, there are several remedies. The distinguished lawyers in this house know that one remedy is specific performance. In these circumstances that is out of the question. Conditions have changed and will continue to change. That remedy is not open to these people. Another remedy is to restore to our native peoples the property which was originally taken from them. I do not think that is a reasonable proposition either and I am sure the Indians would not take the country back with the financial mess the present government has introduced.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: The third alternative is reasonable damages for the losses which have been sustained. That is the stage we have reached today. There have been a series of conferences. The minister, his colleagues and a number of my colleagues have met with the Indian people in various places across Canada. I regret that I could not attend the Indian Act consultation meeting held at Edmonton on December 12 and 13, 1968. The Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur (Mr. Andras) attended. At that meeting, at the initiative of one of our most intelligent and active young Indian leaders, Harold Cardinal of Sucker Creek, Alberta, a resolution was proposed and passed dealing with the whole aspect of treaties, the rights of Indian people under those treaties and the wrongs that have been done to them. There, in unmistakable language which I am sure the minister noted, the Indian people of Canada made known that they object strenuously to any effort on the part of the government to bring forward a new Indian Act until such time as the breach of treaties and the rights of Indian people over many generations has been adequately dealt with and considered. The consideration of those matters they say ought to take place before there is any amendment to the Indian Act. Otherwise the Indian people will not be prepared to go along with any revision of the act.

Hopes had been high for a genuine attack on the prejudices and inequalities that have plagued Indians for a century. This seemed one thing the Prime Minister was committed to. That has now been revealed to be an illusion. He got rid of one minister who was respected by the Indian people and allowed the present minister to become, in effect, the captive of his department. The difference in the regard in which the Indians held the two ministers was based on the differences the ministers displayed in their approaches to this problem. The Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur was prepared to make some basic changes. As a result, he was changed. He was accepted by the native people simply because he regarded their advice as being at least as good and probably better than the advice of government officials.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I have great admiration for the minister but I must be frank and do my duty as I see it. I can do nothing less. The present minister has lost the respect of the Indian people because they suspect he listens much more to his officials than he does to the people he is supposed to serve.

The government made a great show of consultation and held meetings across the country. From the beginning there was the disquieting suggestion that some of the Indian

people called upon to testify were too heavily influenced by the closeness of their relation with the department. They were people who, for one reason or another, had to come to terms with the department and were thus less objective and less critical than other spokesmen might have been. There was the lingering suspicion in any event that the minister and his officials were listening to what they wanted to hear and were disregarding the rest. Over the years I have found that is a fault most ministers seem to acquire very easily. That was proven by the final consultation meeting held here this spring. That meeting gathered together some of the most able and articulate people in the country, representatives of the native people drawn from the ranks of the native people. This group was as talented and as effective as any group which has ever appeared in Ottawa to argue their case, and I have sat on a number of Indian Affairs Committees both of this house and in conjunction with the other place.

It was clear that this group of representatives of the native people considered the consultations so far to be inadequate. They considered the consultations were a show and were avoiding many of the real problems. They wanted treaty and aboriginal rights considered before the Indian Act itself was considered. This group asked the right to conduct their own consultations, free of the influence of the department and free of the implications of colonial status which are bound to exist when the department clearly does not trust the Indians' capacity to examine their own problems and recommend their own solutions.

This all comes down to a question of trust in the Indian people. Will they be allowed to make their own analysis and their own decisions, or will they continue to be subject to the prejudice and the vested interests of the department? That was the issue which faced the minister when he met the last consultative conference here in Ottawa. He evaded the issue then, as he has consistently evaded questions in the house. I qualify that by saying the minister did make a statement in the house not too long ago that he would be making a definitive statement before the summer recess. I rely upon that undertaking and we will examine that statement with interest. I hope it will go at least part of the distance the Indian people wish the government to go.

The minister's remarks at that conference left the Indians to understand that he would seriously consider their request for the financial assistance required to let the Indian people conduct their own inquiry into their condition and make their own recommendations about the priorities and the solutions required. That meeting established a national committee on Indian Rights with representatives from British Columbia, the prairie region, Ontario, Quebec, the maritime region and the Territories. It was the function of that committee to lay the groundwork for a large-scale inquiry by Indians into Indian conditions. Delegates to the last consultative conference left the meeting believing the government was prepared to support this inquiry.

Members of the National Indian Committee met in Ottawa on June 3 and 4. The minister's office knew they were coming but the minister was not available to meet with them on either of the two days they were here. It may well be the minister will reply to that statement. If he is in a position to establish that I am wrong, I will be prepared to accept it. I must rely on the information I have received.

Mr. Chrétien: I must reply to that remark, Mr. Speaker. The delegation did not ask to see me until the second day. However, I was out of the city on that day. When they were asked if they wanted to see me they said it would not be necessary to meet me at their first meeting, but they changed their minds after they met.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister will admit that this is not a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: I accept the minister's statement. However, I do not think it destroys what I have said. The minister's office knew that the members of the committee were coming to Ottawa, but the minister was not there to meet them on either of the two days they were here. The minister has given what he considers to be an adequate reply to my statement. It is a matter of the extent to which it is accepted. I am not denying the accuracy of the minister's statement. It is a question of the weight to be given to it.

Questioned by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in the house, the minister offered all kinds of excuses. He said that the committee had met at length with officials of his department. The point is that the Indian representatives did not want to meet officials. The Indian people, with some justification,

feel they have met enough officials. They wanted to meet the minister. They were elected representatives, a highly responsible and competent group. The minister owed them the courtesy of doing everything in his power to be able to meet with them.

Let us be frank about it. There is the suspicion the minister intends to introduce his white paper or statement about the Indian Act without consulting with this group or other recognized spokesmen of the Indian people. If I am wrong in that, I will be delighted to hear the minister say so when he rises to participate in this debate. If the minister is allowed to get away with that, he will then be able to argue that his hands are tied, his priorities are set by his statement in the house, and he will then be unable to deal with the real problems as the Indian people see them. If he does that it will be a tragic betrayal of the confidence the Indian people had begun to develop and had been encouraged to develop in the motives of this government. It will indicate that the government continues to distrust the Indian people. It will be exactly the same kind of runaround the native people of Canada have been receiving for years from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

There is no reason for the minister to take this course. There is every reason for him not to take it. If he makes his statement without consulting fully with this committee and other representatives, he cannot claim to have a consensus among the Indian people. He cannot expect the Indian people to co-operate with him. He cannot shed or defeat the resentment of the Indian people against the department and the reputation of the department for continued colonial behaviour.

This government generally has a habit and a reputation of secrecy and silence. In no department is silence more serious nor frankness more required than in the Department of Indian Affairs. Yet this minister has been more guilty than most of evading direct questions in the house and of avoiding meaningful meetings and discussions with representatives of the people he is supposed to serve.

I would like nothing better, Mr. Speaker, than to be proved wrong in the statements I have made.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, one thing about which there can be no debate is that the Indians of Canada very deeply distrust all governments of Canada. In the last couple of weeks the Indians of Ontario have been demonstrating, protesting and demanding the resignation of the minister responsible for Indian affairs for the province of Ontario. The Indians of Manitoba recently picketed the health services centre provided for them at The Pas. The Indians have been vigorously protesting the plan of the provincial government, financed jointly by the province of Manitoba and the federal government, for the development of power resources on the Nelson River. This will mean the forced movement of some 600 or more Indian people from South Indian Lake who have demonstrated they have no confidence in the provincial government of Manitoba.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The Indians of Canada have demonstrated they have no confidence in the federal government. They have no confidence in the Department of Indian Affairs that supposedly looks after their interests. They have made repeated demands for an adequate opportunity to express their points of view with regard to the Indian Act and everything else which affects them.

Despite repeated statements by the minister that he would be making a definitive statement this session on the governments' position it now seems that he will be making that statement so late in the session that members of parliament and representatives of the Indian people will not have an opportunity to discuss adequately before parliament adjourns the white paper that he will present. The other day I was told that the minister will be making his main statement on June 24. If the session finished next week there will be no time to discuss it. He has repeatedly intimated that the white paper will deal essentially with the government's views in regard to revision of the Indian Act. He shakes his head. We could demonstrate this quite easily by what he has said, and much more easily by what he has not said.

For I do not know how many years, but certainly long before the minister was appointed, the government has been promising to introduce legislation setting up an Indian Claims Commission. Where is that commission? Where is that legislation? Maybe we will hear something about that in the white paper, but certainly there will be no such legislation this year.

As I understand the Indians' position they really do not want to discuss the Indian Act or the provisions of an amending bill until the government deals with more fundamental

issues which they think are important, namely, the systematic ignoring, the systematic flouting and the systematic and unilateral revision of the treaties made with them by former governments, by the British government before Canada became a self-governing country, treaties which the Indians feel were binding not only upon themselves but on the government of Canada, whether the British government, the provincial legislatures before Confederation, or the federal government since Confederation.

As early as the royal proclamation of 1763 the basic right of Indians to hunt and fish was recognized by the government responsible for the administration of this country. In the Jay Treaty the right of Indians to cross the border from the United States into Canada and from Canada into the United States, and to bring with them their household effects without being obligated to pay customs duties on them, was recognized.

But what has happened? Through a series of court decisions made by white men's courts, where Indians were not represented by counsel who understood the law, their traditional rights guaranteed under treaty have been constantly whittled away. Under the Migratory Birds Convention Act, agreed to by Canada and the United States, the right of Indians to hunt out of season has been restricted. I suggest this is completely wrong. It is immoral that the rights of a group of people, guaranteed by treaties, should be reduced by the unilateral action of a government which supposedly represents those people.

I am not an expert in this field but I have heard conservationists argue that it is necessary to control hunting by all people, including Indians. Indians have told me that they do not kill anything close to the number of animals shot by white hunters for sport and recreation. If it was necessary to restrict the rights of Indians in this field it ought to have been discussed with them, and compensation should have been provided for them. We have nothing like that.

Now we have the recent actions of the Department of National Revenue. In recent years Indians crossing the border at Cornwall have been required to pay customs duties on household furnishings brought with them, a practice that was not followed for virtually all of the first 100 years of Canada's existence. Again that was done without consultation with the Indians of Canada. It is no wonder they are unhappy. It is no wonder they do not trust Canadian governments any more.

A recent British Columbia Supreme Court decision holds that the Fisheries Act has restricted the right of Indians to fish. This is a right they have always had. It is not difficult to argue that Indians no longer depend primarily on hunting and fishing to earn a living. But there is an important principle involved. It is that rights given to the Indian people of this country in treaties negotiated by the government of Canada, or by the government of Great Britain before we became an independent country, should not be abrogated, restricted or reduced without consultation with and agreement of the Indians involved.

It is not my duty today, nor do I have the time, to record the systematic way in which the Indians of Canada, the original inhabitants, were pushed from pillar to post until eventually they were pushed on to reservations in the least productive and useful areas of the country, to which they have been restricted ever since.

In view of what has been done to them, in view of the conditions which have developed, the shabby way in which they have been treated and are being treated, in view of the fact that the earning power of Indians is probably not more than a quarter of the national average, in view of the abysmal health standards of Indians, in view of the fact that less than 100 Indians in 1969 have had enough education that they may attend Canadian universities, the Indian people are saying that what they want is for the federal government to set up an Indian Claims Commission which will look at what has happened to them, assess what we have done to the Indians, and assess the damages which Indians have had to bear as a result of the treatment they have received from the white people of Canada.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Governments have been promising the Indians for years that an Indian Claims Commission would be established. Where is that commission? When have we heard even a formal or official statement on the part of the minister that such a claims commission, on which I would hope there would be a majority of Indian members or at least a substantial percentage, would be established? Indian representatives on such a commission would understand the problems of the Indians and could articulate the desires of these people so

that we could begin for the first time to compensate the Indians for the tremendous injustices which have been inflicted upon them in this country by past Canadian governments and the people of Canada for more than 100 years.

The Indians of Canada feel very strongly about what they consider to be the complete ignoring of the rights they were guaranteed through treaties negotiated freely on the part of the white people but not so freely or knowledgeably on the part of the Indians. Because of this feeling they believe they must have a claims commission which will consider the problems of the Indians and assess the kind of compensation to which they are entitled. In this way these native Canadians could begin to function as first-class citizens.

In spite of the claims of the minister and the Department of Indian Affairs that these Indian people have never before been so widely and thoroughly consulted, the leaders and representatives of the Indians have made it clear that they are completely dissatisfied with the consultations and the steps that have been taken. Let me put on record a resolution which was passed at the national conference of the Indian Act held in Ottawa in the last few days of April, 1969. That national conference brought together about 100 of the top leaders of Indian communities from British Columbia to the east coast. This is what this resolution says:

> The new Indian Act will be our magna carta.

This appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of April 30, 1969. The article went on to state:

> Its impact will be more closely felt by Indians than by government. It can be our passport to equality and opportunity. Or, it could be just another compromise solution to a long-term problem.

Later the article refers to the resolution and states:

> The new Indian Act must reflect the real interest of the treaties. It must stipulate the government's commitment to its obligations. The Indian people, through their legitimate organizations, should be given the opportunity to consult meaningfully with Indians across Canada, to develop their own Indian Act for (the government's) consideration and not vice versa.

That resolution is very clear. It is written in the kind of language which even this minister ought to understand. The representatives of the Indian people who met at that national conference are not satisfied with the consultations which have been held. I do not want to be unfair, and I do not think the representatives of the Indian people are hostile to the minister personally, but they certainly are not satisfied to leave the drafting of the new Indian Act to the top officials of the Indian Affairs Department. In their opinion, and I agree, they have consistently betrayed and ignored the interests of the Indian people.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

These people believe it is the view of the top bureaucracy of the Department of Indian Affairs that the Indian people are not now ready to participate in the real decisions which have to be made if their conditions are to be improved. These people believe that the top bureaucrats of the department feel that the Indians are not ready today and will never be ready to participate in these decisions. Certainly they do not believe they will be ready in my time or in the time of the present minister who is a few years younger than I.

These native Canadians are completely and unanimously resolved that they will no longer leave their fate and welfare to this bureaucracy which has so consistently and so often betrayed their interests and their desires. They are calling on the government to change its whole approach to the problems of the Indian. To spell out this change they have asked first of all for a reassessment of consultation with the Indian people and what the rights given to the Indians under the treaties really mean in the 1970's rather than what they meant in the 1600's when the treaties were signed.

They insist that the government bring in legislation to establish an Indian Claims Commission with Indian representation and give the Indians an opportunity to appear before it with adequately trained technical staff including lawyers, sociologists, anthropologists and historians. They could then present to this commission the rightful claims of the Indians in respect of which they demand compensation for more than 100 years of wrongs. They feel these claims result from mistreatment by the white people of Canada.

Lastly, the Indians of Canada insist that the minister, not on his own or with the department, rewrite the Indian Act in a way which will not suit the Department of Indian Affairs only but, more importantly, the Indians themselves. They insist that the Indian Act be revised not simply through consultation, which simply means the officials will listen to the Indians and then go back to their offices and draft the legislation. They want to be given the opportunity to rewrite the act

themselves with staff capable of doing the job they require. They know what their problems are and they know better than white people what must be done if their condition is to be improved.

The Indians would agree that they do not have all the answers, and I am sure they would be the first to admit they will probably make mistakes. The minister surely must agree that they could not possibly do worse on their own than we white people have done for them for the last 100 years. Let me urge the minister and the government to make an effort to meet the demands and reasonable requests of the Indian people of Canada.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, the subject now under discussion is very important as we are dealing with the largest area of the Canadian territory, even though it is sparsely populated.

However, this part of the country is inhabited by people who were the first Canadians and who are perhaps increasing the most rapidly in number in spite of a relatively high mortality rate and a much lower rate of longevity than that of other Canadians as a whole.

I would like to quote a few statistics on this subject.

Thus, in 1965, for Canadians as a whole, the average age at death was 62, while it was about 20 for Eskimos and about 36 for Indians. Furthermore, infantile mortality in 1966, for Indians and Eskimos in the Northwest Territories, was 108.8 deaths per 1,000 living births for the Eskimos and 46.2 for the Indians, as compared with 23.1 per 1000 for the whole of Canada.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of a rather limited development, from both health and sanitation standpoints, in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories and in Northern Quebec and considering also the rather high mortality rate of these people, who had sharply declined in number at the beginning of the colony, their condition has greatly improved since the first half of this century and it is now developing at a very rapid pace.

Therefore, we must pay a great deal of attention to these territories and to the people who are widely scattered in this part of the country which is not easily accessible to the officials responsible for education, health, housing, employment and so on.

The Progressive Conservative party is asking today, in the course of this debate on supply, to consider especially the third report of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This report deals with matters relating to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Employment, education, housing, sovereignty in the Arctic, community centres, crafts, hydro-electric power in the North, in Dawson City—which may be considered as a tourist spot—those are so many matters dealt with by the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development during the present session.

I am a member of that committee, and on two occasions I had the opportunity to visit several centres in the Northwest and the Yukon Territories and my attention was drawn to certain points specifically referred to in the report.

For instance, in the field of employment, I was particularly struck by the lack of interest shown by employers, who take part in the development of the natural resources in those territories, towards Indians and Eskimos, in order to arouse their interest, to hire them, to promote their self-fulfilment and give them jobs in mining exploration work, for instance, or even in strip mining operations.

There is also in the Northern Territories some logging operations in which Indian and Eskimo manpower could be interested. I think the government should take some specific steps to have those corporations hire as many people living in that area as possible. Even if they have to be displaced at times to be closer to their jobs, I think this would be worthwhile. In respect of welfare assistance to Indians, a report recently published by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shows that 39.1 per cent of treaty Indians are living on welfare assistance. In other words, 9,883 employable heads of families need help.

I therefore feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is an important matter, which requires consideration and the seeking out of solutions. To my way of thinking, the solution lies in inciting companies to hire Indians and Eskimos.

As for education, to which our committee has also given consideration, we have been told that educational methods are constantly improving, more specifically in the field of basic education, but that there is also a growing tendency to provide these people with vocational training.

The government seems to show more willingness to supply such vocational training, which can best benefit Indians and Eskimos

who will end up in the employment of industries operating in those regions.

• (4:10 p.m.)

As for employment, pressures should be brought to bear in order to urge mining and other companies to hire local manpower as much as possible so as to improve their standard of living.

We must also concern ourselves with the housing problem in those areas. I think that the government had made substantial progress in that respect. Homes have been and are being built for Indian and Esquimo families, in order to provide them with more comfort in those cold lands. But I wonder if we have adequately taught the Indians to maintain their homes. I believe that we have failed to show them how to maintain their houses. I have noticed over there that houses which are as strongly built as our own houses in the South were considerably worn out within a few years' time, to the extent that they practically became unfit for living. If Indians were shown how to take care of their houses, we would not have to rebuild those units every five or eight years.

During those trips and studies in committee, we have also looked into the problem of sovereignty in the Arctic. In the last few weeks, we were able to realize the importance of Canada's sovereignty in those regions. It has already been questioned to a certain extent regarding some parts of the Arctic which, in my view, belong to Canada.

In the past, we have shown too great a lack of interest in those territories to claim everything that is there, not only on the islands, but also in the surrounding waters. We will have much to do in the next few months and years, in order to take hold of those territories and to develop them as much as possible to become their true owners. In so doing, the Canadian people would only fare better, since a country, perhaps friendly, has shown some interest in owning in those territories.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what I wanted to say this afternoon in connection with the problems facing the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

As a member from Quebec, I represent a constituency which covers quite a large area of the province and is inhabited by an important number of Indians and Eskimos. Indeed, according to the figures provided to me in December 1968, the Abitibi constituency comprises 2,363 Eskimos and 4,919 Indians.

[Mr. Laprise.]

Mr. Speaker, needless to say I am much interested in the welfare of those Indians and Eskimos not only in my constituency but also in the province of Quebec and in Canada.

The problem in the province of Quebec is a little different from that in the Northwest Territories, in the Yukon or in any other province where there are Indians. In Quebec, in most communities where Indians are living, they do not own the land. So it becomes difficult for the federal government to apply the same policy as everywhere else in Canada.

I should like to invite the minister to bring pressure to bear, if necessary, and to take all possible measures that could lead to an understanding with the Quebec government, so that the Indians living in our regions might know exactly what to expect as concerns the policy of both governments. More and more people seem concerned and dissatisfied with the existing procedure.

I could see with my own eys, on the occasion of the meeting held in early October 1968, at which a great number of Indians were represented mostly, by their band chiefs, with what anxiety they face the future. In several fields, they do not know whether they must depend on the federal government or the provincial government.

That was an opportunity for me to find out how ridiculous we can be when it comes to applying legislation. For instance, at Rupert House, on the east coast of James Bay, there is a federal school system, there is also a provincial school system and there are mission schools. That complicates matters to a very high degree, but it is also very expensive and yet the results are not very good. Matters should, I believe, be straightened out and it should be determined who has jurisdiction in this or that area, in order to improve living conditions in those regions.

I would like to speak in particular about the areas in my riding where there are large numbers of Indians.

At Rupert House, for instance—the figures I have on hand are for last year—almost all the residents of the village were unemployed. One can easily understand that for those people life is terribly hard. They must rely entirely, in summer especially, on welfare benefits, and that is no solution for them nor for the white people who live in the southern portion of the region.

The fact they continuously depend on the government weakens the will power of these people, it hampers their initiative when it

does not destroy it completely, condemning them to living sparely in undeserved poverty.

I think there would be much to do in those villages. I am told that at Rupert House, there are only half a dozen decent dwellings. There are 35 huts with families of 8 or 12 crammed inside. In the field of housing there is certainly much to do.

As suggested by some of the people living there, we could, for example, develop the forest for building material. There is even a sawmill that could be used to cut and saw and process wood for building purposes. That mill is idle. Local wood could be used to build houses; this in turn would provide employment for the local population.

A lot of other things could be developed. In the field of electricity, for instance. Rupert House has no electric power, no running water and, indeed, hardly any health facilities. I am speaking of Rupert House but the same conditions prevail more or less in every village along the coast of James Bay or of Hudson Bay. There, again, we could promote public health and develop public services, and train the local manpower in order to ensure the operation and maintenance of those services.

There is also another subject which, like the minister, I consider quite important, that is the municipal administration. I understand that soon the minister will make a statement which we have been expecting for a long time—with regard to the new government policy on the administration of Indian affairs. As far as the municipal administration is concerned, I think that we should grant the Indians a good deal more leeway to deal with the affairs of their own community.

For example, in almost every settlement—

[*English*]

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Bell: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the unanimous wish of the house that the hon. member should be allowed to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I shall try to be as brief as possible.

As I was saying, as far as those Indian villages are concerned, almost everyone of them has a Council chief. However, the chief and members of the council have practically no authority. They have no budget or almost none to administer so that the social problems which exist in those villages and communities, such as alcoholism or violence which as a rule is the result of the latter, are quite serious. The Indian chief and his council have practically no authority, no influence on their people, to fight that evil which prevails in every Indian or Esquimo group.

Therefore, if the government finally decides to grant the Indians increased authority similar to that which is found in our areas, so that they could administer their own affairs—they would certainly be in a position to improve their social conditions.

Therefore, this is a point to which I draw the minister's attention and for which I care very much because I think that if this could come about as soon as possible, there would be sensible improvements in those areas. There is no doubt that many things can be done to improve those areas.

Canada is particularly generous as far as helping underdeveloped countries is concerned. In our country, huge areas are underdeveloped and are only waiting for the funds needed to ensure their development.

Mr. Speaker, we could first encourage mining exploration since in the distant northern areas there are not many farming or lumbering possibilities. The subsoil of these northern regions is extremely rich in all kinds of minerals. We should encourage mining exploration and developments there, in order to bring in more people first, and to give employment to the Indians and the Eskimos.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to do in that field and we should do it as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Scarborough East): As I listened to the debate opened by hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I frequently thought I could hear myself speaking. I thought this particularly when emphasis was laid so clearly on attacking the past performances of all governments during the past several decades. I recognized the attack on the developing bureaucracy. I recognized the emphasis on a past which is indeed infested with grievances, as well as the emphasis placed by many speakers on the crucial importance of Indian affairs.

In this respect I was reminded of the private member's bill I introduced into this

house proposing amendments to the Migratory Birds Convention Act in the interest of restoring treaty provisions which have been breached unilaterally by an act of this parliament. However, I find myself in disagreement with many of the things said by spokesmen on the other side. In particular, I think there has been a failure to recognize the needs of the future as well as the need to clear up the problems of the past.

The basic need for the future is a massive social and economic development program, one which we have not yet mounted. I think there has been a failure to recognize—and this is a sensitive point among the Indian people—that substantial progress has been made in the past few years, by and large on the basis of Indian initiative. Enormous progress has been made in some provinces. I am thinking of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba where the Indian organizations have brought about a new kind of relationship between themselves and the provinces, and between the provinces and Ottawa. We have to recognize, therefore, that a good deal of this progress has been achieved largely as a result of Indian initiative. We should recognize that the capacity for change which is now developing in the Indian communities makes it all the more necessary for us to respond in an intelligent way.

We who sit on the government side of the house welcome this debate, the second which has taken place in the house on this general subject. Not only does it show the high importance attached by parliament to Indian policy but also, because the government, after conducting an intensive nine months review of established policy, is on the threshold of a comprehensive new approach, it takes place at a particularly opportune time. This review, in which two ministers were involved and which proceeded through 17 consultations with regional Indian groups across Canada, inadequate as those consultations were, ranks in the minds of many of us as the most significant of the many major policy reviews which have been launched since the beginning of this session. This work reflects the commitment of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to a new and higher order of justice for Indian and Eskimo citizens. It will affect directly nearly half a million Canadians of Indian origin who are expecting a new deal and who want a future of full and equal citizenship.

This review must involve much more than the consideration of the Indian Act. I am pleased that speakers on the other side have recognized this point. The Indian Act is only one element. A challenging, comprehensive and far-ranging approach to the future is needed. We welcome this debate, not knowing the contents of the new policy which is to be announced within the next few days, I hope, but assured that at least a meaningful dialogue with our Indian citizens has now begun, involving the whole government, not just the Department of Indian Affairs. This policy statement can only be another stage or phase. It is subject to development which will come from inputs by the Indian people. It cannot be seen as a conclusive answer to the many problems facing Canadians of Indian origin; it can be seen only as another step which is subject to the continuing and extensive consultation process, so that its implementation will be assisted by the people themselves.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I do not want to speak at any length today on what I hope will be a major policy statement to be made by the minister in the near future. My own views on Indian policy have been twice recorded this session in the house. I should like to take a few minutes simply to emphasize what I think should be some of the considerations surrounding the new policy and which will make for its success. I particularly want to emphasize the central need for flexibility in the new policy, and also the need for meaningful consultation with the Indian people.

This policy cannot be delivered, as it were, as another product of the government for a special group of clients. It has to come from the people themselves. This means that the broad outlines of any policy must be followed by consultation. Is there any doubt that in the past the low achievement of programs and policies and lack of momentum in this field can be attributed to the lack of clear objectives? Therefore clear goals must be recognized in this new policy, and all of us, Indians and non-Indians alike, will then have to confront the dilemma of implementing those new objectives.

From where must these goals and objectives come? I think the answer has already been given by the Indian people themselves—full and equal citizenship in the mainstream of Canadian life. Full and equal citizenship means more than simply equal opportunity; it means the substance of equality. It is this equality, without loss of identity as Canadians, in which people of Indian origin are

interested. The Indian choice is to be a contemporary person in Canada today while remaining an Indian. Indeed, it can be said of Indians today, I think, that they recognize that continuity as Indians and the preservation of an identity can be achieved only by entering into the mainstream of life as a contemporary person.

This, as I have said before, is a momentous turn in the lives of all of us in Canada. It is a significant and historic decision that is being made in Indian communities and means that they themselves must be centrally engaged in all of the decisions that implement that particular goal.

One product of consultation will, I believe, be that full and equal citizenship implies a planned and phased reduction, if I may use that term, of the special legal and administrative arrangements that today perpetuate separateness and which in themselves become discriminatory. It means consulting Indians on every phase of the process of eliminating over a time the Indian Act and the special department whose functions, I believe, can better be performed by other federal government departments. It also means consulting Indians and the provinces to ensure that the Indians become citizens of the provinces and receive a full range of services as well as accept the obligations of other provincial residents. It means a general decentralization of administration so that Indian communities will control, for example, as much of their own lands, economic development, education and other functions as do other Canadians through their own local government and the agencies of the provinces.

Self-determination brings with it new obligations as well as the benefits of freedom. Only through consultation and understanding will the Indian people be able to share in decisions as to the extent and pace of change that they wish to bring about. Full and equal citizenship means that Indian associations must also be brought into the discussions, because they can perform an essential role in terms of projecting the consensus of Indian communities. As I have mentioned before, hon. members will note the great progress the Indians have made in consultations with the provinces, particularly in the west, and how the issue has now been joined in the province of Ontario.

This will mean that the government will have to supply funds to the Indian organizations to enable them to do their job. They will need the assistance of expert personnel and resource trained people so they can study and fully understand the implications of going down one path or another to meet their goal of full and equal citizenship. It will not be an easy path to follow, and all of us will be confronted with many dilemmas.

Success will depend not on our enunciating a new policy but on the people themselves adopting such policy as their own. They cannot do this unless their own organizations are in the position of fully discussing with their own communities the meaning of change. We cannot hope to get a full response to new policy orientations unless we cope successfully with the complex issues and attitudes surrounding the question of treaties, claims and grievances.

The Indian treaties, apart from engaging the honour of the country, have for the Indians an enormous symbolic value, even though today the mainstream of federal policy and programs flows not from the requirements of the treaties but from the Indian Act and other sources. The deep importance that the Indians attach to the treaties naturally leads to a suspicion that major policy or program changes or shifts in the federal government mix of services may threaten the position of the treaties. Therefore it is essential that the new policy announcements and changes, which we now await, provide in themselves for intensive and close study by Indian communities and organizations of the treaty provisions and past grievances, and also of their relevance to the needs of the future. This has not been done hitherto. Both the past and the future should be viewed in a single context or as a single package. Settlement of past grievances, which is absolutely necessary to progress, should be part of the plans and programs of the future.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I believe, as a result of attending consultation meetings across Canada, that the Indians are ready to re-examine the past, not as a barren exercise but in order to balance the experiences and grievances of the past with the needs and possibilities of a fulfilled future. Continuing consultation is the only way in which the views and objectives of the Indian peoples as a whole can be made known and it is the only way in which the government can bring about a realignment of objectives. If we are to give our native peoples full equality as citizens and if special status and discriminatory aspects with regard to Indians are to be phased out, these people

must be assured that they are embarked on a course which will bring success. They can only have that assurance if they themselves are involved in every phase and stage of that process as it develops.

I have tried to emphasize the need for consultation and flexibility, as have all hon. members, in dealing with this question. Without going into details may I again stress that there is an absolute necessity for us to introduce social and economic programs of major magnitude to underwrite new government policies. It is not enough for us to remove from our law discriminatory provisions, to unwind, so to speak, the Indian Act, and to transfer certain functions from federal to provincial power. Even if all this is done after there has been consultation it will not be enough to remove the legal and administrative restraints blocking the way to equality. Equality in this area will not emerge if we do not recognize that some people are starting from farther back than others in their march toward equality.

We shall have to develop special programs of an economic and social nature and those programs will have to have for our Indians a substantive meaning. Our actions must proclaim, too, that we mean what we say about the continuation of the Indian identity. We will have to orient some of our programs of assistance to make sure that what is valuable in Indian culture and in contemporary forms of Indian expression survives. We have not done this in the past. Indians will need assistance to keep alive their contemporary spirit and the contemporary form of their traditions. They want to keep alive their expressive and performing arts. I place that very high on the order of priorities. Only if we give our Indians that assurance and only if we assure them that the course we are embarked on will meet with success in the social and economic sphere will equality emerge. Only in that way can the Indian identity continue to exist.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this afternoon to speak for a few minutes about the welfare of the Indian people of Canada. This year, 1969, when Canadians have often heard the phrases, "the just society" and "the age of participatory democracy", our country has been facing a problem that requires immediate attention, namely, the problem of the emergent Indian and Eskimo. The non-Indian world must be alerted to what it has not done in the past and to what must be done in future.

[Mr. O'Connell.]

As a member of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development it has been my privilege to travel from place to place in our great country and become better acquainted with the problems of our native peoples. Many meetings have been held during the past few months at the standing committee level. Also there have been many meetings in which the minister, his officials and representatives of Indian groups participated. What have been the results, Mr. Speaker?

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) spoke this afternoon and expressed grave concern about the government's tardiness. They complained that no positive conclusions have been arrived at with respect to proposed government policy on amendments to the Indian Act and with respect to the Indian Claims Commission which our first Canadians have long been waiting for. I must emphasize it is high time that the government moved more quickly and brought about action that will place our Indian and Eskimo peoples—my remarks, have mainly to do with our Indians although I am also concerned about Eskimos—on an equal footing with the white people. Personally, I am pleased to see that the Indians are taking initiatives to help their cause. They have organized the National Indian Brotherhood and the Indians recently held a conference in Ottawa in April which some 100 Indian leaders attended. In other words, the voice of the Indian wilderness has begun to ring from coast to coast. The Indians are beginning to give notice to Canadian society as a whole that they are emerging at last as a significant political force.

In my hand I have a pamphlet written by Mr. Boyce Richardson, a writer for the Montreal *Star*, who has put in phraseology more skilful than that at my command certain aspects of the Indian problem. I wish to read part of page 7 of the pamphlet. The heading at the top of the page is, "Race Has Shown Marked Success In Surviving Incredible Battering". The article following says in part:

> The Indians of Canada, like those of the Americas, have made a remarkably tenacious effort of survival. They survived, first of all, a systematic effort by the white man to destroy them, an effort which culminated in the series of treaties under which the Indians ceded almost the whole of Canada in return for a promise to set aside certain Crown lands "for the use and benefit of Indians."
>
> Since then, for 100 years, the Indians have survived the white man's assumption that they

were a vanishing race who would disappear in the fullness of time.

They are not a vanishing race, but a rapidly multiplying one. The present population of 250,000 is increasing at 5 per cent a year, a rate that would double the population in 14 years. This rate of increase is likely to become even faster, for today 60 per cent of the Indian population is under 21, and already considerable pressure of population is developing on the 6 million acres of Indian reserve lands.

I visited a number of reservations in my constituency and saw that the Indians who have accepted the white man's medicine—family allowances and social welfare benefits—are multiplying at such a rate that soon there will be no room on the reservations for all the Indians who wish to live there. I presume the same can be said for many other areas of this country. Indian leaders themselves say that we should absorb at an accelerating rate our native Indians into the mainstream of Canadian society and make sure they have the same status as the white man. In the long run that is the only way out of our difficulties.

It is true that many Indians are suspicious of the white man because of the many promises the white man has broken. All the same our leading Indians realize that there are great advantages in allowing their children to be educated. In some academic fields our Indians could take the lead. Other Indians hope to take advantage of our vocational training facilities and learn trades which will help them to find jobs in society. Once they have jobs they will soon have sufficient status.

In future I hope it will not be necessary for us to have an Indian Act. Several Indian leaders have said to me, "You know, you discriminate against us by having an Indian Act. Why do you not have a French act or a Ukrainian act, or other acts covering other ethnic groups in the country?" I can understand the logic behind such remarks. We are segregating the Indians by having an Indian Act. They do not wish to be segregated from the rest of society. They do not want a special status. The Indian is a proud man, Mr. Speaker. He merely wants a chance. Let us see that he gets it. In the meantime the government is responsible for rectifying some of the ills our Indian people are suffering from.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I now wish to quote from the article by Mr. Richardson which is headed, "Finds treaties, act provide no guarantee as expected".

Indians in small communities around Lake Nipigon, north of Lake Superior, have begun to discover by painful experience that the treaties and the Indian Act do not provide them with the guarantees that they thought they did—the same conclusion that Manitoba Indians have reached through legal study.

Most of the Indians in this area have moved off the reserves to new land, but they still regard their original reserves as "theirs"—a very doubtful conclusion.

I now quote from the paragraph under the heading, "Community problem":

He is, however, a man of immense experience in life who has worked at everything from bell boy to tugboat captain in the little towns and around the lakes of this extraordinary north country, and in his role as a community worker (though not from inside the official establishment) he has already won himself a remarkable position among these people.

Perhaps I can best illustrate the problems faced by Indians today, and the ambiguities produced by history and by official policy by describing some of these communities:

This writer goes on in his article to illustrate how the Indians are making a valiant effort to adapt in every way possible to the ways of the white man. I could go on at great length referring to this article because it is very knowledgeable. It explains the cultural life of the Indian as being full of drama and character.

The previous speaker referred to the possibility of providing Indians with better facilities to develop their artifacts, and place them at the disposal of other members of our society to enhance their economy.

I wish to refer to a situation in my own constituency of which I am sure the minister is aware. However, I feel it is an instance where the Indians themselves in that particular part of Canada would like to see some action. It would encourage them and also be an example to other Indians that our governments are moving to help to put them in a better economic position. I refer to the project known as Lost Hope Park. This has been developed through the co-operation of ARDA and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) under whose supervision ARDA now is.

This proposal has been studied and has now actually been approved. There was an agreement with the government of Saskatchewan, but it is now being held up at the Treasury Board level. I have received several inquiries lately regarding this project. In fact, I have placed questions on the order paper in this regard. I hope the minister will look into this particular proposal because it has the full agreement of both provincial and federal authorities and is now only a matter of

economics. The Indians in the Broadview area of Saskatchewan have developed a lot of initiative through this project which will enhance their own economic welfare. I am sure it would be of great encouragement to every Indian if the government could move in at the earliest possible date to see that this project reaches its culmination.

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, in this debate, as in the previous day's debate, there have been some thoughtful and constructive things said from all sides of this house in relation to our Indian people. Pee okoke sun nika mamook wawa kope huloima iktus, nika mamook wawa kope hiyu siaaah kah cole chahko illahee.

In connection with the north, I will deal specifically with one section of the committee's report, namely that dealing with Arctic sovereignty. The committee heard evidence indicating that Canadian sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic archipelago to the continental shelf in the Canadian Arctic is well established. However, the extent of sovereignty over waters within the archipelago is less certainly defined. The committee's recommendation is that prompt and positive action by the government is required to define the extent of Canadian sovereignty.

In these few minutes that I have I wish to suggest what that prompt and positive action should be. Essentially, we should primarily draw base lines headland to headland to include the entire archipelago and declare all the waters within those base lines to be Canadian waters. We cannot stop at this point because it would not be common sense to exclude the shipping of the world from passing between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans if this proves feasible. There should be an accompanying statement to our issuance of the maps showing the base line co-ordinates. In this statement Canada should proclaim that she recognizes the rights of ships of all nations to safe and innocent passage, not innocent passage alone, but safe and innocent passage for reasons I hope to make clear later in my remarks.

In my opinion, Canadians and Canadian governments have never had enough interest in their northern territories. They never had enough appreciation of them. For most of the years that the Territories have been part of this nation we have just occasionally reminded ourselves that there is something up there in the attic that is nice to have but we know very little about it. As Vilhjalmur Stefansson once said, if you can find any Canadian university graduate to offer you ten ideas on the north, at least nine of them would be wrong.

To be fair, there has been an immense improvement in the attitude of Canadian governments in the past 15 years. There was some awakening of interest during the years of the St. Laurent government, a considerable increase during the years of the Diefenbaker government and an interest through increased participation continued during the Pearson government. It is continuing to accelerate with this government. This is revealed in the annual budget figures in many ways. I will not deal with it, but I think it is felt here and it is also felt when you go into the north. We are taking more interest.

In some matters we are simply not taking enough interest. That is my feeling in the matter of our claim to the waters of the Arctic archipelago. We are not moving sufficiently fast or in a sufficiently positive way.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I would like to take a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the history of territorial claims, but not with the history of our land claims because they are not in dispute. Canada essentially followed the system adopted originally by the Czarist government of Russia and since followed by some other nations, the sector theory. We took the limits of the nation's borders east and west and we extended lines in a more or less pie-shaped form up to the North Pole. The Russians took the view and still take it—they are an extraordinarily zenophobic nation, and I am not suggesting we should follow them in this—that everything within the sector lines is Russian territory. I, myself think, and from my reading believe, that most experts in international law find it difficult to conceive of a nation claiming ownership of packs of ice and even open water hundreds of miles from the nearest land.

The Canadian view was slightly different. The architect of it was Senator Poirier, and he pressed for it about the turn of the century. The Senate eventually caused the government of Canada to make a declaration. The Canadian position was that we laid claim to all the lands which might be discovered within the sector enclosed by the lines. At that time we did not think very much of territorial waters. It was not an issue, but it is becoming an important one.

Although we have belatedly taken action, and after five years of delay the government

is at least moving to draw the baselines and enclose the inland waters of the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, we are still neglecting the Arctic—yet we do consider them our waters. I quote here from a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the house on May 15, found at page 8720 of *Hansard*, where he was quoting with approval the statement of a former Canadian minister of northern affairs:

> The area to the north of Canada, including the islands and the waters between the islands and areas beyond, are looked upon as our own, and there is no doubt in the minds of this government, nor do I think was there in the minds of former governments of Canada, that this is national terrain.

If it is national terrain, and I am speaking now of the inland waters, how precisely are we going to define it, unless we draw baselines and issue maps to the other nations which say clearly, "These are the limits of Canada's inland waters, and outward from these limits we claim three miles as territorial waters plus an additional nine as an exclusive fishing zone?" Of course this may be disputed, but Canada's claim to the archipelago and its waters does not rest upon one point alone. It does not rest merely upon effective occupation, although we have had that and it is undisputed.

There is also ground for the Canadian claim in that the islands are a natural geographical extension of the continental land mass which is Canda's. Without going into the detail of the theory there are precedents for waters within archipelagos to be claimed as a nation's internal waters. There is now a precedent for drawing baselines headland to headland, from island to island, and even from rock to rock, as has been done in Norway. Norway has established beyond dispute baselines of 40 miles. Well, if 40 why not a base line of 80 miles, or 120, or 150 or more? In the Arctic there are one or two places in which the baseline might have to reach an extent of 100 miles to pass from point to point, but we do have considerable legal support for drawing such extended baselines.

I have mentioned before that we have more of a claim than mere effective occupation of the Arctic. There are other claims which strengthen us, and there is one I have not yet mentioned. We have a specific historic claim to those waters because in 1906, when Canada was having one of its rare spasms of interest in the north, we sent the Canadian ship *Arctic* under Captain Bernier into those waters specifically to establish our claim to them. He came upon a foreign whaling fleet in there—Norwegian and American. He obliged them in those waters to observe Canadian regulations as to the taking of whales, and to pay licence fees. Further, he collected customs duties from those whalers on what was at that time probably considered open seas by the nations of most of the earth. Nothing could have been done more clearly and effectively to establish Canada's claim to those waters.

The equivocation came about in 1969, and not in 1903, because until we draw those baselines and display them, what does our claim to these waters really mean? This summer the American ship *Manhattan* is going to attempt to force her way through the Northwest Passage from east to west. When she enters Lancaster Sound at what point will her captain say, "I am in Canadian waters"? Will he say it at all? Will it be three miles seaward from a baseline drawn between Cape Liverpool on Bylot Island and Cape Cockburn on Philpots Island? It won't be if we don't say so. And if not there, where then? At what point in the passage of Lancaster Sound will the *Manhattan* be in Canadian waters, or at what point in Viscount Melville Sound or McClure Strait if she gets through to McClure? I say this because the pack ice from the Beaufort Sea will probably block that way, in which case the *Manhattan* will likely go down the Prince of Wales Strait. There will be no dispute at that point because at its narrowest it is only six miles across and we can claim three miles from each side.

But without baselines around the outer perimeter of the archipelago our claim to these waters is formless, and other nations can legitimately ask us, "where exactly do you make your claim?" Probably some nations might even undertake to tell us where they think our claim should be, and I do not think they will be generous if they make the choice. All this concern about the waters of the north and our sovereignty there has been sharpened because Prudhoe Bay, the great oil discovery, is transforming much of Alaska. With good fortune we are going to make a similar discovery in the Panarctic operation.

The *Manhattan* project finally has focussed our attention clearly and precisely on this question which we must answer. I would like to review that project briefly, although most hon. members by this time have probably read of it. The *Manhattan* is a supertanker of 115 thousand tons. She is being reinforced and fitted with a modified form of the Canadian Alex Bow ice-breaker plough. She

is owned by Humble Oil Company. The intention is to see if she can move through the Northwest Passage to Prudhoe Bay. If she can then it is expected that Prudhoe Bay oil can take the short way into the eastern United States or into Europe, because the shape of our planet is such that the Arctic actually is quite close to Europe. It surprises some people to learn, for instance, that when leaving Vancouver and driving as close as you can drive to Coppermine you go 1,000 miles inland and about 2,000 miles north, yet Coppermine is as close to Yokohama as is the city of Vancouver.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Perhaps there is no point in speculating on the chances of the *Manhattan* making this passage, but I have heard them estimated at about 50-50. She has a tremendous forward thrust, about 45,000 horsepower. Her reverse power is considerably less, something below 10,000 horsepower. If she does become wedged in the ice it will be necessary for the *John A. Macdonald* and the United States icebreaker *West Wind* to break her free. The experiment would then probably be a failure. Let us hope it is not, because if regular shipping could move through the northern ice this would be a great thing for all of us; not just the United States but Canada as well.

There is one interesting point in this regard, and that is whether the United States government asked our permission to put this paramilitary vessel, the coast guard cutter, through the Northwest Passage. When the minister appeared before the northern development committee some time ago he was asked this question, and he said: Yes, in effect they had. Under the Canadian-United States defence agreement it is common practice, or acceptable practice, for the United States government to inform us in the event of planes or ships entering Canadian air space or waters, and that this in effect constitutes permission. I hope the minister is correct and that the United States has adopted that interpretation, but I am by no means convinced that it has adopted that interpretation.

Those who saw a recent story in the New York *Times* in which the president of Humble Oil was discussing this great project—it was lengthy and interesting—would not have found anything to indicate that Canada was involved in any way. It is hard to believe that Canada is even aware these ships are passing alongside Canadian islands. His statement as to these waters is that there is an opportunity for a great international waterway to be

opened up by his ship. Personally, I feel it is a great pity that Canada is not putting the *Manhattan* through instead of the United States. Of course, it would be expensive, but so is our experiment with Panarctic. We have to risk some money to make money up there. I think it would have been worth it.

In 1913 when Steffanson was fully financed by the United States geographic society to explore the Canadian arctic and Sir Robert Borden was informed, he would not tolerate it. He put Canadian money into the expedition and it became a Canadian expedition with United States participation. In any event, the Steffanson explorations were Canadian.

I think Canadians are hoping that this crossing of the Northwest Passage will be successful. We should hope that a great waterway does open up there so that our ships and the ships of other nations can use it. You may ask why, then, should I be concerned as to sovereignty over these waters if we are to welcome the ships of other nations and offer innocent passage. There are no great fish resources there. There are some but they do not appear to be extensive in the Arctic. Why should we concern ourselves? Let's just draw the three mile plus the twelve mile straight lines along the shores of individual islands, and if the lines do not meet leave them as international waters. One might ask that, but there is more than one reason we should be concerned. I am going to outline one or two.

If we establish sovereignty, it will increase our responsibilities in the Arctic. If regular traffic develops through the Northwest Passage this country would be responsible for installing navigational aids and these, like everything else done in the Arctic, could be very expensive. I am pleased to learn that our Department of Transport is making a study of the cost of installing a Decca system in the Northwest Passage. Again, I feel the government is moving a little more slowly than it might. Our position would be better if that Decca system were put in on those islands by ourselves. We could put up a semi-permanent system along the side of the passage. We could then have charged the *Manhattan* a nominal fee for moving through on our Decca system. This country will be responsible for installing such a navigational system.

This is the more dangerous aspect of the situation. We may find ourselves tempted to say to the United States: These are your ships

and this is your oil you are moving out. You put the system in, you make the expenditure and then this will be your system. Now, we come into the dangerous part which involves territorial rights to the land. Let me quote briefly from two authorities who appeared before the northern development committee, one Dr. Carr and Dean Maxwell Cohen. Am I running short of time, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. St. Pierre: I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. I should like to quote what Dr. Carr said on this point. He recently wrote an article on the economic aspects of the Yukon. When I asked him what future threat to our sovereignty might exist, he said he saw no threat to sovereignty over the land mass of Canada for the moment. He then said:

> I think we just simply have to keep moving in the direction of insuring our sovereignty. I did not mention that the factors that tend to assist the encroachment on our sovereignty are improvements in transportation, air transport, under sea transport and various new developments in technology.

He went on to say:

> In those vast spaces, it would not be difficult for other countries to set up studies or research units here and there and eventually obtain squatter's rights and move on. The point I do make is that we must be more energetic and do more in terms of services for the north now than we used to when it was so difficult to reach the north.

Dean Cohen of McGill University said very much the same thing to the committee. He put it in these words:

> It is possible to argue that as technology improves exploitation must equally improve on the part of Canada to reinforce the idea that we effectively occupy the area and if we did nothing in the Arctic except visit when in fact technology provides now for real chances for exploitation, we might be weakening title if the sector and other theories did not support us.

We must consider the possibility that the United States might wish to put a navigational aid system in the Northwest Passage and that we might be sorely tempted to let them do that, to our own detriment.

In closing I wish to refer to another point. The *Manhattan* is comparatively small as a supertanker. She carries 112,000 tons. The latest ship to be built for Gulf Oil by the Japanese has a 300,000 ton capacity. The *Manhattan* is larger than the *Queen Mary* and if stood on end would be taller than the Empire State building. The latest ship built for Gulf is far larger than that again. I would ask hon. members to think of the *Torrey Cannon* disaster in the English Channel when this small tanker spewed out her oil and poisoned the beaches in England and France. She was a small tanker.

I would ask hon. members also to consider that the chief danger in a passage through the north is being trapped in the ice and crushed. What would happen if a supertanker the size of the one recently built for Gulf Oil were caught in the Arctic ice, crushed, and lost 300,000 tons of oil? It would mean that 75 million gallons of crude oil would be spilled out in the waters with temperatures from 33 degrees, to 34 degrees. I ask you to consider the size of the problem that would face us, the terrible expense and the almost incredible damage that would be done to the ecology of the Arctic. This is the reason we should have control of these waters and the power to determine what ships come into them. We should be able to determine that these ships are safely built and that disasters of this sort do not happen. We cannot have control unless we have sovereignty.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) — Agriculture — Quebec — Request for assistance to prevent bankruptcy among Quebec farmers; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)— Canadian National Railways—Pensions of retired employees; the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack)—Canadian National Railways—Lennox County—Protection of rights of farmers in expropriation proceedings.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—CONSIDERATION OF THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate. I shall be rather brief. I should like to begin my remarks by dealing briefly with the department of Indian affairs. I think it can be generally concluded that there exists today a great deal of mistrust between officials of the department of Indian affairs and the Indian people. The Indian people have witnessed a huge bureaucracy build-up within the department. As I pointed out a few days ago in my speech on the budget, in personnel alone an increase in excess of 50 per cent has taken place in the department in the last three years.

Much of the dissension which exists today between the Indian people, the government and those concerned with the administration of Indian affairs is due to poor liaison, lack of understanding and lack of a true, sincere and sympathetic approach in earnestly working, through co-operation, to overcome the numerous difficulties which exist among our Indian people. The concept of paternalism which has been the philosophy of the department of Indian affairs has to be scrapped. In its place I believe we must adopt a philosophy of sincerity and sound national conscience in order to overcome the social and economic inequalities which exists between the Indian and the white communities. The situation that exists today can only be termed as harmful in many ways when one looks at the complete picture of our Canadian society.

I believe the role of the department of Indian affairs must include the reparation of some of the government's shortcomings in the treatment of Indians. It must also include the neutralization of the ethnic tension which exists between the white and the Indian peoples. In addition to the normal rights and privileges of Canadian citizenship, I believe it is reasonable to assume that the Indian community possesses certain additional rights because they are, after all, charter members of the Canadian community. I believe the Indian affairs branch has a special responsibility to see that these additional rights in so far as citizenship is concerned are respected, and that the government and the Canadian people are educated to accept these standards. Rather than dictating to the Indian people what the department of Indian affairs thinks is right or wrong, the officials of the department should be concentrating upon the development of education, upgrading living standards and providing employment opportunities. This would demonstrate a true feeling of trust and understanding. At the present time the Indian affairs branch is a massive stumbling block which prevents the Indian people from achieving their hopes and aspirations. The Indian community is discriminated against through a rigid interpretation of policy. We should be placing the emphasis on development through a humanistic approach.

We cannot legislate rigorously. There are no cut-and-dried policies created through legislation which can provide a humanistic approach to achieving the aspirations and ideals of our Indian peoples. I submit—I am glad the minister is in the house this afternoon—that one step which would improve the relationship and understanding which exists between our Indians and the Indian affairs branch would be to immediately commence the recruitment of Indian personnel to man many of the offices in the department. As far as I am concerned, no one has a better understanding of the problems of Indians on or off the reserve than the Indian himself. I believe that no one in our society is more aware of the poverty, social injustice and economic degradation of our Indian people than the Indian himself. Therefore, I urge the minister to consider this matter in order that Indians may have better opportunities, greater responsibility and a more realistic stake in their destiny.

I should like to deal briefly with treaties and their interpretation, particularly in so far as they concern health and welfare services. Although the treaties between Her Majesty Queen Victoria and the Indians of British North America were instituted and negotiated by men of good will in what they collectively considered to be the best interests of the Indian people, there is no doubt in my mind that the treaties are now woefully outdated, impractical and in many cases meaningless. For example, many sections of these treaties are obsolete, such as one plow for every ten families; a yoke of oxen for every band, and a suit of clothes for the chief every third

year. Clauses respecting hunting and fishing rights, health and welfare services and education are grossly outdated and have lagged far behind the national progress of this country.

It is generally concluded, through the interpretation of these treaties, that health services were to be provided by the federal government as long as the sun shines and the rivers flow. But what have we today? With the advent of medicare we have much confusion, apprehension and dissension. We have an atmosphere of mistrust and an environment in which the Indian Association has urged all treaty Indians to boycott enrolment in the Alberta medicare program. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the Edmonton *Journal* of January 13 in order that the evidence in this regard may be on the record. The article is entitled "Indians urged to boycott medicare in premiums row" and reads in part as follows:

The Indian association of Alberta is urging treaty Indians to boycott Albert's medicare plan until the question of premium payments is resolved.

The association maintains that medicare premiums must be paid by the federal government as part of their treaty rights respecting guarantees of health care.

Harold Cardinal, spokesman for the association, said the federal health and welfare department has indicated it will pay premiums for treaty Indians only on the basis of need.

The Indians Affairs Department, meanwhile, claims national health and welfare must pay any premiums necessary to ensure coverage on Indian reserves.

"It's not an issue with us," Mr. Cardinal said. Indians feel the federal government must pay the premiums for them, and they don't care which department does it, he added.

• (5:30 p.m.)

He said, however, Indians wish to ensure that their treaty rights will be protected. They also want assurance that their medicare premiums are not turned over to the provincial government, if the federal government carries out its policy of turning medicare back to the provinces after five years.

"We want assurance that the federal government will pay all our health costs in future, as they have in the past," Mr. Cardinal said. This is part of the historic treaty rights, he added.

Farther on, the article reads:

There has been "confusion" at the regional level between the two departments, over the question of premiums, Mr. Cardinal said. He said he hopes the two ministers will clarify the matter.

In the meantime, treaty Indians are being advised to refuse to register for medicare, he added.

Today I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) a question regarding this specific subject and he advised me that he will be attending the Indian Association conference in northern Alberta tomorrow or on the weekend. I presume that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) will attend also. The Minister of National Health and Welfare suggested that he will urge the Indians to enroll. I should like to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian people in my province want some clarification of this matter, and rightly so. Certainly, they want some assurance from the federal government and some guarantee that payment will be made for the health services as prescribed under the respective treaties. After all, health is of prime concern to the Indian people. They were assured that their health services would never be curtailed. Now, they are being asked to produce an indigent or hospitalization card. I think that some clarification is due to them to indicate how we are going to classify those who are indigent and those who are not.

My contention is that those who are living on the reserve are entitled to be granted health services under the terms of the treaty. In my own province of Alberta the government has built a so-called medicine chest. However, on many occasions it has been reported to me that many of these people are denied these services and facilities. One individual from the Saddle Lake reserve suggested that they are asked to be sick on certain days. "If I am sick on the reserve on Thursday, I may have to wait until next Wednesday to get into the hospital", he said. I believe that this is a breach of promise and I hope that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of National Health and Welfare will clarify this matter. I hope that it will be clarified well before the end of June because, as hon. members may or may not be aware, the medicare program is due to go into effect in Alberta on July 1. The deadline for enrollment is the end of June.

I should now like to touch briefly on some aspects of the economic development and of the conditions on reserves as well as the plans and programs the government intends to implement to overcome the deplorable conditions which exist there. I think that the Indians, and the public in general, cannot understand why the government has continued to disburse funds on welfare and mere subsistence allowances. I believe this money would be much better spent on developing work projects and developing industry on or

near the reserves which would make possible the employment of Indians and thus make them self-sustaining. This is certainly one of the areas in which I believe the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion could play a very useful role. I think that officials of the department should take a long hard look at the possibility of encouraging and promoting industry on or near the reserves. After all, this is one of the major problems with respect to the employment of Indians on reserves. Indians, just like any other human beings, want to spend their evenings and weekends with their families on the reserve. Therefore, I believe there is a great deal of merit in developing industry in or near the reserves.

The housing, the sanitation and the water supply in the majority of reserves is deplorable. There is great poverty. For example, in my own riding of Vegreville, in which the Saddle Lake reserve is to be found, the same conditions exist. I have had much correspondence with the minister with regard to housing. He was good enough to despatch two of his officials to the reserve and we made a survey. Our survey revealed the fact that we need 100 houses on the reserve to meet the demand in the next five years. That comes to an average of 20 homes a year. The average number of homes that have been built in the last five years has been seven or eight per year. We are certainly never going to catch up unless we upgrade our program. When we look at the deplorable situation, the low standard of living and the poor housing on the reserves I believe we are fair in saying that the government and the Indian affairs branch have failed. Why have they failed? Because they have not given the Indians the opportunity to achieve their own destiny through active involvement, through participation, and through the acceptance of responsibility in discharging many of the numerous administrative, social and economic activities which exist on the reserve.

We hear it said in some quarters that the Indians have no pride. Well, they do not have too much to be proud of, particularly in view of the paternalistic approach of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I say we should give them opportunities and responsibilities and they will soon experience a deep sense of pride.

I should like to refer again to my own constituency of Vegreville and the Saddle Lake reserve. Recently, the band council embarked on a very ambitious project of clearing something in the order of 15,000 acres of prime arable land. This project has provided employment, administrative experience and responsibility and has instilled a sense of pride in the Indians. It has had a terrific impact on Indians as is shown by the decrease in welfare. In addition, a prefab housing plant was established and is continuing to operate. It constructs homes for use on the reserve, and it also has had very good effects. It has developed an incentive in Indians to increase their skills, to take post secondary courses and, for example, to attend the school of agriculture in the neighbouring town of Vermilion. Some have also taken up carpentry. All this has instilled a sense of pride and responsibility.

These programs have been administered through the local band council and they have instilled a sense of responsibility. People are proud to have a say in their future and in their destiny. I hope that the minister will continue to encourage these types of programs because they will bring nothing but good to the Indian people and to Canadians in general.

I should like to conclude my remarks by reminding the minister that since he is in the process of writing a policy or a position paper on the new Indian Act, I hope he recognizes that Indians also are a changing people and that future policies must be flexible and adaptable to change. I urge that he incorporate and utilize the talents of our Indians to solve the numerous problems which we have created together and which have accumulated over the years. The Indians of this country are not interested in hearing any more words or seeing more complicated legislation and red tape. They want a reaffirmation of their rights and some positive action to overcome the complexities of their disparities so that they too may have the opportunity to participate in the benefits which other Canadians have had.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that in suggesting that one of the days be used to examine the report of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development the opposition has shown, I suppose I might say for once, a great deal of good judgment. I am happy, as I know every member of the house is, that the opposition should have chosen this subject for discussion

today. I think the spirit which has been shown by all members indicates the concern and the honest confusion which exists in the minds of so many of us in this house, and of so many Canadians, with regard to the future of the Indian people.

We hear constant references to the Indian and Eskimo people and the circumstances which have existed in the past. We continually hear advice as to what should be done in the future. As a Canadian who is not of Indian background I feel somewhat reluctant to become involved in this debate. I believe the Indian people of Canada are beginning to show that they, too, have ideas about what their destiny should be.

What has been happening in the past two years or so, community development programs, education programs, housing programs, schemes for economic development and, what is more, the consultation which is going on between the government and the Indian people, are an indication that the Indian people are ready to take upon themselves much of the responsibility which in the past was exercised by government. The minister has promised that shortly there will be a statement on the government's position with respect to questions affecting the Indian people. I do not wish to get involved in giving advice to the minister. I will merely say that I trust the statement to be made will not become a political football. I hope it will be left to the Indian people to determine whether or not it is satisfactory. I hope it will be left to the Indian people to produce alternatives if what the government has said is not what they want. I, for one, believe the role of parliament should be limited to satisfying ourselves that whatever the Indian people want is carried out.

In the Northwest Territories, as in other parts of Canada, we have seen significant changes in the Indian way of life, in Indian attitudes, and in the attitudes of the Eskimo people. I should like to tell members of this house about a society which was formed by the Indian people in the community of Fort Smith. Historically, the Indian and Métis people of Fort Smith had a difficult time breaking into the government establishment. There was a problem of communication, a problem of economics and education. About three years ago a group of local people decided that they would form an organization to help themselves. This group, known as the Thebache society, assumed, in effect, responsibility for the economic development of their own community. The manager of the society was a former heavy equipment operator for the Department of Northern Affairs. His work force consisted of people from all parts of the community. Race really did not make much difference. The group was able to fulfil contracts offered by the municipal government, the territorial government and the federal government. In the first three years hundreds of thousands of dollars of income were made available to residents of Fort Smith as a result of the initiative and action taken by the Thebache society.

Groups such as this could become cornerstones for the kind of creative activity, the kind of leadership which we hope will come from within a community, and I hope the government will take cognizance of this situation. I am sure any hon. member who has had experience of work of this sort can report the same kind of achievements. Earlier this afternoon the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) referred to me as parliamentary secretary—I think he was intimating I was parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development. However, Mr. Speaker, as you intimated when you recognized me, I am the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I want to make this clear in anticipation of what I shall have to say in the next seven or eight minutes. On two occasions in the last few years, the committee has visited the north, once in the summer and once in the winter. I think this has been a good learning experience for members from the south who would not normally have an opportunity to see this wonderful part of Canada.

I know that in the last parliament some of the strongest supporters of the idea of northern development were members of the committee from all parts of the house. Members had an opportunity of meeting the commissioners of the Northwest Territories and of the Yukon Territory. They had meetings with members of both councils, including the appointed members of the Northwest Territories council. They became familiar, as far as the Northwest Territories were concerned, with the Carrothers report.

• (5:50 p.m.)

By way of background, in 1965 the then minister of northern affairs, recognizing the restlessness of the people in the Northwest Territories in regard to the administration of their own affairs, appointed as Commissioner,

Dean Carrothers, to examine the future of the political, social and economic development of the north. This commission reported to the minister in October 1966.

Basically, the recommendations of the Carrothers commission were that the then administration, which was centrally located in Ottawa under federal auspices, be transferred to the territorial government and moved to the north; that the powers of the council be expanded; that the terms of reference of the elected members of the council be widened; and that government be brought close to the people. Much has happened since that period. The capital, Yellowknife, has been developed. The territorial government, the newest government in Canada, is on the ground and has taken over much responsibility of a provincial nature. But that is where it ends.

When the announcement was made of the location of the capital in February 1967, the indication was that the Federal government's position on further political development would be made known shortly. Two and a half years later we are still waiting for an announcement. The Northwest Territories council is in session in Yellowknife, and the members of that council are critical of the lack of a statement. They have said to the minister that they must hear from him; that the minister must come to the north and tell them what their political future is to be.

I believe the minister would like to be in the position to do this. He may have decided what should take place in the north; whether or not we should be divided; whether or not the size of the council should be increased; whether or not we should continue to have appointed members; whether or not the councillors should have the right to set their own indemnities. But I am more than a little concerned that up to this time we have heard nothing.

I tell the minister in all sincerity that this statement must come and has to come before the conclusion of the present council session. I say that to the minister because I believe that his relationship with the elected members of the Northwest Territories council, the appointed members and the average citizen in the north, depends on whether or not this statement is forthcoming.

I regret that I have to say this to the minister in this manner, but I believe the role of the federal government in the north during the next number of years is greatly dependent on the kind of mutual trust and understanding that is developed between the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, his commissioner in the Northwest Territories, the Northwest Territories council and the people. In my travels in the last three or four months I have become aware that the people of the north are restless. They are looking to the minister for a statement, a statement that will show the kind of leadership that can be given in the transfer of responsibility.

I have said on more than one occasion that at this stage of our development in the north we are not talking of provincial status or quasi-provincial status. We are saying that we want the right to run our own affairs and to make the kind of decisions that affect a person's everyday life. I hope the minister is able to convince his colleagues in the cabinet that he is under severe pressure, or, if I may use the expression, that he is under the gun to produce. And produce he must. He must produce by Friday of next week.

Mr. Barnett: Or else.

Mr. Orange: It all helps, yes. This may sound like an ultimatum but it is not.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Why not?

Mr. Orange: What I want to impress on the minister and on some of his colleagues in the cabinet is that we have waited long enough, that his relationship with the people in the north is dependent upon when he can come through with this most important document.

Before I conclude there is one other matter I should raise in relation to the sort of thing this particular minister has done, though those who preceded him took the first steps. I refer to consultation with the people affected, not only the Indian people but all people in the north. I hope this is the sort of relationship that will develop with regard to our national parks. In calling it six o'clock may I say that in this day and age I think consultation is so important that we must have it in all phases of our activity.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I heard many comments worth listening to on this subject affecting Indians and northern affairs. I found especially interesting the speech of the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) who touched on a subject matter somewhat different from that dealt with by other hon. members. In one sense he was promoting new ideas and I hope the minister paid close attention to him. We can do something worth while in the area to which the hon. member referred.

I wish to deal with a theme with which most hon. members dealt with this afternoon, the theme of the native peoples of Canada. I am concerned about the future of these people. I wish I had had the chance of hearing the minister's speech before making my own comments since what he has to say could easily alter what I have to say. The other day I asked him what the government's policy is in this area. I understand he will give us his answer before the end of next week. I want to make some remarks in order to make sure he does not forget that we expect him to make a statement.

A short time ago when consultation meetings were going on in Ottawa I had the good fortune to treat one Peter Dubois to lunch. He is an Indian from my province of Saskatchewan. He told me that when the Indians controlled North America they had a good educational system which was flexible and served their needs. They also had a code of morals and ethics, and an economic system. The only area in which they failed was immigration policy. He said they had a poor immigration policy. It was second class. Indians can at least joke about themselves when they look back on their history, their problems, and the mistakes they made. But they are concerned about the future.

We took their land and left them to live on reservations. We left them the poorest of poor land which they could not make a living on even if they were exceptionally able farmers. In exchange we offered them our way of life, our habits, our language, our sense of justice, etc., whether they wanted to accept these things or not. We pay civil servants high salaries to administer Indian affairs. We give aid to Indians. We call it social aid but it is charity and handouts, call it what you will. You know, some Indians look on the department of Indian affairs as a make work project for white men. White men are making work for high priced civil servants who are not too happy sometimes about the names Indians call them.

There are five Indian reservations in my constituency. Having visited them I have become acquainted with many people. I have hired some Indians to work on my farm and discovered that Indians, too, are people. I want to discuss some of the complaints and observations the Indians have made as individuals. I would also like to deal with how the department of Indian affairs affects them by what they do or do not do. An Indian on a reserve who is idle receives a form of social aid which will help him to survive. If he tries to get ahead by farming or owning a small business, it is like pulling hen's teeth to get assistance from the department. Have any hon. members ever applied for social aid through the department of Indian affairs? It is a very awkward and slow procedure. If you want assistance in order to farm or have your own business, you might receive it this time next year, if you are lucky. Some feel it is so awkward they do not even bother applying for it.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Another complaint Indians have made to me is that Indian agents who understand them are quickly moved from the post they hold. I think this is a valid complaint they are making. These people who understand the problems of the Indians are asked to move by the department of Indian affairs. I received a complaint from a magistrate. He said the Indian cannot get drunk on the reserve and cannot afford to hire a hotel room, so where is he to get drunk but on the street. When this happens the reaction is: there's a drunken Indian; get a policeman and throw him in jail. What is the magistrate to fine this man if conditions for him are not the same as they are for the white man? If we are going to give the Indian justice, he should be treated as an equal of the white man.

The leader of the Creditiste Party has suggested a French speaking person in Quebec or Ottawa should be entitled to have his trial conducted in French. I ask the members of the Creditiste Party, if an Indian gets drunk or commits a misdemeanor in Quebec in what language is his trial conducted? It is conducted in French. In my part of the country his trial is conducted in English, not in Cree,

Huron or Montengnais. These were the original people on our continent.

I think the minister of Indian Affairs should have a heart to heart talk with his colleagues the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) as some of the work of the Department of Justice in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon is still being farmed out. There is no Crown prosecutor in that area and that is the reason the work is being farmed out. One is never sure who the Crown prosecutor will be. It reminds me of something said by the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) who earned his living as a humorist writing a column for a Vancouver newspaper. He discontinued writing the column because he found it very awkward to be in this house and still write a humorous column for a Vancouver newspaper. I am a farmer from Saskatchewan and I find it awkward to run my farm from Ottawa. I believe it is equally difficult to administer justice in the Yukon Territory from Ottawa.

I wonder if the eloquent, patrician, well paid, well educated civil servants in Ottawa really understand what the problems are out there? They should go and live with the people to understand the background of these people and the conditions they have to tolerate? In that way they may have a better idea of what justice is all about. I strongly urge the minister to look into this matter.

There is one other area which is quite disturbing to me, that is the problem of unemployment in the north. This was mentioned by some hon. members this afternoon. Although it is a problem all over Canada, it is the responsibility of the federal government to a larger degree in the Yukon and Northwest Territories. I suggest the Indians affairs branch should have personnel officers to help Indians or Eskimos when they move to a new job and change their way of living. We frequently hear of Indians or Eskimos who get a job, stay for a short time and then leave because of emotional problems or some other factor. I suggest these personnel officers could counsel these people, as it is very awkward when they cut themselves off from one way of life and then find they are unable to do well in another.

Another matter I would like to mention is something I have been told by young people. These are people who are attending university or are graduates. They are clever people and they have done well. However, I am surprised at the bitterness among them and their lack of trust in not only the Indian affairs branch but of all white people. As a member of parliament, I was also included in that sense of distrust as they really do not trust anyone. They feel that many years of promises have not brought them what they wish. It may be that the general public have not accepted or recognized these young people. Possibly they still treat them as second class citizens; I don't know. This is an area in which we should improve our relations with these young people.

I would now like to deal for a moment with the matter of Arctic sovereignty. One of the reasons Arctic sovereignty has come to the fore lately relates to the possibility of oil in that area, both on the land and under the sea, and the value of that oil. I am hopeful oil will be found in that area, as there is sediment there of the type found in Alberta and Saskatchewan. In all likelihood there will be more oil found in that area than in these two provinces combined. What concerns me in this respect is the problem of future markets.

As a wheat farmer, I have encountered a great deal of disturbance in our area because of the lack of markets. At the present time in Alberta oil is being produced at only 45 per cent of capacity. We are now developing more oil wells in the Yukon, Northwest Territories and in the high Arctic. I am quite disturbed about our national oil policy. I strongly urge the minister to announce a policy which will give some direction to our oil people because they are very concerned about this matter. The name of the game in oil is markets. If you cannot sell oil, which is expensive to produce, what good is it? We should look at it as a national resource and see that the market is developed in an orderly fashion.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): It is a pleasure for me to voice my personal opinion in this very interesting debate on policies governing the Indian affairs of Canada.

While listening to some of the speeches made by our friends in the opposition, I have heard some very interesting statements and I have tried to listen to them with as much attention as possible.

Among other things, it has been said that the Indians should be treated the same as the white population, that their rights should be recognized and especially that ancient treaties should be honoured.

Some hon. members of the opposition have attributed to the minister some hostility

towards the Indians. It was even said that the Indians would be opposed to any legislation that would be enacted by the government until they are assured that those ancient treaties would be honoured as they should.

The minister has also been accused of not doing his duty. It has even been said that the Indians in Canada no longer have any confidence not only in the government of Canada but also in the provincial governments, and that they were deliberately being relegated to the most isolated, barren areas in Canada.

The last speaker, who is a good friend of mine, the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley, (Mr. Thomson) quoted a phrase, with which I understood he agreed, saying that the Indians had a good education system and highly advanced ethics when, centuries ago, they were masters in this land.

I have great respect for the Indians. I have known several of them for whom I had much esteem, having worked with them, made trips in the North with them when I was practising my profession.

But, although I respect them highly, I also respect the ancestors of the white people. And, when I heard the remarks of the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley, it struck me as very similar to saying that when our paleolithic ancestors were hunting, gathering food to survive, they had an education system superior to ours and that we should, we, Europeans and North-Americans, go back to the paleolithic education system.

I think that in Canada, our respect and our love for the Indians are increasing. Is there an employment problem among the Indians? Of course, but this problem is becoming more and more world wide because of the development of our society, because of automation and of technological progress.

As for Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic regions, it is a very important aspect of Canadian politics which should not be forgotten. Therefore, it is good for hon. members to remind occasionally, as often as possible, the minister and the government that it is more and more necessary, at least to claim possession periodically of these far northern areas which certainly belong to us and which will later yield resources that will help our economic development.

This third report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development is indeed most interesting and I think that every hon. member, regardless of his political party, should first congratulate the members of this committee for the remarkable study and observation work they did during their last trip in northern Canada. It is indeed a good thing to see that, at the beginning of their report, the members of the committee mention that in the course of their northern trip they noticed a vigorous and healthy economic growth in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon.

We stress the problem of employment, as I said a while ago, because it is always an urgent problem.

There are many problems to solve, not only in the employment field but in all other fields dealt with in this report. Are we going to say that this government has not taken these last years very positive action, apart from helping the native people of Canada to solve their employment problems? The same could be said of education, housing, arctic sovereignty, friendship centers for the Indians who come to live in our cities, handicraft problems among the Indians, electric power in the north, which is in my opinion a pretty difficult problem to solve, on account of the enormous distances and sparse population in those vast territories.

There remains the tourist aspect of certain areas to be dealt with. As concerns Dawson City, when I was a member of the committee on northern affairs a few years ago, I saw that the area of Dawson City—that already old city that was so active at the time of the gold rush—is one of the most interesting as far as the tourist industry is concerned and there is still much to do there.

But having looked into the present government program and the estimates for the current fiscal year, can we say that the government and the minister do not want to do anything for the Indians? On the contrary, I think that in that field, the government is striving harder than ever.

• (8:30 p.m.)

If we consider, for example, item L-40 in the estimates for this fiscal year, it is aimed at increasing to $4,300,000 the amount authorized for loans to Indians and Eskimos for the construction and the purchase of houses, up from $2,300,000, while in 1967-68, it was only $1 million.

For the entire program to which are allocated items 1 and 5, the estimates for this year amount to $175,159,000, while last year they totalled $135,446,000, an increase of $20,574,000. And if we examine that program and

those estimates, we will see that it is the same for all the other items.

Allow me to refer to a publication of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which gives facts and figures about Indian affairs, and which was published a few years ago. It is obvious the figures are not recent, but we can see that already, at that time, the policy of the present government in the field of Indian affairs was constantly improving, as was the situation of the Indians and the economic organization of the territories where they live.

Whether the figures relate to Indian handicraft, education, housing (construction and repairs), we always note the same progress.

When comparing the general expenditures for 1965 and 1966, in the fields of education, welfare, economic development and administration, including the special fund of British Columbia, they amounted to about $81 million for the fiscal year 1965-66 and $104 million for the following year, an increase of over $24 million.

With regard to engineering and to capital expenditures, including the construction of roads and bridges as well as other works relating to water distribution systems in 1961-62, for instance, the total votes allotted in this connection amounted to $1,420,000. In 1966-67 they were $3,845,000, nearly four times more.

Regarding education, the total expenditures in 1961-62 were $6,944,000, and in 1966-67, $11,418,000, that is nearly twice as much.

As for economic development, the amount spent in 1961-62 was $446,000 and in 1966-67, $2,085,000.

As far as the housing program is concerned, government expenditures for 1961-62 amounted to $2,254,000, and for 1966-67 to $8,226,000.

I think we might say, in the light of those figures, that things could be better for the Indians and their economic development, but we are doing a great deal at the present time as we did in the past. And now the Canadian government is doing its utmost to increase even more the well-being not only of the Indian people, but of every Canadian citizen.

May I be permitted, before concluding my remarks, to inform the house of some needs that are felt by a few Indian bands in my own region, along the Lower St. Lawrence river and in Gaspé.

In Gaspé, there still exist two reserves of Micmac Indians who lived in the area already under the French régime and account for approximately 15 per cent of the population.

In passing, I wish to say that on the Maria reserve, for instance, a new school for the neighbouring Indians has just been built and that 80 per cent of the costs, if not the full costs, have been paid by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to remind the minister that in Gaspé, on those two reserves, many houses are in poor shape. In fact, many houses have neither running water nor bathrooms or, as we say, no sanitation nor water supply.

One important question is the order of the day of the Micmac reserve of Saint-Louis-de-France, at Maria, in Gaspé. There now exists a trading problem with regard to handicraft. For a long time, if not for always, the Indians on that reserve have specialized in the weaving of baskets. Occasionally, as is the custom, they trade those for mocassins, slippers and other handicraft products with the Indians of the Lorette reserve. As far as the reserve in Maria is concerned, it could have quite an interesting market with the United States, New York particularly, at the present time. Because they have to pay high customs duties, the Indians are loath to develop such a business which would be very profitable to them. On the other hand, the chief of the reserve, Mr. Léonard Jérôme, came to Ottawa recently to meet with officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He pointed out that matter to his member of parliament, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard). He also mentioned that products imported from Japan were advertised as being made by Indians of his reserve and that it was quite detrimental to their business.

On the other hand, Indians of both reserves and citizens as well who visit those reserves complain about the sorry condition of the highways. They would be most interested in seeing the government give special attention to their repairs and improvement.

For many reasons, I think, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development might be interested in establishing on the reserve at Restigouche a museum which would have the advantage not only of stirring up the interest of Indians and visitors, but also of developing the economy of that area.

A few years ago, the Capuchin Fathers of the parish of Restigouche, who minister to the Indians of the area, discovered the ship of

the Marquis de Malause, a French naval officer, whose ship is reported to have sunk in the Restigouche river, in the vicinity of the reserve, during the last wars between the French and the British.

They located the wrecked ship, and they are now proceeding with further excavations.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that if the department could take some interest in this particular warship and other details related to its foundering, it might improve the status of the Restigouche Indian band, boost their economy, attract tourists and have other advantages, not only for the reserve, but for all the people of the area.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation of the minister's drive, and congratulate him on the initiative and decision he has shown whenever problems, greater or lesser, occur in the field within his responsibility. To illustrate this, I would like to recall briefly one field where he recently put up a brave and successful fight.

His efforts, among other things, without mentioning the touristic and, in particular, the economic angles, will have the effect of providing employment for some people in the Gaspé Peninsula, not only to the Indians to which I referred a moment ago, but also to the white people, to other citizens of the area. I want to point out the positive and spirited manner the minister has displayed during the debate on the setting up of the Forillon Park.

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate having the opportunity of saying a few words on this subject quite so soon, but I welcome the time now that I have it. We have under discussion a motion concerning the third report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Like other hon. members, I was interested in the speech made this afternoon by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre), who dealt with one specific item of the report in which the committee recommended that prompt and positive action by the government is required to define Canadian sovereignty.

I think it can be fairly said that the hon. member's speech dealt with that recommendation of the committee in rather concrete terms which I found very interesting. Generally speaking, I felt his proposal was one that I would be able to support. For the most part, however, the discussion this afternoon tended to centre more on matters which are not referred to in the report of the committee. The committee report pays particular attention to the situation of the native peoples of Canada. Its report contains headings which deal with jobs, education, housing, friendship centres and handicrafts.

No one in this house would deny that these matters are important and are very real questions with which the committee should properly wrestle. However, Mr. Speaker, I feel I should enter this discussion at the point at which it was introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). That hon. member introduced into our discussion an area that is not touched upon at all by the report of the committee. In my judgment this represents a serious omission on the part of the committee, which otherwise presented a well-rounded report for a committee of this kind. I am not saying this by way of criticism of the committee, because I realize there are limitations upon the matters a committee may include in its report. I mention this matter because, despite the importance of parliament being concerned with such matters as jobs, education and housing for the Indian and Eskimo peoples, the more fundamental question of the relationship of the rest of us to these people is at the core of what we should be discussing today.

All the well-meaning efforts that may have been made in the fields of housing, employment opportunities, retraining, and so on, will have missed the point unless we in this parliament are prepared to come to grips with what in my opinion is the fundamental and basic manner in which we should deal with this group in the Canadian society. Reference has been made to the fact that a statement of new policy is shortly to be forthcoming from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien). The hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) touched upon this subject in a speech which I thought was able and constructive. He referred to the fact that this comprehensive statement of new policy will shortly be made after an intensive, nine months review.

I confess that I do not await the statement with quite the same degree of optimism as that displayed by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, because on a number of occasions when it has been said we were on the

verge of a comprehensive statement of new policy we have heard from various ministers, statements which have not lived up to expectations. The minister who now occupies this rather important and arduous post will, I hope, succeed in his portfolio and have time to get his teeth into the questions that need to be dealt with. It is unfortunate, whatever may be the reasons behind it, that for quite a long time we have not had a minister in this portfolio who remained long enough to come to grips with the problems that must be solved.

I remind the minister that since the Liberal government assumed office we have had in this portfolio, if my list is complete, Mr. Favreau, Mr. Tremblay, Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Laing in rather quick succession. In the period before that we had Mr. Fulton, Mrs. Fairclough, and for a brief period Mr. Bell. I mention this as one of the reasons for the long procrastination in really coming to grips with the essential problem of the recognition of the rights of these people, as referred to by my colleague the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson).

The hon. member for York-Scarborough referred to these people having full and equal citizenship in the mainstream of Canadian life without loss of their identity. If I heard him correctly, he referred to the fact that it was not enough simply to unwind the department of Indian affairs or the Indian Act. I agree with that sentiment. I have said before in this house that in my opinion the core of this problem lies in unwinding the effects of colonialism, which covers a much broader area than that covered by the Indian Act or the department of Indian affairs.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I was intrigued by the remarks of the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley to the effect that Indians had a good economic and educational system but a very poor immigration policy. He said this with that quiet sort of humour that the Indian people display with regard to their position and relationship with the rest of us. The hon. member's remarks reminded me of a discussion I had with the people of an Indian community in my constituency. We got into a rather similar area of discussion which came to the point of my suggesting that because we call these people Indians we tend to lump them all together as it were, whereas at the time Europeans began to arrive on this continent there was no more relationship or kinship between people from the St. Lawrence Valley and those from British Columbia, than there is today between the people of Finland, for example, and Malaysia.

I suggested to the people with whom I was talking that if Columbus had thought he had discovered China instead of India, they would all be Chinese. This remark seemed to catch their fancy and we had one of those beautiful, quiet sessions of laughing about it. I suggest to the minister that if this had happened he would now be the minister of Chinese affairs, even though this would not involve him in some of the matters in which we understand his colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is involved.

One of the aspects of this whole situation with which the house has been called upon to deal from time to time centres on the reference to the idea of an Indian claims act. The whole question is in many respects one which should take precedence over any revision of the Indian Act or decision to abolish the Indian Act. My own experience after hearing various ministers introduce bills throughout the years on the subject of Indian claims makes me more sceptical than the hon. member for York-Scarborough as to the nature of the shining light of policy which may be expected to come from the present minister. I recall a bill being introduced with considerable fanfare on this subject in 1963. First reading was given on December 14. In due course the bill reached a stage where consideration was to be given to its terms in consultation with the Indian people. Well, Mr. Speaker, a bill supposedly based upon the results of this consultation was introduced on June 21, 1965—and it was identical in all important respects with the one which had been introduced in 1963. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) refers to the need to deal with Indian claims, but I suggest that if we are going to seek once again to deal with these claims in terms of either of the bills introduced in 1963 or 1965 we might as well forget about the whole idea.

Something much more fundamental is needed. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said we were dealing, now with a different ball game, and this is the thought which has been going through my mind. The sweep of events in the last few years has so outdated any action contemplated so far by this parliament that we really need to begin all over again, though I realize this is scarcely possible. I should like to remind hon. members of a plan for dealing

with Indian claims which was put forward by my hon. friend from Skeena (Mr. Howard) and myself at the time the bills to which I have referred were under consideration. We advanced the idea that the claims commission should, as it were, belong to the Indians—that it should work for the Indians by presenting their claims; that it should not leave in Indian hands the work of marshalling the necessary evidence, and so on. Such a commission would constitute a real step forward in the context of the realities of the situation today.

Some hon. members may recall that when dealing with the two former bills my hon. friend for Skeena and I attempted to present a substantive amendment on second reading, one which reversed the concept of the commission set out in the bill. Instead of the commission being an agent of the Crown it would be a court of Indian claims, one which would, as far as possible, lie beyond the control of the Canadian state; one which would as far as possible be an international tribunal. I remember arguing that such a court should be headed by someone other than a Canadian, by some judge with an international reputation, in order that the commission might operate in the spirit of the United Nations charter and might constitute a recognition that our encroachment upon the land and sovereignty of the Indian people is something for which we were prepared to compensate. It was my contention then that the flow of events was passing parliament by. Since then, the things that many of the Indians have been doing tend to make courses we have advocated in the past less relevant to the situation.

I am prepared to say now that the concept of the commission for which the hon. member for Skeena and I argued in 1963 and 1965 is less relevant today than it was then. If we could get away from a judicial atmosphere altogether it would be more in keeping with the spirit which the Indians themselves are showing today. If the minister were prepared to come forward with a policy statement making it clear that the government intended to establish a commission which would represent the Indians as their agent when dealing with the government and with the Parliament of Canada, then I would hope that in a spirit of mutual goodwill the concept of an international court of claims might become superfluous, and that we could reach, as it were, a man to man settlement with the Indian people which would settle this issue once and for all.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I am glad that the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), in opening the discussion today, took an approach which I feel is essentially in agreement with the one that I am advancing. I also felt that there was the same basic attitude and approach to this question in the speech made by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, and I am glad of it because I think that there is a genuine desire on the part of members in all parts of this house, in the words of one of the speakers this afternoon, not to allow this issue to become a political football. I think that there are many members in the house who sense that we are dealing with something that is at the very core of our future self-respect as a nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue on?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Barnett: I was about to conclude, Mr. Speaker. I was going to say that I think the last time there was any real sort of breakthrough in dealing with the whole matter of our relationship in this parliament and our relationship as a Canadian people to the Indian question was in the work that was done by the parliamentary committee in 1960-61. Some of the more practical aspects of the recommendations of that committee have been dealt with, at least in part, and some of the transformation that has taken place since that time stems from the work that was done by that committee. I really feel that since then, apart from some more or less satisfactory programs in such fields as education and housing, there has not been any breakthrough in the thinking or attitudes as reflected in the policy statements of the government or in the decisions of this parliament.

I hope that we are on the verge of a breakthrough in this area at this time. As I told the minister frankly, although I am a bit sceptical I am also genuinely hopeful that as and when he makes his statement, to which various people have referred, it will be the kind of statement that can be applauded by members in all parts of this chamber.

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I also thank my colleagues for their moral support. I rather wished that my maiden speech had allowed me the opportunity to extol the many

attributes of the constituency I represent, Prince George-Peace River, but because of the importance of this debate I am sure my constituents will support my contention that an issue concerning people deserves priority, a view which many hon. members share.

Problems and the direction of their resolve by official and unofficial bodies is so complex and divergent that there is a danger of Indians, Eskimos and whites alike losing sight of the over-all objective. Constructive dissent is necessary and desirable, otherwise consultation meetings would not have been initiated by the government. We have listened on two occasions in this house to criticism that consultations were a farce, were engineered, were controlled and were expensive exercises in futility. I consider such comments as destructive and political.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Borrie: Consultation meetings have allowed members of this house, indeed all Canadians, to hear the grievances of those persons most concerned with the administration of the Indian Act, that is the Indians themselves.

It is not possible for all meetings to be successful in the eyes of all participants or observers. We have all attended conferences or meetings of one kind or another when we felt elated that much had been accomplished. We have also experienced that let down feeling when we wondered what prompted our attendance. To expect elation from each consultation gathering would be naïve of both the participant and the observer.

The meetings were not controlled. It has been suggested that the discussion booklet "Choosing a Path" prepared by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development directed the dialogue to a predestined goal. The brochure was prepared as a guide and a tentative agenda. Surely, it is common sense to pattern a procedure.

At the Prince George meeting it is recorded that Mr. H. Pierre of the Stuart-Trembleur band asked whether the meeting must follow the booklet or whether reference could be made to anything in the act. Mr. Boys, regional director of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, said that the delegates were free to refer to the act or the booklet or to present their own ideas. Unfortunately I was unable to attend the five days of discussion, but again going by the record and from my personal observation I know that the subjects discussed strayed considerably from the prepared guide.

Non-Indian concern for the rights of Indians has been a long time in the making. Our society's inherent virtuous manner will not allow us to accept our responsibility without looking for an excuse or for someone to shoulder our guilt.

Criticism is levelled at the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Accusations could be tolerated if we were not required to examine the record too closely. Certainly, some errors are evident, but in dealing with the subject objectively, compassion and common sense is frequently exercised in tempering the stringent regulations of the Indian Act. Considering some of the human resources, both white and Indian, with which the department has had to work, it is surprising that there are any signs of progress at all.

White society established an act that was originally designed to protect Indians. Some bands required and desired protection, but others did not. Unfortunately, all were treated alike. The same situation appears to be the case today. In presentations at consultation meetings some bands indicated that they want to go the entire way to autonomy, while others suggested partial authority and the balance did not want change.

In consideration of the desires of Indians, I suggest that the act should be flexible so as to accommodate specific regional administration.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Borrie: The act must be amended to provide for the natural right of self-government to return to Indian communities their pride in self-reliance.

Many Indians and whites in coming up against the legislative regulations of the act have been badly bruised by their own people and by the rules. They have contributed toward awakening our conscience and should be remembered for their individual stand. However, the courage of those who remain within the ambit of the act to work for the change and development of their people is much to be admired. Laws cannot be changed by immovable confrontation. Conflict of ideas, tenacity of conviction and proof make for reasoned revision. It may take longer to proceed in an orderly fashion, but in the end the results are more firmly entrenched.

I have some problem in approaching the matter of education properly because I am unfamiliar with the content of the proposed

white paper. I feel, however, that hon. members should be made aware of the concern of Indian parents and students. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is in the process of phasing out residential schools and entering into educational agreements with provincial governments. Concern is quite high for the type of facilities to be made available in the province of British Columbia. As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, integrated independent schools in British Columbia receive no financial assistance from the provincial government; they are self-supporting. Indian parents are of the opinion that the basic policy of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, which is, and I quote, "to purchase the services of provincial and territorial school systems for all elementary and secondary school Indian and Eskimo students as soon as possible", means that their children must attend the public school system, or if they attend an independent school that they will be required to pay all fees themselves.

• (9:10 p.m.)

During the hearings of the committee, we received assurance from the deputy minister that Indians would continue to receive financial support for children attending independent schools. I suggest that the question of Indian education be examined closely. I would not like to see a basic policy or an act of this house be misinterpreted by administrators.

As the house will note from the report of the Indian affairs committee, members of the committee are cognizant of the role education will play in bringing about more equitable treatment for Indians. To assist all members in their assessment of present and future policies, I would like to draw their attention to the testimony of Mr. Walter Currie, president of the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada and assistant superintendent of supervision, department of education, Toronto. His testimony appears in the minutes of proceedings No. 28 on pages 963 to 1001. I suggest all members read it carefully.

During the last debate on Indian affairs, the minister stated that provincial governments must accept responsibility for Indians as they do for non-Indians. I adhere to that principle also. Acceptance should not mean that they move from one special status to another special confining status. There must be complete equality. Non-Indian communities have a responsibility to share in the loosening of restrictions on Indians. We cannot place the entire problem at the feet of Indian agencies. Legislation may provide equality, but people must make that legislation live.

Legislation should be the tool for directing the many programs to aid Indian-Eskimo development. It should not be a crutch for the native or non-native communities. The Indian Act does not prevent the employment of natives at current wage or salary rates; they are locked out by prejudice and by lack of understanding. Businessmen may employ Indians and Eskimos without the approval of the minister or regulations under an act.

Will an amended act provide jobs? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker. Is it also easier for charitable persons to devote a few years of their lives to bringing medical care, education, employment opportunities and to the general raising of living standards in far off countries than it is for them to direct their energies to helping our own native peoples? I am aware of the motivation and I do not wish to detract from it, but when we evaluate the shortcomings of the Indian Act we must not let it cloud the evaluation of our own social and business conscience.

In considering the third report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, we may justly assume that members of the committee have had their work cut out from the very beginning. I am sure we anticipate a large volume of work to arise from the forthcoming white paper, but the greatest task all hon. members have before them is to advise the non-Indian community that an amended act is not a crutch. We must all strive to ensure that Indians and Eskimos gain and maintain their rights to full citizenship as citizens, not as instruments of regulation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion this afternoon about the Indians and their problems. Nothing was said against them. I have indeed nothing against their problems and I sympathize with them. There is an Indian reserve in my constituency. I would add that, while travelling across Canada, I did notice that those people are experiencing problems. Many things have been said on this subject and I do not want to go over them.

I will deal with a new problem now under review which concerns the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, namely national parks.

I will deal with this new problem because my Conservative colleagues and myself frankly do not understand exactly the government policy on this subject.

[*English*]

The former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development spoke optimistically of a program to establish 40 to 50 new national parks by 1985. The new minister, in a burst of enthusiasm, has expanded this figure to 60 by 1985. In this we wish him well. But we must also add a—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I am sorry I must interrupt the hon. member. However, with the consent of the house, the hon. member might be allowed to speak on national parks. After careful consideration of the motion introduced by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), I do not think national parks are referred to, and unless the hon. member is granted unanimous consent by the house to speak on this subject, he will not be authorized to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Comeau: With respect, Mr. Speaker, as I read the motion it says "relating to the consideration of estimates of the department". It is for that reason I want to talk about parks, because the report includes all the votes of this department.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on the same point of order? In doing so, I should like to support the position taken by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). Although we have been discussing Indian affairs all day, the motion relates to the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Therefore, anything covered in the estimates of that department is surely germane to the discussion of the motion that is now before the house.

Mr. Chrétien: Go ahead. There is unanimous consent anyway.

Mr. Comeau: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in his proposal to establish 60 new parks by 1985, we wish him well. But we must also add a realistic footnote to this problem and remind the minister that since 1885 only 20 national parks have been established, of which only two have been added in the past five years. Furthermore, the present park system creates the anomalous situation whereby 94 per cent of the national parks' area is in western Canada, where only 26 per cent of Canada's population lives. I am not saying this critically; rather I wish to point out the necessity for parks.

As we all know, an agreement was reached a few weeks ago giving Quebec its first national park. Ontario's six million people are served by only three small national parks. All of this indicates that we are desperately short of national parks. Couple with this shortage our tremendous rate of urbanization and increased leisure time, and the whole situation takes on almost crisis proportions.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

There is no doubt that national parks are necessary and I need not overemphasize the point. The people need them more and more.

Working hours are being increasingly reduced. In brief, people want to enjoy themselves. They want to observe nature, they want to relax a bit. Bar-B-Q is now a household word.

One only needs look around in the stores to realize that picnic equipment is in great demand.

[*English*]

We realize that the creation of a new park is a cumbersome and difficult economic and constitutional process. Negotiations between the federal and provincial governments are difficult because usually the province must first acquire the land that is to be dedicated and then turn it over to the federal government without encumberance in perpetuity. The provincial government then obviously relinquishes all claims to the property, including any claims to mineral rights. That is the present position as we understand it unless, of course, there have been proceedings that this house has not been told about or that the minister has kept secret.

Provincial governments in the past have been very jealous of their rights and hesitant about surrendering land under these absolute conditions, their reluctance stemming from the fact that they may one day decide that the development of mineral finds with timber stands is more lucrative than any esoteric benefit to be derived from an outdoor recreational facility and the concomitant revenue

generated by increased tourist traffic. The demand for compensation on the part of provinces for their lands is often an insurmountable problem. There is here, of course, an important question of jurisdiction. Canadians who frequently take advantage of the existing parks are beginning to see the results of these federal-provincial stalemates as overcrowding begins to spoil the beauty of these areas. Lack of facilities makes the park areas unattractive.

By 1985 five times as many people as today will be trying to use these existing facilities. Will the facilities be sufficient to accommodate them? We sincerely hope that the government will not continue in its present delaying fashion to wait for an overwhelming outcry of public opinion before being spurred into action because by that time it may be too late.

I have alluded to the urgency of this problem. There is one further aspect to which I wish to direct my attention and the attention of the minister. That is the question of the over-all policy considerations with which the minister guides his negotiations. These considerations are relevant to our discussion this evening because of the recent agreement that was concluded with the government of Quebc.

[*Translation*]

I want to say, in all sincerity, that we are proud of the announcement concerning the establishment of a national park in Gaspé but we are concerned about the policy of the department or the government with regard to this new project.

[*English*]

We welcome the announcement of the creation of the first national park in Quebec. Nevertheless, because of the manner in which the park was established we must raise certain questions. We do so in the spirit of ensuring that our system of national parks will not be weakened by a too flexible approach to the negotiations. Canadians must be sure they know what is happening. We must ask, then, what the present policy of the government is with respect to national parks. Has the Quebec agreement signalled a change in policy? If it has, what is this new policy? If it has not, what is the government proposing to do about other provinces which are not willing to turn over the necessary land without encumbrance in perpetuity?

Mr. Gibson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon member is now launched on an interesting but irrelevant discussion about our parks. I submit he has completely forgotten Indians and is therefore clearly out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. Just a while ago there was unanimous agreement which gave the hon. member the right to talk about national parks. The hon. member is reviewing a report, and that is in order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Go home. Go to bed.

Mr. Comeau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am about to conclude my remarks. At this time I should like to reiterate our great concern about the government's sluggish reaction to this critical problem. The difficulties in creating a national park anywhere in Canada today will be increased many times over if the current inaction continues. The future preservation and development program of our wilderness areas is simply too vital for the future of Canada for it to be subjected to a vacillating and leisurely policy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the minister will be able to tell us, once and for all, whether the most recent decision represents a change in policy. I know that the minister wants to say a few words tonight. It is now 9:30 and in closing I would just say that when making decisions we should not irritate the other provinces.

[*English*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments of the time of the house in order to take part in this debate which has been, generally speaking, very enlightening. It has touched on Indian affairs and northern development. Most hon. members who spoke made a worth-while contribution. Only a few adopted a partisan attitude. After the first speaker in the debate, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), had completed his remarks the house settled down to an orderly discussion of Indian affairs and did not attempt to play political football with the Indian people. Generally speaking, if one ignores the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River, this has been a sound debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: The problems of the Indian people in Canada are most serious. Immediately after being appointed Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development one year ago I tried to find solutions to these problems. I looked at the problems and got in touch with the Indian people of Canada. Last July we launched a series of consultations and for the first time in Canada's history Indian people in Canada were able to really participate in the elaboration of a new Indian policy. The results of the consultations were by no means perfect. The format of the meetings has not been perfect. At any rate, the meetings gave the Indians a chance to express their views. We discussed all aspects of the Indian situation in Canada and, after 17 meetings across the country, we had the last meeting in Ottawa about a month ago. There the representatives of all Indians of Canada put forward their views to the public and to the government of Canada.

The time has not come, Mr. Speaker, for the government to respond. As I said in the house not long ago, that response will be ready soon. We shall have a new policy on Indian affairs and I will announce it in the house before the end of this session.

Mr. McGrath: When?

Mr. Chrétien: I think that next week I will be in a position to make that statement.

Mr. McGrath: Why not make it tonight?

Mr. Chrétien: Because we must be courteous to our Indian people and because, being more courteous probably than the hon. member would be if he were in government, I wish to distribute the relevant documents to the leaders of the Indian communities so that they have them in their hands at about the same time as hon. members here have the contents of the documents. Also there must be an opportunity to have the text of the document printed, and it will take a few days before it is ready. We decided after a year of consultation that it is time to offer to the people of Canada, including the Indians, a new policy. We have heard from the Indian people that they are proud and are willing to take their future into their own hands. They want to make more decisions.

• (9:30 p.m.)

There has been a certain pattern existing in Canada for over 100 years. We feel we have to make many changes. Personally, I feel quite frustrated most of the time because of certain situations. For example, when Indians wish to borrow a few thousand dollars from C.M.H.C. they are obliged to get the signature of the Superintendent of Indians of Canada, who happens to be myself, before they are able to get the money they need. This is the sort of thing that requires change. We have to permit the Indians of Canada to make more decisions at the local level. The policy of Indian affairs to be tabled next week will reflect this attitude of the government.

Today, we heard about the problem of Indian treaties. I have said many times that we intend to respect all aspects of these treaties. However, there are some problems. We must find the mechanism to permit the Indians to know what their rights are. A significant aspect of our last consultation was the establishment by the Indians of Canada of their own committee to study their treaty rights. I think this step will have a great influence on the new policy that has been established and will be made known next week.

I do not wish to take too much time of hon. members by commenting on the Indian policy because this will be made known next week. We think this policy is the best approach to permit the Indians of Canada to be economically and socially equal to all citizens of Canada and at the same time be in a position to keep their own traditions of culture which they have had in Canada since before the white people came to this country.

I will not refer to all the points raised by hon. members in the house today because many of these have already been dealt with in committee. Hon. members asked questions regarding education, housing and other matters. Most of these questions were answered by my officials or by myself when we appeared before the committee.

I want to thank all hon. members who have participated in this debate. I wish to assure them we will not overlook any of the proposals they have put forward today. We intend to make a complete and objective review of the Indian policy. This is one of the most difficult social problems that we have in Canada. These problems should not be approached on too much of a political basis, but in the spirit of proving to the first citizens of our country that we are willing to offer them a new deal in a Canadian society.

I would now like to deal with a point raised by an hon. member regarding employment. I wish to inform the house that we have offered summer employment in my

department to all university students of Indian origin. The department has hired 87 of these students. We made certain we had a position to offer to every student of Indian origin who cared to apply. I feel this is a very good response from the Indian population.

Many other matters were discussed by members of the committee. I wish to refer to the speech of my good friend, the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) regarding the territorial waters of Canada.

[*Translation*]

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin has explained the situation very well.

Of course, the problem is quite serious, but I want to reassert here that there is no question at this time about the sovereignty of the government, of the people of Canada over the North, the Arctic Islands and the northern continental shelf.

The only unsolved problem is the territorial waters problem, which is most complex and cannot be solved easily and unilaterally. There are territorial waters problem in all parts of the world today, and as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has pointed out so ably in his statement of May 15, 1969, we must be careful and act in such a way as to ensure the maximum protection to Canadians, without for all that infringing upon international jurisdictions.

I wish however to thank the hon. member for his very positive contribution which will certainly help the government assess the situation. He showed that he has thoroughly looked into the subject and that he was very concerned with the problem. I must assure him that the government too is very concerned with the matter, all the more as now, because of the fantastic development in the North in the past few years, in connection with the potential development of oil and mining resources, it is extremely important that Canada resort to every available means to retain for itself and its citizens control over resources and the access to resources.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

With your approval, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) touched on the problem of national parks. The government has committed itself to an effort to establish more national parks in this country. The hon. member said that in the last five years we had established only two national parks. If I may be permitted I wish to point out to him that in the period from 1957 to 1962 when his party formed the government not a single new national park was set aside for the benefit of all Canadians.

Personally, I am happy to see that the people of Canada are beginning to realize it is important to set aside land for national parks for use by future generations. I accepted the hon. member's contribution to the debate and the spirit of conservation in which he made it. I point out we must be conscious of the fact that in 15, 20 or 25 years from now there will be a great lack of land available in North America for recreational purposes.

As I say, the government is willing to establish more national parks but we need the collaboration of the provincial governments to do so. We have established two national parks since the government took office, and I am glad to mention that in a few weeks from now we will have a new national park on the west coast of Vancouver Island. I would publicly like to thank the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) who, as the former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, was the main initiator of the movement that will bring to Canada probably what will be the best coastal park in North America.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: Would the minister permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Chrétien: Yes.

Mr. McGrath: In keeping with the mood of the house and the minister's own very generous mood, could he tell us what is the position at the moment with regard to the second national park on the west coast of Newfoundland, a project that has run into some difficulty with the government of Newfoundland?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I was coming to that point because I want to show the hon. member that we are concerned and that we are proposing to have more national parks in the future. One of them will be the second national park in the Bonne Bay area of Newfoundland. I have spoken about the new national park on the west coast. We are negotiating with other provinces about more national parks.

I was happy with the talk I had the other day with the Premier of Saskatchewan, who is now ready to permit the government to go ahead with the establishment of another national park in that province. I hope that in

the weeks and months ahead we will find agreement on other national parks in Saskatchewan. We are working to establish another national park in Manitoba, and lately we took steps to establish the first national park in Quebec. May I say I am very surprised that the opposition questioned that move. Through ARDA we have achieved a plan to have Quebec's first national park established. We were flexible in our approach. We were not too flexible. In the past we made special arrangements with other provinces. We were obliged to make a special arrangement in B.C. because of a particular problem. I do not think the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) would disagree with what I am saying.

We had a special problem in Quebec but through the ARDA agreement we have succeeded in establishing a national park there. We have stated in this house that this was a particular case and that we do not intend to proceed in the same manner in the future. I think the people of Canada are happy that for the first time we will have a national park in Quebec. You know, Mr. Speaker, it will be a great contribution to the development of the tourist industry in that part of the country. It will be one of the most fantastic parks in Canada, and will be very good for the province of Quebec.

At present we are having some discussions with the government of New Brunswick to establish another national park in that province. We are proceeding quite rapidly, but I do not know when I will be in a position to make a definite announcement. However, I found the government of New Brunswick very easy to deal with.

Mr. Gilbert: What about Ontario?

Mr. Chrétien: We have three small national parks in Ontario and we are having some discussions with the province right now. We are not progressing as fast as I would like in Ontario, and I think the members from Ontario should raise hell if they want more national parks in that province. I need some backing in order to achieve that. I hope the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) will help me achieve that goal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I should simply like hon. members to realize that, at the present time, visotors to national parks are increasing at the rate of 15 per cent every year. In the United States, where there are 250 million inhabitants with more and more leisure time, they just cannot handle all those who wish to visit the national parks. As a matter of fact, there is such a big demand that people have to wait for hours and days to visit the parks.

In view of the fact that it is still possible for us to put aside those big green spaces for future generations, it is my opinion that we should act now, for, in 25 or 50 years from now, it will be too late.

[*English*]

I forgot to mention that we are negotiating to establish three more national parks, two in the Northwest Territories and one in the Yukon. The people in those areas are generally receptive to the idea, and in the gallery tonight there is the mayor of Fort Smith, who is a great advocate for national parks in the Northwest Territories.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. minister in his trip to the national parks but his time has expired.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much of the time of the house. I have explained the situation about national parks. I touched on the situation in the north, but I forgot to refer to the problem raised by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) about the statement on development in the Northwest Territories. It is not yet ready, but I hope it will soon be ready. I will not tie my hands by trying to specify any date, but lately we have made great progress in cabinet on it and I hope soon to be in a position to make a statement. However, it may take a few more days. I can assure members of the house that we will have a new policy that will permit the people of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon to participate more in the administration of their own affairs to determine the quality of their own lives. I hope to make that statement after tabling the white paper on Indian Affairs.

In conclusion, I wish to thank hon. members for their contributions to this debate. It was a very worthwhile one and we received good advice. The spirit of the debate was not partisan. I hope members of the house will retain that mood in the future.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, in the brief minute left at my disposal I would like to say that we are all looking forward with great anticipation to next week when the minister is going to be forthcoming on matters about which he has been asked for many months. I would say to him that despite how hard he has tried and how much he has listened, it will take a great deal of effort on his part and a great deal of compassion to compensate even in part for the grievous, egregious errors made for many years in the administration of the affairs of our Indian and Eskimo people.

I speak as one who has no Eskimo constituents and whose Indian constituents in terms of quantity are negligible. But I was impressed by many things in the report. I thought the reference to Arctic sovereignty was one of the most pusillanimous statements I ever cast my eye upon. I noticed also the reference to unemployment among Indian and Eskimo people. I say to them, and about them, they are suffering from a malaise that is affecting the whole of Canada today, especially the young students.

• (9:50 p.m.)

In particular I accept the minister's invitation to raise hell about national parks. He talked about Ontario, Saskatchewan and New Brunswick. I would like to remind him that for many years discussions were undertaken by his predecessor with the government of the province of Prince Edward Island in reference to a national park there. I am sure that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing), a man of excellent judgment, splendid taste and a real feeling for this country, will understand that there is land available in Prince Edward Island, that gem of tourist attractions; that area par excellence for tourists. I may say, with a burst of utmost unselfishness, that this is so because it is not even in my constituency. I say to the minister that it would be a fine thing if he and his department would move more rapidly in their discussions with the province of Prince Edward Island to establish a park in the eastern part of the province. I see the minister nodding in agreement.

Our province, with its somewhat restricted tax base and its narrow range of industrial capacity, has as its most expansive and most expandable industry, the tourist industry. The Dominion Government could do a great deal by developing a second national park there to provide facilities comparable to those now provided for nearly a million visitors who come to the national park which is located partly in my constituency and partly in the constituency of my friend the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean). This is why I am so unselfish. Here we could do something that would enable the people of Canada to see the beauties of this garden province.

In my gentle way I do raise a little hell with the minister, to use his rather off-expression which no Prince Edward Islander would use. I urge him to exercise a little alacrity in discussions with the province of Prince Edward Island in respect of one of the few areas in which we can expand our economic base, namely tourism. This will offer an injection of substance, support and encouragement, and I urge this upon him with all the sincerity at my command.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amazement tonight to the attack by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) on the parks policy of this government. The hon. member must be living in a never, never land because here is the record. Members know of the proposed parks in western Canada, in British Columbia, the west coast of Vancouver Island and the Long Beach area—one of the scenic highlights of the whole nation. In Saskatchewan we have proposed parks in the vicinity of Val Marie and on the South Saskatchewan. In Manitoba there are parks in Flin Flon and the Bloodvein River area. There is going to be a park in northern Canada, and that project is now under discussion. There is a park proposed for the Newfoundland Bonne Bay area. I could go on and on to give proof positive. We could go into the Gaspé and New Brunswick and consider the Kouchibouguac area, and I hope I am pronouncing that correctly. In Nova Scotia and a park in the East Point area.

This all is proof that the minister has demonstrated a keen appreciation of the need for a comprehensive and diversified parks system in Canada. His predecessor also made a distinguished contribution to the parks policy of this country. Some people nurture the mistaken notion that there are millions of acres of undeveloped land in Canada, and they dismiss the need to set aside on a systematic basis additional park reserves at the national level. This theory is nonsensical. I am glad to acknowledge in the house that the minister appreciates this fact. In no sense does Canada possess unlimited recreational resources. The total area per capita in Canada appears large but over 80 per cent of the land

is poorly accessible northern tundra and non-productive forest.

It is encouraging to note that the minister does not aspire to being a defender of the status quo in respect of park policy. Regardless of the criticism which has been directed at him—perhaps indirectly by the opposition—he is perhaps better aware than any of us that a recreation explosion lies ahead, far beyond the numerous demands for recreational facilities we have seen in recent years. The population growth, the rise in individual and social mobility, the increase in urbanization, the increase in personal income and the increase in leisure time available are going to bring increasing pressure on our resources of recreation.

For every person using Canada's recreation land in 1960, there will be four people using the same land in the year 2,000 A.D. This is not a doubling, this is a double doubling. Some 10 million people are going to visit our national parks each year, and some 50 million people will visit these parks each year by the year 2,000. This will mean a five-fold increase from now until the year 2,000.

The argument is advanced that in economic terms the value of our parks is open to question. More than ever we are going to witness a struggle between those who see in all lands, wherever they may be located, an economic resource measured purely in terms of extractive riches, and those who see in our national parks a heritage of immeasurable value which must be preserved for all generations. I find myself in agreement with the latter philosophy, and I know that the minister is in agreement as well. This encourages us.

Even in economic terms, the year 2,000 may see Canada's parks and our wilderness area as being the most valuable resource in this nation.

Some hon. Members: Faster, faster!

Mr. Perrault: I support, as I hope members in the opposition will support, the acquisition of two or maybe three national parks per year to complete Canada's basic parks system by 1985. We have to get busy to reach that goal. I am encouraged by the fact that the federal government is showing strong leadership in this field. Too often local and provincial governments are under high-handed pressure to commercialize provincial and local parks. If the federal government fails to provide leadership and to make sure the wilderness areas of our parks are kept free from commercial development, then no one is going to protect this heritage.

I congratulate the minister for the dynamic leadership he has given in this field and I know he enjoys the support of all members in this house, regardless of party.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to inform the house that pursuant to Standing Order 58 (11), the proceedings on the motion are considered to have expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO PREVENT BANKRUPTCY OF FARMERS

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1969, I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) a question in which I requested assistance to prevent bankruptcy among some Quebec farmers.

Mr. Speaker, at no time in its history has the province of Quebec experienced the application of such a weak and unsteady agricultural policy as the one it is subjected to at the present time.

In that region where I live, the Eastern Townships, farmers are leaving the land at an alarming rate. In nearly all the parishes around Lake Megantic and in parts of the Compton constituency, there are parishes where at least six farmers, on a weekly average, abandon their farms. This is a disaster unheard of before. This is certainly attributable to the agricultural policy even though much was expected from this policy which did not materialize.

The government's dairy policy is resulting in disastrous consequences for the farmers. This policy is forcing a great number of producers to abandon their farms.

The minister did not tell the farmers the whole truth when subsidies were granted and his policy is now producing terrible and irreparable damages.

For instance, subsidies for a 100,000-lb. quota of milk would be worth $990, or 99 cents per cwt. The penalty for shipping an additional 50,000 pounds would be $260, that

is 52 cents per cwt. This penalty of $260 should be deducted from the net subsidy granted for a 100,000 lb. quota, which would reduce the subsidy to $730. Therefore, it is really a penalty, because it contributes directly to reducing the net subsidy.

All this is frustrating, especially the policy, on account of its great rigidity toward progressive producers. In other words, it strikes more directly the farmer who wants to increase his production and to improve the use of his resources.

This is detrimental to efficiency in the dairy industry.

The situation is disastrous in the province of Quebec and I believe in the whole of Canada as well, because a policy of punishment cannot succeed. In a way, punishment is meted out to the farmers who wish to increase their production. At one time, the government was asking the farmers to extend their holdings in order to make their operations more economic, today they are punished for having done this.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Not only the small farmers who produce less than 50,000 pounds of milk leave the land but also those who produce 150,000 and 200,000, although for many reasons, they would be in a better position to survive from an economic point of view.

First of all, the cost of machinery is too high. Secondly, too many taxes plague the farmers. They have to pay too many taxes and they pay too much for their machinery. In such circumstances, they cannot do well.

Whatever things the Minister of Agriculture may do or whatever plans he may devise, they prove useless and are no solution to the problems of the farming industry.

We all know that when farmers are well off, the country is prosperous because the farm people are the greatest consumers.

Farmers are the greatest consumers in the world. They have all kinds of needs in various fields and they are responsible for keeping Candian industry going. They ensure the prosperity of the cities and give work to many people in Canada.

So, if we do not encourage agriculture, if we allow it to go slowly to the devil, the rest of the people will also go there.

Never in our history have we experienced such an indifferent, such an unwholesome policy as this one. The minister will say that the government is spending millions for this and that, but most of them are spent on administration. Not much goes to agriculture—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to answer the question put to the Minister of Agriculture.

I would have thought that the hon. member who asked it had some idea of the conditions of agriculture in the province of Quebec. But, in his seven-minute speech, he convinced me that he has no solution to the agricultural problem, and what he said is not true to the facts, or the figures we have.

Now, through the policy of the Department of Agriculture, all farmers are going to hell. I feel that if they were administered by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe), they would not be going to hell, they would already be there.

To prove how wrong he was in his arguments, here are some figures.

The gross revenue of the province of Quebec amounted to $621 million in 1967 and rose to $635 million in 1968. Considering the net revenue of farmers in 1967—and those are figures that the hon. member for Compton can easily get—I see that $93 million have actually been taken from the net income of Quebec farmers, and that amount went up in 1968 to $209 million, for an increase of $16 million.

If the hon. member had had to deliver his speech on milk production without his notes, I do not think he would have been able to quote any figures, since he did not seem to understand at all the quota situation.

The government has perhaps been criticized by some provinces for having granted too much assistance to the Quebec dairy industry. Some of his colleagues who made the trip with the agriculture committee, heard similar comments in almost every Canadian province, but he himself says that the assistance given is not sufficient.

I do not know whether he has consulted with his colleagues, or at least the one who knows agriculture for having himself been a farmer.

Insofar as milk is concerned, production is on the increase—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PENSIONS OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on page 8901 of *Hansard* of May 21, the record reads as follows:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Now that the minister is obviously well established in his new department—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —is he in a position to report on a matter about which I questioned him the first day he took office? What progress is he making in his consultations with Canadian National Railways about increasing the pensions of its retired employees?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can assure my hon. friend that I am not that well entrenched in my department yet, but I am working on it.

For my money, that was a pretty good beginning for the minister. On Friday, June 13, I questioned the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) again as to what progress he was making, and he admitted that there had been some brief consultations and he hoped to have something to report in a matter of days. Whereupon I suggested this might be a good subject for him and me to discuss some night on the late show. So, here we are.

I am sure the minister will not mind if I say in public that we had one of those conversations in the hall a day or so ago in which he asked me whether I had any idea how many times I had asked questions about pension matters, whether about old age pensions, or veterans pensions, or pensions of retired civil servants, and I admitted to him that it could be hundreds, or perhaps even thousands of times; I had no such record. But I want to say to him tonight this is not what matters. What matters now is finding a man of action to get started on this issue.

I do not need to make the case again. The case has been made so often for the right of retired people to keep up with the cost of living and their right to share in increased productivity. The needs of these people are admitted by all. The problem is becoming more acute as time goes on, as people live longer, as inflation gallops a bit faster, and recognition of the fact that something must be done to increase the pensions of those who are already retired is now widespread. It applies, as I have tried to make clear, to pensions of all kinds. It certainly applies to old age pensions in general. It applies to people on private pensions and it applies to people who have retired on federal pensions—to retired civil servants, retired members of the Armed Forces, retired members of the R.C.M.P. and so on to the group we are talking about tonight, retired employees of Crown corporations and of the C.N.R. in particular. I say a case has been made. The need is there. What is required now, is action. The need is to get started.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

I like the appearance, the image the minister has created. Since coming to the Department of Transport he has given the impression of a man who wants to do things, who wants to solve some of the problems, to get moving.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Some day, soon, somebody will have to start the ball rolling in this matter of getting pension increases. Some institutions have done so recently—private corporations and others. I do not know which department will start first in the government—whether it will be to the benefit of the retired civil servants, the C.N.R. pensioners or others. But to show the minister I like him I am giving him the chance to make the start with the C.N.R. retired employees. Yes, the others will have to follow soon—the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), the Solicitor-General (Mr. McIlraith), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). But I say to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson): you have the chance to start this, and make a name among retired employees of the C.N.R. and retired people generally. I hope tonight you will accept the challenge.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I feel reasonably certain that the hon. member who has just spoken will not be one of those who will have to worry about a retirement pension because I suspect he will be around and active for much longer than those for whom he is showing such concern. However, if it should happen that he does formally retire, and the most impressive record of his work in this house is made public, he will be known indeed as a champion of the elderly and of those who find themselves in a difficult position today.

I only wish it were possible for me to do as he suggests and declare flatly that something will be done about this particular group but, as I am sure the hon. gentleman knows, having raised this matter on so many previous occasions, the complex nature of this question

is such that it is exceedingly difficult to solve by taking care of one segment at a time. Let me say most emphatically—and I hope he will accept this in the sincere manner in which it is said—that I share his concern for these people.

I feel this concern particularly when I think of the many fishermen in my own constituency who do not even have the kind of pensions which many of those about whom he is concerned are able to draw on as a basis on which to build other income. So I say to the hon. gentleman, as I suppose he would expect me to say, that it is the responsibilty and the duty of government to look after all elderly and retired people. While we have not perhaps done as much as my hon. friend would like—indeed, we have not done as much as I would like—I think the record over the past few years has been a reasonably impressive one. The position today is a far cry from even a few years ago when the total was $25 or $30 a month. Even the pensioners about whom the hon. member speaks are, for the most part, I expect, in receipt of the general old age pension, and some at least have the benefit of a portion, if not all, of the supplementary pension. So their lot is, in some respects, better than that of some of the citizens to whom I refer.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is still poverty.

Mr. Jamieson: I cannot agree more with the hon. member that is far from adequate. But I am sure he also realizes that while this group has had a good deal of attention in terms of increases in the old age pension, we do wish to do more; and I believe that we will do more. However, as stated in the house very recently—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—LENNOX COUNTY, ONT.—PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF FARMERS IN EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I bring a matter before the house tonight as a result of a question which I asked last week of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) pertaining to the expropriation of certain lands in the second concession of Richmond township in the county of Lennox and Addington, on both sides of the C.N.R. railway main line, consisting of pieces of contiguous farms owned by six resident owners along a length of track of more than a mile. Here, the C.N.R. is expropriating enough land on either side of their present double track right of way to construct a passing siding on their side, the one on the south side to serve the eastbound services and the one on the north side to serve the westbound services of the new proposed automatic central traffic control system which will go into effect in the near future on this important and busy railway.

The first and main point that I wish to make this evening is that the railway, with its lopsided privileges of expropriation, is not being fair to these farmers. First of all, they are offering agricultural prices for the land they require—that is, only $500 an acre—but at the same time they are using the land for industrial purposes, and industrial purposes of national importance as well. Industrial land in and around Napanee, which is in my county, is selling for as high as $1,500 to $2,000 an acre.

At first this railway was a single track line. Then, in the early 1900's it was a double track. Now, in the area where these six farms are located there will be four tracks. Up until now the former 19th century conditions have been tolerated. With the advent of this new system, with its high speed trains, unless proper facilities are provided by the railway these farms, as paying propositions and economic units, are doomed. At the present time there are 16 passenger trains per day operating on this line, plus the four new turbo trains which will soon go into service, together with freight trains both day and night. The railway has not acceded to any request of the farmers for cattle and produce passes underneath the tracks for the safe handling of dairy herds, other livestock pasturing on the opposite side of the railway, and for the safe handling of crops of grain and hay.

Not only is the railroad reducing the value of these farms but it is seriously inconveniencing their future operations. In refusing to construct underpasses for cattle and transportation of agricultural products the railway will endanger the lives of the operators and their livestock and threaten the safety of their equipment. Surface use of this right of way under the proposed conditions will be a very hazardous proposition. Only two weeks ago a farmer whose farm lies along the same railway line 35 miles east in the Joyceville-Gananoque area lost 13 head of very valuable dairy cattle when they were killed by a train as he was frantically trying to drive them across the right of way over

two tracks; and here in Richmond township I am referring to four tracks.

This is now one of the busiest railways on the North American continent. It is reported to me by more than one of the land owners that often less than a minute elapses between the first sight of a train and its passing at the point of observation. This is particularly true when referring to eastbound trains. Although the right of way is fairly straight it has a grade with a horizon that limits westerly visibility in direct proportion to gradient and horizontal distance.

There are several other grievances in connection with this case that I can only briefly list and to which the farmers must have an answer. They include: (1) loss of two good wells for watering livestock; (2) the diverting of a natural water course by the C.N.R., namely, Brandon's creek where it crosses the property of Mr. Lipsey, which will be to his disadvantage and will reduce his remaining arable land; (3) the obstruction of crossings by trains in the sidings for extended periods each day.

• (10:20 p.m.)

As the minister knows I have been in touch with him by letter. Also, I have communicated by telephone with the manager of real estate for the C.N.R. in Montreal. Representations have also been made on behalf of the farmers by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. I ask the minister, as I did in my question of June 11, will he see to it that the economic and human rights of these farmers in Lennox country, whose land is about to be expropriated for railway industrial purposes, are protected and defended.

This matter of expropriation with no assurances or commitments on the part of the railway is most vexing, exasperating and discouraging for these farmers. I recall that many years ago it was trouble between a railway and the farmers of the state of Kansas—the railway disregarded the rights of the ordinary man—that caused Jesse James to turn to a life of revenge and crime that sent him to his doom as an outlaw.

Although the farmers of Richmond township whom I represent are vexed and frustrated, they are not going to pursue the course which Jesse James chose. The farmers of Richmond township are good Canadian citizens interested in the progress of all Canada, just as much as they are interested in their own progress. All they want in this instance is a fair deal. I appeal to the minister, to the Department of Transport and to the real estate department of the C.N.R. to reopen this case, to give consideration to these land owners and to reassess values pertaining to the land itself as well as drainage problems; the safety problem; the question of cattle and produce passes; the loss of water supply and the diminished value of farms resulting from the widening of the railway. I respectfully request that, for this to be accomplished, an experienced and qualified agronomist who is acceptable to the farmers and the railway be appointed to mediate and adjudicate this case in a manner that will be fair to all parties concerned. The decision of this arbitrator, of course, will be final. I communicated with the real estate department of the C.N.R. in Montreal by telephone this afternoon and I believe they are agreeable to having this problem mediated. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the just society, here, hopefully, I rest the case with you.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in view of the hon. member's most eloquent representations, not only on this occasion but on previous occasions when he has drawn this matter to my attention, representations on his behalf and on behalf of all these farmers have been made to the C.N.R. It is, of course, a decision for the C.N.R. to make but I have been very happy to urge them to follow the course which the hon. member has suggested. As he was advised this afternoon, I believe, the C.N.R. has now agreed to the appointment of an independent agronomist who will examine the whole picture. His services will be engaged to carry out an in depth study of the entire farm operations of the farmers affected and the total amount of damages which farmers have suffered due to their having to cross the wider railway right of way. He will also express his opinion as to the sum of money required to be paid to each farmer. I hope as a result of this action the matter can be resolved in the interests of the farmers who, I quite agree, have a genuine problem.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 20, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate has passed the following bills without any amendment: Bill C-183, an act to establish the Export Development Corporation and to facilitate and develop export trade by the provision of insurance, guarantees, loans and other financial facilities, and Bill C-195, an act to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton) presented the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that this is a report of the Liberal members of the committee only. It does not have the support of any members of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Order.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Fourth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts—Mr. Hales.

[*Editor's Note: For reports of committees above referred to, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

FINANCE

TARIFF BOARD—TABLING OF REPORT ON BINDER AND BALER TWINE

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies in English and in French of the report of the Tariff Board respecting binder twine and twine for baling farm produce, reference No. 142, together with a transcript of the proceedings at the public hearings held by the board.

This report contains the results of a study of the economics of the binder and baler twine industry in Canada, both from the production and consumption points of view. I assure hon. members that the report will be carefully and urgently considered by the government. In this connection I trust that any interested parties who wish to comment on this report will let me have their views promptly.

REVISED MAIN ESTIMATES 1969-70

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting revised estimates of sums required for the service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1970, was presented by Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board) and read by Mr. Speaker to the house.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER FOLLOWING TABLING OF REVISED ESTIMATES

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the estimates for 1969-70 include a loan to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited of $10 million under Vote L20 for the financing of the purchase of Canadian-produced heavy water. Following the tabling of these estimates, it became evident that there would be no heavy water produced in Canada this year. It was therefore necessary for Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to make commitments in the United States for the purchase of the heavy water it required.

In order that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited may use for the purpose contemplated the funds requested in Vote L20, it is necessary to revise the wording of the vote by removing from it the limitation contained in the words "Canadian-produced". This course, it should be noted, was recommended by the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Public Works in their report tabled on May 30, 1969.

Under these circumstances, I have assumed that the house would not wish this revised estimate to be referred to the standing committee. The revised estimates as tabled today make this revision to the wording of Vote L20.

Cash Advances to Western Farmers

• (11:10 a.m.)

GRAIN

ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING ELIGIBILITY OF FARMERS FOR FULL INTEREST FREE CASH ADVANCES

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In view of questions which have been asked, particularly yesterday, I wish to inform the house that under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, farmers will be eligible for full interest free cash advances in the new crop year, even though outstanding advances may not have been fully repaid.

It is estimated that $65 million will still be outstanding on July 31 and as deliveries will not be sufficient to enable many grain farmers to retire these advances, the government has decided they will be eligible for the full advance when the new crop year opens August 1.

Mr. Speaker, this decision means that producers will be entitled to advances of approximately $65 million more than would have been the case if advances in the 1969-70 crop year were reduced by the amount outstanding from the current crop year.

This will have the effect of providing western grain producers with advance payments in respect of both their 1968 and 1969 crops based on a six bushel quota. Thus, those farmers whose delivery opportunities have been limited this year will be able to obtain an interest free advance which will provide them with operating funds, and their entitlement in the new crop year will not be impaired.

As hon. members will recall, last November parliament doubled the maximum advance available under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act from $3,000 to $6,000.

During the current crop year some 92,000 producers have received advances totalling approximately $153 million. Advances are repaid as producers deliver grain to country elevators, and at present outstanding advances amount to about $90 million. Under the old legislation the previous highest amount advanced was in the 1960-61 crop year when some 76,000 producers obtained advances totalling $64 million.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): In commenting on the minister's statement and in particular on the decision to allow additional interest free cash advances to prairie grain farmers, I think it is only fair to say that this represents merely an advance on payments which would be forthcoming to farmers had they sold their crop. In taking the action now contemplated, the government is admitting that it has failed to sell the farmers' crop.

There is something else I should point out. This cash advance arrangement applies only to wheat, oats and barley. We are trying to encourage farmers to diversify their production. These interest free cash advances will be of benefit to farmers on a short term basis only, and only to farmers with a large acreage. It will not help the specialized farmers, particularly in the irrigation areas, because of the limited acreage farmed. They will not help those farmers who are trying to help themselves by diversifying production. At best they amount only to short term assistance, since, as I say, they represent advances on grain which will have to be sold to the Wheat Board, and when it is sold the cheques paid to farmers will be docked by the amount of the advance.

So this does not really help; it will not bring about any relief of the desperate position in which farmers find themselves; it will not encourage farmers to diversify, and it will not help farmers who are using their knowledge and the technological advances available to them to make better use of fertilizers and irrigation.

At best this is a short range policy that is really not much help at all. If this is the final and only help that the farmers can expect from the government this year, then I am certain they will be discouraged. But I should like to think that it is not. I should like to think that the government has more than this in its barrel of tricks to bail the farmers out of the desperate situation in which they find themselves.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the minister for sending us in advance copies of the proposals that he has put before the house. I note he mentioned that they were, in part, answers to questions that have been posed, among which was the question whether we were or were not going to achieve a five bushel quota at all points. I sincerely hope that the statement of the minister does not indicate that he and the government have been forced to recognize that it is possible that this objective will not be reached. I hope that is not the situation; but if it is, then we are in desperate straits indeed.

In addition we are awaiting an announcement of government policy. These proposals

are, at best, a stop gap, and not a very good stop at that. Some questions are left unanswered. For example, when may the farmers expect to be paid the remainder of the advances for this year? How long are they going to wait? Also lacking is an indication of a real, forward looking policy for our grain farmers which will let the farmers know what they may expect in the future.

We have already been waiting for one year for this kind of statement. The farming organizations, the federation and the unions, have given the government some possible approaches. I hope the government will consider them soon, because the farmers of western Canada are waiting to know what lies ahead for a reasonable assessment of what might be expected. They cannot live in limbo forever, borrowing money that will eventually have to be repaid.

These are the sort of questions which must be answered, but no answer is yet forthcoming from the government. The farmers are heading into more debt and uncertainty. The worst feature of all is that there does not yet appear to be a recognition by this government that the grain farms of western Canada just cannot operate with a five bushel quota, or even a six bushel quota. The government must recognize this, and work out and develop alternative courses of action, as well as devise a sales program to meet the problem.

• (11:20 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, once again, I wish to congratulate the western farmers. With regard to wheat, it seems that it is always the same thing. I welcome the statement, even if I heard the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) say that it was not enough and that more should be done.

If the hon. member were in Quebec, he would see that there is nothing at all there. In my opinion, it is better to have a little than nothing at all—I speak of these interest free loans—because I can see that western farmers will benefit again this year from interest free loans, up to $65 million. I think—

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Pepin: I believe it is necessary to correct this statement immediately. They are not interest free loans but loans on which the government is paying the interest. There is a difference.

Mr. Gauthier: I am most happy, Mr. Speaker, about the minister's remarks, for I was just going to say that it was without interest to the farmers or to the consumers and that the government, in order to protect financiers, was going to pay them interest, because it does not dare face them.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the farmers welcome those interest free loans.

The government is making itself the financiers' servant, and, therefore, must protect them; but I say that it must continue to grant interest free loans and apply this policy to every province, not only to the Prairie provinces, because Quebec farmers also need interest free loans for their main product which is milk.

We sincerely approve the government for applying some Social Credit principles which allow for interest free loans. We would like it to abandon its devious ways and go directly to the Bank of Canada to make interest free loans, as it has done for other countries.

I congratulate the minister on his statement with regard to western farmers and I am anxious for the day when similar assistance will be granted to Quebec as this would be of great help in promoting unity in Canada and doing away with discontent in Quebec.

Some assistance was granted the other day to the Maritime provinces. The government is becoming aware of the need to solve some problems on the regional level rather than on the national one.

When they want to help Quebec, they pass legislation for the whole of Canada. It is said that regional legislation is necessary, as the one that applies to the Prairie provinces, and we heartily wish, for the sake of Canada, that the interest free loans policy will also apply to Quebec.

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

GRAIN

INQUIRIES RESPECTING ANNOUNCED INTEREST FREE CASH ADVANCE PROGRAM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce—to whichever minister

it is appropriate to address my question. Does the proposal announced a few minutes ago by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce constitute the carrying out of the program announced by the Minister of Agriculture in the *Financial Post* or has the government any other measures in mind which it will announce shortly?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture did not make any announcement in the *Financial Post.*

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Olson: I had discussed in this house everything contained in that article before it was printed. The announcement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce does not claim to be a complete solution to the problem but is, nevertheless, another and additional measure which this government has introduced in order to be helpful in the situation.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister were to answer our questions directly he could save a good deal of the time of the house. Does the minister or the government propose in the near future to announce additional measures along the lines of the announcement or, as a result of the minister's *Financial Post* interview, is this the extent of the program the government is to introduce?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in the house two or three days ago I outlined 12 measures, not all of which had been introduced during the present session, that the government has brought in to be helpful in this situation. The announcement by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce today perhaps constitutes the thirteenth measure that we have introduced to be helpful. It would not be wise to announce now what additional measures will be taken because we have to watch the situation to see what is appropriate, depending on the conditions.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I assume from that long answer that this is always in mind, at least at the present time. Can the minister who made the announcement in connection with the repayment of cash advances made in the current year, that is to say, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, tell the house when these will be repaid? The minister has announced that any plans will not restrict cash advances in the ensuing year; can he tell the house when the cash advances made with respect to the current grain year will be repaid?

Hon. Jean Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, they are being repaid now. I said that $90 million is still due at this time. The amount left at the end of the year will be $65 million. The new cash advance payment will simply add to what will still be owned by farmers who are not in default at that time. It is a question of adding new loans on top of those which will still be owed at the end of the year.

Mr. Stanfield: Would it be correct to assume that any cash advances made this year, but not repaid at the end of the crop year, will have to be repaid over the quota next year in addition to the repayment of any cash advances made next year with regard to the quota?

Mr. Pepin: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): In view of the fact the legislation specifies that anyone who has not repaid his cash advance by December 31 will be considered to be in default, can the minister advise this house if this provision will be overlooked at the end of December this year, in the event of any number of farmers not having repaid the cash advance obtained in the previous crop year?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between being in default and not having been able to discharge one's obligations to deliver the grain when called to do so.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The regulations now state that on delivery 50 per cent of the cash advance will be returned to the government. What suggestion has the minister got in this regard, for the repayment? Would it be over the 50 per cent? The minister stated that the cash advances carried over from this year and added on to next year will have to be repaid in the next crop year. Is that correct? How is the minister going to get that repayment if he still takes only 50 per cent of the amount delivered?

Mr. Pepin: There is no change from the way their payments are being made at the present time. The same situation exists under the present system.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would like the minister to explain the differentiation between being in default and actually owing part of the advance. If a farmer, because the government has not been able to secure markets for wheat, is unable to sell his wheat by December 31 of this year, will he not then be in default and be denied any advance such as was outlined here today? I wish the minister would go into detail because the difference between owing and being in default is difficult to understand.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, all the experts here understood what I meant. I presumed the right hon. gentleman was a wheat expert. I am surprised he does not know the difference between a farmer being in default and a farmer not being asked to deliver his grain.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Any time the minister can teach anyone in this house about wheat, it will be a new day, because he does not know anything about it himself.

Mr. McIlraith: He just did.

FINANCE

UNDERTAKING BY MINISTER TO MAKE POLICY STATEMENT ON U.S. TAKEOVERS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the Canadian Investment Dealers Association and the Toronto Stock Exchange have initiated a study into the effects of the foreign takeover of Canadian financial institutions, may I ask the minister how soon he will be able to make his promised statement as to the action the government contemplates with regard to this matter, and will he be making that statement prior to the house adjournment next week?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am very encouraged by the steps taken by the stock exchanges and the Investment Dealers Association, after consultation with my officials. With respect to my statement, I will be making it next week before the house rises. I am prepared to make it now but the Governor of the Bank of Canada is out of the country and I want to consult with him before I deliver the statement.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a supplementary question may I ask the minister if he has any indication that there are further takeovers of Canadian financial institutions in prospect, and does he intend to take legislative action, if necessary, to prevent such takeovers?

Mr. Benson: I have no personal knowledge of any such prospective takeover.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Broadview has a supplementary question.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that Laura Secord has regained her Canadian citizenship, would the minister protect other Canadian corporate citizens from losing their citizenship by imposing a 30 per cent takeover tax as proposed by Mr. Gordon?

Mr. Benson: All I can say is, good for Laura, and I have no intention of imposing such a tax.

INDICATION OF INTENTION TO REFER STUDY OF INTEREST RATES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I think it was last Friday I asked him if he would consider referring to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs the question of constantly rising interest rates, despite immense profits being made by the financial institutions in Canada, and he said he would give this serious consideration. In view of the fact that the Banking Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington has already begun investigating this question, and since interest rates in the two countries are closely tied may I ask the minister if he is in a position now to tell the house whether he has reached a decision on the question of referring this matter to the standing committee?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to do it.

Mr. Lewis: As a supplementary question may I ask the minister whether he can possibly do it before the house rises for the summer recess, and will he also provide that this committee may meet during the summer, in view of the fact that a delayed investigation would not be very helpful?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I would intend to make the reference before the house rises. As to when the committee meets—that of course is not up to me: It is up to the committee.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

SHIPBUILDING

CANADIAN VICKERS—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

As the minister stated yesterday that the federal government could do absolutely nothing to prevent Canadian Vickers from closing down, and as 40 per cent of the nation's unemployed are to be found in Quebec whose economy is seriously affected by the lack of specialized industries, would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce be willing to co-operate with that company so as to put its production on a competitive basis?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we have already done so. We have helped Canadian Vickers to rationalize its operations. We have, if I remember well, given a little over $1 million to Canadian Vickers to develop the industrial sector of its operations so as to transfer some workers in shipbuilding to another type of activity and, in fact, quite a number of them have been transferred.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask another supplementary question to the minister.

Since the measure he has just mentioned is proving ineffective because the threatened closing of Canadian Vickers still hangs over us, can the minister tell the house whether he intends to request the government to nationalize the company?

Mr. Pepin: No, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to point out that there are 1,000 workers in industrial production at Canadian Vickers and that this sector which offers new opportunities did not exist a few years ago.

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES

INSPECTION BY U.S. GROUP OF CANADIAN FRESH WATER POTENTIAL

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) who answers in this house on water resources. In view of the fact that an official of the Department of Mines, Energy and Resources is accompanying the group who are presently touring Canada inspecting potential sources of fresh water which could be tapped to supplement inadequate sources of fresh water in the United States, is it the intention of the government, by giving official recognition and aid to this mission, to help the United States to achieve its objective of tapping Canadian fresh water sources?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case with the hon. member I think I have to say again that I do not accept the bulk of the statement he has made in asking his question, but I would like to assure him that in any look at Canadian water resources Canadian interests in that water will be completely safeguarded by this government.

Mr. Hees: Then, as a supplementary question, what is the purpose of giving encouragement to this group, who are looking over potential sources of fresh water, by sending an official of the government with them on their trip?

Mr. Drury: Have you ever heard of hospitality, George?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I don't put that interpretation on any such travels.

AIR TRANSPORT

SERVICE OF AIR LINE PILOTS UNDER CONDITIONS OF FATIGUE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Are officials of the Department of Transport still giving permission to air line pilots to fly passenger aircraft up to as much as 150 hours a month?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice. I do not know the particular circumstances to which the hon. member is referring. So far as I am aware the circumstances are as I outlined them to him previously, and I would doubt very much if any such permission is being given. However, if he would give me the details I will be glad to look into the matter.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Does he regard as significant the apparent result of recent collective bargaining in Toronto whereby plumbers, working a 37½ hour week, will evidently be paid some $136.62 more per month than members of parliament?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

LEGISLATION INCORPORATING U.S. AND CANADIAN AUTOMOTIVE AND TIRE FEATURES

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport arising out of his comprehensive statement a few days ago on automobile safety. In light of the fact that his department is paying great attention to safety tests being made on tires in the United States, can he assure the house that Canadian programs will be undertaken as well, due to the very different tire needs here in Canada, especially for wintertime conditions?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peddle: As a supplementary question, in view of the fact that jurisdictions between the federal and provincial governments have finally been clarified can the minister assure the house that the long needed legislation regarding auto safety will be introduced in parliament this fall?

Mr. Jamieson: I cannot give that specific undertaking. However, it will be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further supplementary to the Minister of Transport. Could the minister guarantee to the house that the safety devices used on Canadian cars will be co-ordinated with those used in the United States, so that cars manufactured on either side of the border will have the same safety regulations?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a necessity in such a program.

FORESTRY

RELAXATION OF REGULATIONS COVERING IMPORT OF FIRE FIGHTING AIRCRAFT

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Have the regulations regarding importation of aircraft into Canada been amended or relaxed in such a way as to enable the forest fire fighting authorities of British Columbia to bring in all the water bombing planes they require or can procure from the United States to meet an emergency situation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I am not sure whether any such request has come to us, but if it does I can assure my hon. friend we will expedite as fast as we can any needed amendments so that the planes can be obtained.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—NEGOTIATIONS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESPECTING CREDIT

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

During the stay of the committee on agriculture in Quebec City a meeting was held at the Château Frontenac during which no Molotov cocktail exploded, but where the provincial Minister of Agriculture advised us about the possibility of a federal-provincial agreement on farm loans under which important changes would be made.

Could the minister tell us whether negotiations are under way and if so on what?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the representatives of the government of the province of Quebec, as well as others, have made representation to the federal government to amalgamate, if that is the right word, the operations of the farm credit agency in the province with the federal government. We take the position that the F.C.C. has been a very useful organization for the farmers and should be uniformly applied across the country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of his statement that representations, as well as some studies are being made, could he tell the house whether or not a report dealing with the findings of those studies will be tabled in the house for the information of hon. members?

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not want the hon. member to have a misunderstanding of what I said. I said we had received representations. I did not wish to imply that studies were under way.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TESTING OF PESTICIDES IN SUBSTITUTION FOR D.D.T.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I should like if I may to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. It arises out of the fact that he indicated the matter was under active consideration. In order that agriculture will not be deprived of very necessary pesticide controls, can the minister state whether alternative chemicals are on test which might replace d.d.t., should this chemical of necessity be withdrawn from legal application?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the specifics or indicate the chemicals concerned, but if the hon. gentleman would like to send me the specific names of them I would be willing to make a check to find out what the department is doing and what conclusions they have reached to date. Certainly I think the hon. member can take it for granted our department does in fact test both in so far as the health hazard is concerned and, in so far as is possible, the efficacy of these chemicals.

WATER RESOURCES

POSSIBLE DIVERSION OF CANADIAN WATER TO U.S.

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the minister acting for the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the statement Thursday, June 19 emanating from the planning branch of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources will the minister take the house into his confidence and tell us the nature of the study of the water resources which his department is either undertaking or has commissioned.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I know the specific statement that is being referred to but I will look into the matter.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the so-called thirsty American states want our water only because they have so badly polluted their own plentiful supplies, will the minister assure us categorically that his department is not making studies and plans for the diversion of Canadian water supplies to the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question in its present form is not acceptable.

[Mr. Olson.]

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—CHURCHAID AND CANAIRELIEF DAYLIGHT FLIGHTS

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. Now that Biafra has accepted the Prime Minister's suggestion and has agreed to permit daylight relief flights, will the government consider offering assistance to both Churchaid and Canairelief?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasure Board): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the fact of prospective daylight flights alters the situation under which we prefer to channel our aid through one agency. I think this probably makes it more effective.

Mr. Fairweather: In view of the fact that the agency through which the government channels our aid is no longer carrying out this function, does this not place a responsibility on the government to look for an alternative source?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is argumentative.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

APPEAL FROM MANITOBA BROTHERHOOD SEEKING DECENTRALIZATION OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I am aware of the reason for his absence today, but I believe an acting minister is present. In view of the urgent appeal that has been received by the minister from the President of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood urging that the department decentralize its economic development programs, may I ask whether the minister will take this appeal into consideration when he makes his statement of policy next week.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I know the minister has this matter very much in mind and I will bring the submission to his attention, so that he can make the statement next week.

TRANSPORT

"S.S. PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND"—WITHDRAWAL FROM FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the able and articulate Minister of Transport.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jamieson: He wants a new ferry service.

Mr. Macquarrie: May I ask the minister whether he has received a request from the government of Prince Edward Island for assistance in providing for a gracious and useful retirement for the dowager queen of all Canadian rail and car ferries, the *S.S. Prince Edward Island,* and if so has he found a way to give tangible evidence of appreciation of this fine ship's half century of service?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker; I have had some submissions. We are now studying ways to assure that the dowager's bottom is kept completely in order.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce relative to his statement earlier this day with regard to proposals to alleviate the short cash supply of western farmers. My question evolves from the answers he gave the hon. member for Crowfoot and myself several weeks ago, before the Standing Committee on its tour across Canada, with regard to the international world wheat agreement. At that time he stated that some of his officials were working with their counterparts in the United States in an effort to try to iron out some of the difficulties. Can the minister indicate whether there has been any success along these lines?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker. There is to be a meeting of the wheat council next week in London. The prices review committee is to meet too, but I cannot give any assurance with regard to the difficulties to which reference has been made; they are still continuing.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to consider the invitation I extended to him and the Minister of Agriculture to attend the meeting of farmers of the Peace River country? I assure him I will be there for their assistance.

Mr. Pepin: I would like to know the answer of the Minister of Agriculture first.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.—LAY-OFFS AT DOCKYARD

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister say whether he has taken any action regarding the serious lay-offs at the Canadian National dockyard at St. John's?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I have brought this to the attention of the C.N.R. and I am seeking leave to put further ships in there. I have nothing further to report.

Mr. Carter: Would the minister consider diverting some of the bottoms from his department to the dockyard at St. John's, to keep it busy during the summer?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO RETURN OF MINISTER FROM SCANDINAVIA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Can we anticipate the presence in the house on Monday of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and can we expect to hear from him a statement concerning the purpose of his recent visit abroad, and what was accomplished by that visit.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be in the house on Monday and expects to make a statement about any relevant aspects of his travel to the Scandinavian countries.

THE LATE EARL ALEXANDER OF TUNIS

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT FUNERAL OF FORMER GOVERNOR GENERAL

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Malpeque concerning arrangements for the funeral of Lord Alexander. It appears that the funeral will be held on Tuesday, June 24, St. Jean Baptiste day, at St. George's Chapel in Windsor. The Canadian government will be represented by our High Commissioner and the Chief of the Defence Staff, General Allard. I have also asked Mr. Lester Pearson if it is possible for him to act as my personal representative at the funeral.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FISHERIES

EXTENSION OF ZONES TO CONTINENTAL SHELF—STOCKHOLM DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the desirability of convening another United Nations law of the sea conference to win international approval for the extension of exclusive fishing zones to the edge of the continental shelf, is this one of the matters under discussion with other countries by our roving Secretary of State for External Affairs?

TRADE

LOGS—MAINTENANCE OF BAN ON EXPORTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry? Since some of the large lumber companies in British Columbia are alleging that the curtailment of production is due to a shortage of logs, can the minister assure the house that the ban on the export of logs from British Columbia is being maintained and will continue to be maintained, according to the minister's earlier statement, until September 1, when it will be reviewed?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I can give the hon. member that assurance, Mr. Speaker. This ban, which is in the nature of a voluntary ban, has been effective to the point that there are now no requests outstanding from the companies for logs to be exported.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inquire and ascertain whether the ban is being fully complied with? If not, I ask whether the government is prepared to exercise the authority it has to refuse export permits for logs until such time as domestic requirements are fully met.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the export of logs has dropped sharply. It was 29 million board feet in March, 5 million board feet in April, and my information is that it was negligible in May.

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF GREATER SALES AND INCREASED QUOTA

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In answering a question I asked him a few minutes ago with regard to the repayment of cash advances, the minister indicated that these advances would be repaid in the next crop year. Since this suggests we will need a seven or eight bushel quota at least in the next crop year, was the minister's statement based on the possibility of the government's selling more grain?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I will have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will cross our years one by one.

[*Translation*]

VIOLENT DISTURBANCES

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE INTERVENTION OF R.C.M.P.

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Has the Quebec government requested the assistance of the R.C.M.P. in order to control the disturbances now taking place in Quebec City?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Solicitor General that he has no definite information in this regard. However, if the hon. member so wishes, inquiries can be made.

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

TAXI SERVICE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the serious concern and financial difficulties being experienced by taxi owners, other than those associated with Murray Hill, in that they have to return empty after delivering passengers to Montreal and some other international airports, would the minister say whether he is taking action, or has done so, to alter this policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think this is a matter that might be considered at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DIRECTOR GENERAL OF GATT

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): May I call your attention to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Long, Director general of GATT, accompanied by two of his top officials, Mr. Lewis and

Mr. Lucq. I am sure the house will appreciate their visit to Canada.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

TRANSPORT

YARMOUTH, N.S.—DOCKING FACILITIES FOR FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Did the minister meet yesterday with the Minister of Trade and Industry of Nova Scotia, and can he assure the house that the docking facilities at Yarmouth will be ready for the proposed new ferry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I did meet with the gentleman in question, not yesterday but the day before. The discussions were fruitful, but we have not reached the point where I can say specifically that the requirement the hon. member has mentioned can be met.

POLLUTION

POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING COUNCIL TO PARALLEL THAT IN U.S.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. A few weeks ago I asked whether he would consider following the practice that is going to be carried on by the President of the United States in personally heading the environmental quality council aimed at eliminating pollution in the United States. The Prime Minister was kind enough to say he thought it was a good suggestion and would give it consideration. I wonder whether as a result of that consideration he has decided to head such an anti-pollution council in Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, our cabinet system is a bit different from that of the United States. We have cabinet committees looking into this matter, and they report to cabinet. At this stage I feel this kind of co-operation between departments is sufficient. If at a later stage we find we should have a wider council, perhaps involving the public, this of course will have to be done in consultation with the provinces. We will consider that if it becomes necessary.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Prime Minister not noticed that in addition to the President heading this council, the Vice-President and all the senior members of his administration are to sit on the council? Does the government not think that pollution is sufficiently important to warrant its being tackled in this way?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question appears to be argumentative.

Mr. Hees: I think the Prime Minister would like to answer, Mr. Speaker. Will he have a go at it and see what he can do?

Mr. Speaker: The answer may also be argumentative.

POSSIBLE BAN ON USE OF NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mention has been made of the problem of pollution. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether representations have been made to him by the Federation of Mayors to ban the pestilence of non-returnable bottles, which number over a million per day and cost the Canadian people a great deal of money for disposal thereof. Is consideration being given to the banning of this type of bottle and will such consideration require co-operation on the part of the provinces, or can it be done directly by the federal authority, as the Association of Mayors indicates?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I may say in answer to the first part of the question that I have no knowledge of such representations having been made to me or to my office, but I can inquire about it.

My reply to the second part of the question is that I suppose the hon. gentleman knows the answer as well as I do. It is possible that the federal government, through resorting to the Criminal Code, could ban the bottles, but it is not very likely that it would resort to the use of this power.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the Prime Minister in a position to say whether a study is being made of the alternatives to placing a ban under the provisions of the criminal law, because the disposal of these bottles constitutes a serious menace and costs this country a great deal of money?

Mr. Trudeau: It seems to me that pollution, in this instance land pollution, would come

under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. The federal government, except through recourse to the Criminal Code, cannot act on its own, and I do not suggest that any consideration is being given to finding ways in which we could act. However, when we come to discuss the water act the opposition will realize that there will be indications that in some instances we plan to resort to the provisions of the Criminal Code. We hope however that, in the initial stages at least, we will always act in consultation with the provinces. If this system works, we might extend our regulations from water pollution to land pollution, as has been suggested.

AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—USE OF JUMBO JETS AT NEW INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In reply to a question asked on June 18 concerning the spending of $500 million on an airport to service aircraft which may not even go into service the Minister of Finance said:

If we do not have jumbo jets we will have supersonic jets.

In view of the fact that neither the Department of Transport nor the C.T.C. have approved of supersonic planes flying over Canada and landing here, would the Minister of Transport say why Air Canada has placed an order for supersonic planes at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The question should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Skoberg: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I placed this question on the order paper and received an answer, but I would like the situation clarified. How can Air Canada place an order for these planes if permission has not been given to their operating in Canada?

TORONTO—LOCATION OF INTERCITY JET FACILITY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Transport whether he has had an opportunity to consider my request that he make a statement to the house with regard to his position on the proposed intercity airport in Toronto. Has he had an opportunity to consider the matter, and will he make a statement in the next few days?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I have considered this question, Mr. Speaker, and am pleased to tell the Leader of the Opposition that I will be very happy to make a statement in the house if time permits, or to arrange a briefing for anybody who wishes to know the full story behind our whole rationalization plan for southern Ontario in this regard.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Since the house is sitting overtime in an effort to clear up government business prior to the proposed recess, would the Prime Minister consider having it sit next Tuesday? I ask this question because apparently the Prime Minister is not going anywhere and we will be stuck with him here.

PENITENTIARIES

FEDERAL PRISON AT MILLHAVEN—ACTION TAKEN TO MEET CRITICISM

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the genial and gracious Solicitor General. Is he concerned about the constructive criticism that has been made concerning the new penitentiary at Millhaven, which will replace Kingston penitentiary? If so, what does he intend to do about it?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General is concerned about all criticism of new institutions being built for the penitentiary service. He studies all such criticism and takes the appropriate action indicated by each piece of criticism and his evaluation of it.

Mr. Gilbert: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Just what action does the minister intend taking with regard to Millhaven?

Mr. McIlraith: Just which criticism is the hon. member referring to, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gilbert: There have been so many criticisms that probably the minister has difficulty in differentiating among them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRIVILEGE—MR. NESBITT—OMISSION OF NAME FROM DIVISION LIST

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to refer to an apparent omission in *Hansard* of June 5 last, and I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that this was drawn to my attention for the first time only this morning, and that so far I was unaware of it. I refer Your Honour to page 9764 of *Hansard* of June 5 last to point out to Your Honour that on that day a question was asked by myself of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). Shortly after orders of the day a vote was taken on the Income Tax Act, and at page 9779 of *Hansard* of that day there was a record of those who were present in the house, and how they voted. My name is omitted from that list, but I assure Your Honour that I was present in the house when the vote was taken and I voted against the government's proposal for the 2 per cent surtax.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was kind enough to give me notice of his question of privilege, according to the rules. I assure him that the matter will be looked into and the necessary correction made in the official records of the house.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to the day's business I wonder if, on a point of order, I could draw Your Honour's attention to the special order which specified that proceedings today should not continue beyond 6 p.m. There may be some doubt about the interpretation of the order passed a week ago today, but I believe I express the general consent of the representatives of the parties that it is understood that at 4 p.m. today the allotted day would be terminated and we would then return to government orders, for the remaining two hours today. Perhaps, if there is any doubt in that regard, an order could be made to that effect.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). Is there agreement to it?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should just like to assure the house that the subject matter to be debated from 4 p.m. onwards will be the official languages bill.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION OF THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe) moved:

That consideration be given to the third report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs relating to the consideration of estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs which was presented to the house on Tuesday, April 29, 1969.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since the opportunity has never been afforded to me before, I feel it appropriate that, first, I should take the time of the house to mention the Canadian participation in the 25th anniversary of D Day in Normandy, France, earlier this month. To those of us who returned to the beaches of Normandy after 25 years it was an experience that I wish we could have shared with all those veterans who were not afforded the opportunity.

Certainly—and I am sure I am speaking for my colleague on the trip, the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Smith) and the other members of the delegation—the experience was one we will never forget and one which filled us with pride. I feel very sincerely that we learned a valuable lesson in our association with the citizens of Normandy when renewing memories. That lesson is that the path to a strong international relationship and peace is to be found in the relationship with people, the ordinary citizens who suffered through wars and saw death and destruction for the cause of peace.

Those of you who were not with us will not be moved by our experiences when, for a few hours, we were infused with an emotional camaraderie which became so real again, even after 25 years. But it was real and our visit with the citizens of France, along with hundreds of veterans from across the length and breadth of Canada, recreated the feeling of sorrow at war and death, and the joy and laughter of reunion. For a few days in France, Canadians, whether veterans approaching the twilight of their careers or the youngest member of our Canadian forces who participated in the guard of honour to pay our respects to those who remain in the Canadian cemeteries, were welcomed with open arms as relatives who had returned to participate with citizens of France in the celebration of this occasion.

The lesson I learned is that international relations do not come about from talks around a conference table among members of governments. They happen and are created in the hearts and minds of people, people who know what suffering is and elect us to office to preserve peace. They do not happen by the threat of the pressing of a nuclear button by powerful presidents or prime ministers.

I should like to express my opinion of what I thought was a serious error in the planning of the trip. I refer to the failure to communicate the "tongue" of all Canada to those of all origins who participated in the many ceremonies to dedicate memorials and in the laying of wreaths to those who fell on D Day. Those responsible for delivering our message failed to deliver the message of a really full Canadian participation. This might be only my opinion but I wanted the young 18 year old soldier who took part to understand from his ambassador why his Canadian comrades of the same age died and lay in the cemetery instead of having been able to take part in the free Canada in which we are now living. I say this not to criticize but only because I know that those of French origin with whom I fought side by side 25 years ago and with whom I renewed valued friendships would want me to do so.

I therefore express the appreciation of all who participated in the Canadian delegation to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) and his staff and our thanks for giving us the opportunity to take part in an exercise which, outside the realm of politics, brought together in a sense of international participation a spirit of loyalty, patriotism and good will. Even though it came about because of war, I hope it will strengthen our will for and devotion to peace in the world.

In participating in today's debate I am fully cognizant of my responsibility as a member of this house to the most important segment of our population, the war veterans of Canada. In speaking on behalf of my party it is my duty to try to impress on the government of Canada their responsibility to our veterans in their consideration of the priorities with regard to the needs of this country, and to try to find the reasons why the needs of war veterans, especially those who are disabled or incapacitated, seem to hold a bottom spot on the list.

• (12:10 p.m.)

For the past four years, and especially in the last 12 months, this party has shared the concern felt by many thousands of veterans and their dependants throughout the land over the creeping paralysis of indifference which has been and is becoming more prevalent as to concern for those people of whom the late Sir Winston Churchill spoke in the early 1940's when he said, "Never was so much owed by so many to so few." It is easy to forget just what those words mean and to whom they referred, and to become involved instead in superficial issues which only cause controversy and discontent.

It is obvious where the fault lies, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it lies with the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Nor can I conceive that it lies with the hon. members opposite who sit with us as members of the Veterans Affairs Committee, especially those who are veterans themselves. Even if they wanted to do something about the problems I have in mind, their efforts would be stultified by the dictatorial attitude of the cabinet, an attitude which becomes more evident every day. The fault lies with the inner circle of this government, that group of a few toy soldiers who seem determined to destroy the stability of this country while in their dreams of grandeur they think they are improving conditions and bettering our relationships with other countries of the world. A good example of the position taken by the government is its attitude in ignoring the continuous pleas of both opposition members and their own members for consideration to be given to increasing veterans allowances and pensions in line with the increasing cost of living.

What do we get as an answer, Mr. Speaker? We get a shrug of the shoulders and the response that we cannot afford it, or an implication of that kind. We are told that if we increase pensions we shall have to increase taxes. We are supposed to believe this tale of woe by the leader of this country—the lame-brained excuse that in order to raise pensions for war veterans it is necessary to raise taxes. We do not have to raise taxes in order to increase the salaries of the Prime Minister's staff. Pretty soon there will not be enough room in the galleries for them, there will be so many.

We do not have to raise taxes to write off $125 million on the Expo debt with a shrug. We do not have to raise taxes to find millions of dollars for foreign aid. We can squander millions of dollars through lack of control in spending on the *Bonaventure*. We can ease tariffs to the extent of $80 million for the big motor giants without raising taxes. But when it comes to increasing modest benefits to the very people who are responsible for our being

able to sit in this house and govern, who are responsible for the fact that 20 million Canadians are able to live in peace and comparative prosperity, the government has the unadulterated gall to tell the opposition and the nation that we cannot afford it.

I do not know what the 20 million people of this country believe, Mr. Speaker, but I do know there are 961,000 veterans who do not believe it. I know that the Royal Canadian Legion does not believe it, and I know that the war pensioners of Canada do not believe it. Neither do the Hong Kong veterans, the Army, Navy and Air Force veterans, the War Amputees of Canada, or the many other organizations which have submitted briefs to all Members of Parliament as well as to the Minister of Veterans Affairs pleading that the Woods committee report be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs and wondering what happened to the white paper which was to have been produced.

The Woods committee report has been completed since March of 1968, well over a year ago, in both official languages; yet we continue to receive evasive answers to our questions about it and to experience procrastination covered by the excuse that it is being studied with care so that excellent results may be achieved. What kind of camouflage is this, Mr. Speaker? What is the government trying to hide behind? It is hiding behind priorities, its own narrow version of priorities.

The veterans of this nation do not want any handouts. They had the guts to fight and they have the guts to play their part in providing for themselves after years of sacrifice. They do not want to depend on anyone for a living, least of all upon the government. But there are many thousands of veterans who must look to us for help, even though they do not want to, because they had the misfortune to be disabled or incapacitated and cannot provide for themselves through no fault of their own. There are many thousands of veterans who have returned from wars, re-entered our society with a determination to catch up, and have become successful and prosperous. There are also many thousands of war veterans who, in addition to making their way in our society, have taken time to care for those who need support and guidance, realizing that they themselves might have been disabled. There are even veterans who, having taken their place in our society, have become Members of Parliament and sit on both sides of this house charged with the responsibility of governing for the betterment of all Canadians. Some of these good Canadians sit opposite, and I can understand their dismay and disillusionment at the attitude of the establishment in dealing with the needs of veterans.

The Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs is one of the many committees that perform their duties without publicity and in an absence of controversy. It carries out its duties without fanfare because regardless of partisan politics its members are veterans in the main and have one purpose or objective in mind—to help their comrades who need help. They are willing to forgo attention because whether they are Liberal, Conservative, N.D.P. or Créditiste they have one thing in mind, the welfare of their comrades who defended this country of ours.

I feel it is appropriate at this time, when I am speaking about the contribution made by the veterans of Canada, to say something on the subject of national unity, because it is obvious that we in Canada tend to forget just what a solid base we have built in the word "Canadian". Here we are, with almost a year completed in the present session of parliament, and it is important that we look back to see what has been accomplished by the government in this area.

First of all, some of the inner circle went junketing to Latin America on a mission to improve trade and create good international relations. And after spending hundreds of millions of dollars, where do we stand? Why don't we ask the United States where they stand in Latin America after spending vast sums there? They cannot even send Governor Rockefeller there on a good will tour without fear for his life. I notice there are not too many members present on the benches opposite during our discussion of this important question of veterans affairs.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Marshall: We have lots of money for foreign aid, but we have no money for war veterans. They are laughing at us in foreign countries for our determination to help while five million of our own poverty-stricken citizens go without. I am reminded of the story told by a comedian on the Ed Sullivan show who said that the best business in the world today is the foreign aid business. "Just find an island", he said, "give it a name and then go to the United States or Canada and ask for foreign aid and you will get millions without any question whatsoever."

At this very moment we have Colonel Blimp away on a mission playing hide and seek with the communists in an attempt to enter into diplomatic relations with communist China, a country whose leaders continue to blaspheme the closest ally we have—I hope—the United States of America. This government of ours wants to extend diplomatic relations to a gang of warmongers who gave military aid to North Korea in a war in which thousands of Canadian soldiers lost their lives. Before the government becomes pals with Mao Tse-tung and his pirates I suggest that it consider the friendship of war veterans of this country who through their patriotism in the three wars of this century assured the peace which allows them to sit in glory and arrogance determining the fate of our nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: What did we accomplish for national unity with all the millions spent on centennial year, that year of celebration during a period when we find ourselves, owing to the actions of this government, faced by a split in dominion-provincial relations which threatens our future? Would it not have been better to celebrate our 100th year of confederation by providing centennial housing for veterans and centennial pensions for those who made it possible for this country to mark 100 years of national life? This would have been something we could always remember, something with a mark of everlasting remembrance.

I repeat that national unity does not come from secret meetings with premiers. It does not come from prodding and teasing through the press or by antagonizing and giving false promises. National unity is created by people, the citizens of this country. It does not come out of the throat; it comes from within the body. It lies in the hearts of every human being who wants to live at peace with his neighbours regardless of race, creed or colour. And it has developed through the loyalty and patriotism of all Canadians whether English, French or of any other national origin. It comes from the sacrifice of the war veterans who offered their lives to make it possible for us to make the mistakes we are making today in repayment of that sacrifice.

• (12:20 p.m.)

How do we make this inner circle realize the needs of this country? How do we make this group of conscientious objectors realize their duty to society? Certainly not by common sense or human reasoning. We must try to impress on them that they are availed of the opportunity to govern this country because of the sacrifice of those of our citizens who fought with distinction during times when the peace of our nation was threatened by Naziism and Communism. Yet we are flirting with exchanging ambassadors with this type of country.

There is not much to be gained by reviewing the specific issues at stake with regard to veterans problems. The minister is well aware of the excellent presentations forwarded by the various veterans organizations outlining in complete detail their observations on the burning issue of the moment—the 147 recommendations in the Woods report. For heaven's sake let us do something about the report so that we can increase the paltry pensions, as is recommended.

The cost of living is increasing, a fact recognized by everyone. Wages are being increased proportionately. I am sure not one member of this house can say, however, that a realistic appraisal has been made of the plight of the veteran and his dependants with a view to paying him a remuneration sufficient for him to live on. This, in effect, is the main basis of the veterans complaints.

I respectfully request the minister to try to impress upon the inner circle the real standard of priority that the Woods report should be given in the interests of hundreds of thousands of veterans. If the government is having trouble, then the standing committee members are there to help it. This is why they are on that committee. The heads of the veterans organizations are also begging to help. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) keeps preaching involvement, participation and dialogue. These groups want to dialogue, they want to participate and they want to become involved. So why the hell does the Prime Minister not practise what he preaches?

The veterans of this country do not want anything that is beyond reason. However, as a group they represent a good portion of those citizens of this country who gave this government a clear mandate. They also gave this government their confidence. It is the duty and responsibility of the government—indeed, it should be their privilege—to live up to their promises of equality for all Canadians.

To give the house an example of what I mean, one member of the inner circle, the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), stood in this place and told me a couple of weeks ago that an additional 27 cents a year charged to each subscriber would recover all of the increased postal charges on the *Legionary*. I am told by the Legion that the mailing bill for this publication, one which is so important to all veterans, will cost in 1970 $228,000 compared with $18,000 for 1968, and this because the Legion has been refused reclassification. The result of this will be that those same veterans who need help will be charged this increased cost. This is the sort of answer we used to expect from another minister during the war, the minister of propaganda in another country.

There are many recommendations in the Woods committee report which require immediate implementation. I refer in particular to those directed toward the incapacitated and those veterans whose life span has been restricted as a result of serious injury. These recommendations are sincere and comprehensive and have been assessed with careful scrutiny by experts in various veterans organizations across the country. These experts have already pointed out in their comments weaknesses in some 22 recommendations that have already been implemented by the Canadian Pension Commission or are in the process of being implemented. Other weaknesses exist in several other areas. These weaknesses could be resolved by allowing veterans groups to appear before the committee to give evidence and advice.

There is a special section of the report that deals with Newfoundland, whose veterans are of special concern to me. There are many weaknesses in the test of eligibility for pension of Newfoundland war veterans who served in the United Kingdom in world wars I and II. Under the terms of union it is incumbent upon the government to clarify these ambiguities to avoid administrative delays. This must be done soon because time is of the essence.

Steps must also be taken to deal with the weaknesses in legislation relating to our merchant seamen. The War Veterans Allowance Board has been doing a tremendous job in trying to meet the needs of these servicemen. However, there is a serious need to look at the time limit for applying for pensions. These important citizens have no right to a pension unless their disabilities resulted from enemy action. Consideration should be given to giving our merchant seamen an opportunity to receive a pension in cases where they have suffered indirectly from enemy action. Consideration must also be given to strengthening benefits for those who served with the Newfoundland forestry units. In this regard it is time we started to take action instead of procrastinating.

The need for action is Canada-wide. The staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs is a very devoted group of experts who continue to dedicate themselves to the support of the war veteran. They are most anxious to carry out the directions of the government through the Minister of Veterans Affairs so as to upgrade those benefits that are so deserved by veterans in need of assistance.

I hope I have made some slight impression on the minds of those responsible for giving direction and for decision-making. I ask them to do the honourable thing in regard to our veterans. Perhaps the government realize their mistake and are a little ashamed to come forward. In this regard may I remind them that we veterans are a forgiving group of people and will accept their apologies with grace and understanding.

Therefore I ask the government to institute the necessary action to implement the principle outlined in legislation that pensions, let us not forget, are paid to our veterans to provide them with subsistence. They are in payment of a debt and, indeed, are a mark of gratitude that we truly owe the veterans of Canada.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very worth-while motion that is before the house today, particularly in view of the fact that over the last three or four years the veterans of Canada have been awaiting with expectation the changes that the government has consistently indicated will be brought forward. We have eagerly been awaiting some decision in regard to the Woods report. I believe this report was just a stalling device on the part of the government; otherwise something would have been done about it.

When the Woods committee was appointed it was given a very short period in which to review the terms of our veterans legislation, and the committee is to be congratulated on the thorough job its members did during the limited time available. The Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) has since had considerable time to decide whether to implement the recommendations of the Woods report. I am sure the minister will agree that some of

the mistakes made by a previous Minister of Veterans Affairs should be corrected *tout de suite*, and I understand this is his intention. I refer to the fact that Canadian veterans who are receiving the veterans allowance are being penalized in regard to other legislation. They find themselves in no better position than other people who receive supplementary benefits under the Old Age Security Act. I do not think this was the intention of our veterans legislation.

The number of veterans diminishes each year. This is inevitable as we move farther and farther away from the period of active warfare. Eventually we hope the need for veterans legislation will cease. However, the younger members of the house and those who did not participate in either of the two world wars should be made aware of one very simple fact, that veterans legislation should not be considered in the same light as other social legislation.

For example, some of my colleagues have asked how we can justify giving the veterans special preferance in terms of providing money to build houses, or in terms of medical treatment and the financing of their medical care. They forget that our veterans sacrificed their health, happiness, home life, education and the chance to be with their families when their families most needed them. They did this not for their own sake but for the sake of the people of Canada and the debt we owe them cannot be measured in dollars and cents. It is an obligation that each and every one of us must accept. It is a moral, spiritual and financial obligation, and we have fallen down in the last five or ten years in the way we have discharged our obligation.

• (12:30 p.m.)

Do hon. members realize that when supplementary benefits under the old age security program are paid to veterans who have passed a needs test, the amount of veterans allowance those veterans receive is reduced by the amount of the supplementary benefit? That is a disgrace. The extra $30 a month the veteran receives in supplementary benefits is taken off his veterans allowance. The veteran is no better off under these circumstances. It was wrong to lump veterans allowances with other payments made under our social benefit programs. There ought to be no direct relationship between the amount a veteran receives in veterans allowances and any amount he receives under the old age security program. It is wrong of us to subject to a needs test a man who was willing to serve Canada in her hour of need.

I now wish to deal with a number of other matters to which the speaker preceding me alluded. The way we treat our Hong Kong veterans is a disgrace to this country and to any minister prepared to go along with such treatment. Sections 92 and 93 of the Woods report indicate that as of September 1, 1968, 395 Hong Kong veterans were receiving disability pensions of 48 per cent or less. The members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs for as long as I have been on it have been recommending that, considering the privation these men underwent, considering the inhuman way they were treated while prisoners of war and the diseases they suffered from as a result of that treatment, diseases like beriberi, malaria, typhoid, as well as other ills arising from malnutrition brought on by the diet of rice and fish which many of them were not accustomed to, they should receive disability pensions of not less than 50 per cent. They are entitled to that. That is the opinion of the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. It is also the opinion of those who compiled the Woods report. They all think that the pensions of these veterans should be set at 50 per cent or more of disability because these men underwent torture and privation in prison camps unlike such camps anywhere else in the civilized world.

I can remember seeing some women who belonged to an organization known, I believe, as the first world war widows of Canada, or something like that. There were two or three of them who were over 80 years old and when they came before the committee we congratulated them warmly for having lived so long. Unfortunately they were not given the pension the committee recommended they should be given. I am saying this because the minister is in a unique position in the government. He can recommend to the government that payments falling outside the scope of existing social legislation be made to veterans. He can recommend that these payments be based on the needs of our veterans who served our country so well, and their dependants. His recommendation could cover those men who participated in the war but who are not, strictly speaking, veterans.

For instance, why have our firefighters not been paid the pension they were promised? They ought to be classed as veterans and be entitled to veterans allowances. What about the miners who went to Gibraltar and the

merchant seamen who served in our merchant marine during the war? Strictly speaking they were not in the armed forces, yet many of them were killed in the war. They were wearing their own uniforms, although they were not in the armed forces. They filled a need as important as the one filled by our soldiers, sailors and airmen. We have an obligation to these people and we should discharge it.

The minister does not have to say, "Let us wait for the Woods report." We do not need to wait for anyone or for any report. The Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs has made it abundantly clear that all these people should be looked after. Certainly it may mean giving these men money that the general public is not entitled to. But the veterans of Canada ought to be set apart from the general public. The minister has a moral and economic responsibility toward the veterans and he ought to go before cabinet and say, "I know this assistance does not come under our social security structure; I know it does not come under the pension legislation or under any retirement program or under the Canada Pension Plan. Nevertheless, considering the superhuman sacrifices these men made for Canada we have an obligation to look after them to the best of our ability."

I hope no one will say that the war ended 25 years ago and that we will not have another one. That sort of thing was said after the first world war. Our men who joined the forces at the beginning of hostilities in the second world war did not say, "Just one moment now; what's in this for us? What sort of veterans pensions will there be or how big will disability allowances be?" They did not say that. They volunteered to join the forces and went overseas hoping we would give them a fair shake if they came back. There is no connection between a pension paid to a veteran and a family allowance payment or any other social benefit payment that is made in Canada, just as there is no connection, or very little connection, between merchant seamen who operated ack-ack guns on ships during the war and the people who stayed behind.

Benefits paid to our veterans are not in the same category as other social benefits paid to the rest of our people. For the government to say that both classes of benefits are the same is wrong. If we do not discharge our obligations to our veterans we are not keeping faith with those men who served Canada so well. Many friends I went to school with do not ask for veterans allowances. They do not have to. They are lying beneath the soil of other countries. Those who came back had the right to expect that Canadians would recognize their obligation to them. This obligation is being neglected year after year.

• (12:40 p.m.)

It has been 25 years since the end of the last war, yet we have not solved the problems of the Hong Kong veterans. Is it because certain people in high places in the Department of Veterans Affairs collaborated with the Japanese even though the Japanese were not in nearly as bad shape at the end of the war as others? This charge has been made. I am not mentioning names. If hon. members want the names, I will give them. The members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs are well aware of this charge.

Why are these veterans not being properly paid? They have appeared before the committee and informed its members of the diseases from which they suffer. Because medical treatment is not available in Canada to control these diseases, they have to look for treatment elsewhere. Nothing special is being done for them. The Woods report recommended an automatic 50 per cent disability pension so that these veterans and their dependants can have full benefits.

I agree with the previous speaker that something should be done for the merchant seamen. Representations have been made on many occasions in this regard. There have also been many representations with regard to firefighters recruited during the last war. These people talk about the promises made by the minister of full benefits for them when they returned to Canada. What has been the result? Twenty-five years of delay!

I am very concerned that the government will not implement the recommendations of the Woods report. Why did the government appoint this commission if they did not intend to accept the recommendations in the report? The government should have said they were no longer going to honour their commitment to the veterans.

I was shocked when the veterans land legislation was put into the same category as general legislation. Parliament said that money would be lent to veterans at one per cent over the prime borrowing rate, but this is being done under almost every piece of legislation in the lending field. Why could the veterans not have been given another 10 years' extension at the 5 per cent rate?

I know of many veterans who have not been able to raise the money to take advantage of the Veterans Land Act. Why could there not have been an extension? Why was there a cut-off? Are we to assume that a person 50 years of age is too old to build a house? There should be special legislation for veterans as well as maintaining the present legislation. Why did the government say after 25 years, that is enough of that foolishness, we will cut it off?

I am shocked at the way the government is dealing with the veterans charter. When the veterans charter was designed and developed after the war, it was one of the best pieces of veterans legislation in the world. I am surprised that only 25 years later the government is trying to destroy and distort that charter at every opportunity. Changes made to the Veterans Land Act may only be the beginning. The minister should state that he will not agree to any curtailment of veterans rights.

I do not know what is going to happen to the Woods report. I do not know to what extent the government will accept or reject the report. I do know that there is not a veteran in this country who is not disappointed and disgusted with the government for commissioning a report on abuses in veterans legislation and then not being prepared to introduce legislation immediately to correct those abuses. I have attended a number of meetings of the Legion and other veterans organizations. In every case these veterans are unhappy with the government and disgusted with the minister for not pressing the implementation of many of the recommendations in the Woods report to provide them with immediate benefits.

We are all aware that the government is carrying out an austerity program. However, this program should not be applied to legislation respecting veterans. What happened to the former Minister of Veterans Affairs may also happen to this minister. The former minister was unable to get the nomination again in his own constituency. The present minister is not doing much better than the former minister. The minister should seriously consider this matter in order to avoid becoming very unpopular with the thousands of veterans in this country.

The veterans are depending on the minister to implement the recommendations of the Woods report in order that they may receive these benefits. I strongly urge the minister to consider this matter for his own peace of mind. He has a responsibility to all the veterans of Canada who have been waiting a long time for final justice in their relationship with their country through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

[Mr. Peters.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): In my remarks on the comments made by the previous speakers, I for one would like to support unreservedly those words which conjure up the time when I myself was a bit young. I was not old enough to go to war, but I followed very closely the unfolding of that conflict which allowed us to preserve the freedom to speak in this house.

I agree with all that has been said, because I often receive complaints from veterans in my constituency who feel that they are not treated adequately. Too often, owing to a mere technical mistake, they are not eligible to the pension to which they are entitled.

I know that there should exist regulations, that the generosity of the government is not boundless. It has but limited resources yet it belongs to the department to take a more human approach toward the requests it receives.

• (12:50 p.m.)

I recall a fact which took place a month ago. A veteran who, at the end of the war, had been a few months only in England, came back to Canada where he had served for four years. Because he was short of a few days of service to qualify for service overseas, he could not qualify for a pension that would have enabled him to live decently.

Veterans, as all Canadians, are affected by the increase in the cost of living, and because their pension is not big enough to enable them to live decently, they are treated as people on welfare.

I will not repeat what the previous speakers said, but I will deal with a problem that is for French Canadians, and especially Quebecers, simply shocking.

That happened recently—several hon. members have talked about it earlier—during the commemoration of the battle of Normandy, in France. First of all, I shall read—for the understanding of the context,—a report from the *Montreal-Matin* of June 12, and I quote:

—during a trip, all too short, to the Normandy beaches. The commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the allied landing in 1944 was taking place. Thousands of American, English and Canadian veterans were coming back for the first time to the scene of the battle, when French veterans

welcomed them with open arms. Not to mention the people themselves who wanted to show their gratitude in a hundred ways.

From Carentan, a chain of torches were lighted along the coast. Remembrance torches, freedom torches. And in the evening, at Sainte-Mère-Église, took place a re-enactment, according to the sound and light technique, of the landing of 1944, with the sound of bombers, Nazi boots, machine-guns and church-bells ringing in token of rejoicing. Even dummy paratroopers were dropped from the sky. And the loud-speakers installed in the public squares repeated the old coded messages from the B.B.C. in London announcing the invasion.

On the same day, that is Friday, June 6, a ceremony was held at the Beny-sur-Mer military cemetery under the auspices of our own Department of Veterans Affairs. This cemetery could be mistaken for a British one because most inscriptions, if not all, are in English only. All commands to the troops were given in English during the ceremony: guard of honour, salute, last post, reveille, prayers, flower-offering, Scottish lament, benediction. The Canadian ambassador in Paris, His Excellency Paul Beaulieu, saved our honour by reciting a few verses from Charles Péguy.

There are problems. And do not tell me that the department does not have enough money to pay tribute to our veterans. Some of them had a French name, and if it was "Lambert", you can see it on their tombstone spelled "Lambpert". Even in death they have to put up with this lack of respect. I wonder what is the place given to Quebecers. I am not surprised at all the troubles facing Canada today, for justice is not done to our people.

I shall go on with the quotation:

Veteran soldiers of the Régiment de la Chaudière asked that one of their own be allowed during the ceremony to lay a wreath on behalf of Quebec. That would have been a veteran who took part in the landing in June, 1944. The suggestion was met with a flat refusal by the delegates of the federal Department of Canadian Veterans Affairs.

He was finally allowed to lay the wreath once the ceremonies had ended; such arrogance was even more disgusting in view of the fact that that Quebec veteran was Mr. Hugues Lapointe and that in Quebec he represents the Queen as Lieutenant Governor.

When in order to pay tribute to our veterans, we are forced to put up with such humiliations, as a representative of the province of Quebec I do not have the right to accept a re-occurrence of such a situation. It will have to be corrected so that in the future on the Normandie beaches the tribute be paid in our language, with our prayers in the way we intend to live.

I continue with the question:

The delegates from the Régiment de la Chaudière, shocked by such a public blunder, organized for the next day a ceremony at the very site of the landing, on the shore. It was a small and intimate ceremony, without protocol display, in the presence of the villagers.

Our Canadians who have fought so hard, who have helped preserve our freedom, are driven to organize a small gathering in a small village in order to pay such a high tribute. Our brave soldiers did deserve, I think, a much greater tribute.

And I will close by mentioning another rather unfortunate incident. The federal Department of Veterans Affairs had organized a press conference on the evening of June 5, at the City Hall in Caen. Here are the facts as related:

The whole thing took place in English only. A briefing about the ceremony which was to take place the next day at the military cemetery of Beny-sur-Mer was held. A public relations official went as far as to suggest that the Canadian veterans should not be allowed to take pictures during the ceremony, for proprieties sake, he claimed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to drag this on interminably, but I believe that by quoting this newspaper article, you will understand, as I do, that such glaring injustices certainly generate disunity in Canada, and I would not like to be always compelled to remind people that justice must prevail. I hope that the department will take the necessary steps to insure that this kind of situation does not happen again elsewhere.

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I intend, in the few minutes that are left to me, to try and answer all the arguments that have been presented at this stage of the debate. I first want to answer the arguments of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont).

He told us that he fully endorsed all that had been said by the two members who spoke before him.

But the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) who spoke first was himself at Beny-sur-Mer. He complained that the English language was neglected during the ceremony, while the hon. member for Frontenac complains that everything was in English.

Mr. Dumont: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I clearly said that I agreed as to all the economic problems, but I pointed out other problems.

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, the first hon. member who spoke congratulated us, and with due reason, as to the reconstitution of the

landing in Normandy towards the end of the last world war. That celebration, commemorating the 25th anniversary of that landing, was organized by the Department of Veterans Affairs in co-operation with the Department of External Affairs.

The reports submitted so far by all those who were present were most laudatory. They congratulated us, even saying that the Canadian ceremonies were, by far, more significant and impressive than those of our allies.

The hon. member who first took the floor complained that there were not enough ceremonies in English whereas the hon. member who has just resumed his seat complains that there were not enough in French.

I therefore believe we have struck the right balance. This is a striking example of the difficulty of achieving true national unity in Canada.

That is understandable, because people, instead of using their heads, their common sense, often give way to their passions.

When people complain, on the one side that there was not enough English, and on the other not enough French, there is every reason to believe that the Department of Veterans Affairs struck, as I said, a happy medium and respected quite well the ethnic composition of the country.

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

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), after discussing the Bény-sur-Mer ceremonies, discussed the needs of our war veterans. In his opinion, if I recall correctly, he claimed there was a creeping paralysis and a total indifference on the part of our government. He also stated that the attitude of the government was to ignore the requests of the veterans and of members of the house. Then he dealt more particularly with the need for pension increases, implying that very little had been done in the field of pensions on this side of the house.

[Mr. Dubé.]

Perhaps in a very friendly way I should refresh the memory of the hon. member. Of course we all know or should know that pensions were first implemented after the first war in 1919. At the time the basis of the payment was the assessment of disability based on the requirement for enlistment, that is, that a person had a healthy mind and a healthy body. The pension rates established in 1919 were composed of a basic rate and a bonus because of the abnormal economic situation. The bonus was increased in 1920 and in 1925 was absorbed into the basic pension. Throughout the dark years, the 1930's—and they were not exactly known as Liberal years—no increases were made in the basic rates. Of course none were made during the war years.

In 1948, however, pension rates were increased from $900 a year for a single pensioner to $1,128 a year. In 1952 they were increased to $1,500 a year. In 1957 they were increased to $1,800 a year. In 1961—and I salute my hon. friend—they were increased from $1,800 a year to $2,160 a year. In 1964 they were increased to $2,500 a year. Two years later in 1966 they were increased again to $2,760 a year and finally last year, 1968, there was another healthy increase of 15 per cent to $3,180 a year for a single veteran and more of course for a married veteran. In other words, between 1960 and 1968 disability pensions increased from $1,800 to $3,180 for single veterans. This takes in three rapid increases in the years 1964, 1966 and 1968. I for one would not call this creeping paralysis or total indifference.

Of course the cost of living is going up and these rates are always under review. At the present time they are under review in conjunction with a number of other types of payments made to Canadians by the federal government, as indicated by the Prime Minister on June 17. At that time he stated:

> We have to review all aspects of social legislation. We are doing this; we do not want to settle special cases. A special plea can be made not only for the veterans but for old people, for retired civil servants and for all sections of people in society.

Although we are always looking forward to improving the lot of our war pensioners, this is no reason for us to belittle our present record. As a matter of fact veterans in Canada and all of us agree that Canada stands second to none in her treatment of war veterans.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dubé: The hon. member also expressed his anxiety, and rightly so, about the Woods Committee report and the white paper. He felt that perhaps there might be some kind of camouflage to prevent the Woods Committee report from reaching the Veterans Affairs Committee or some sort of camouflage to prevent these recommendations being acted upon. Perhaps at this time it would be appropriate for me to give him and other hon. members some of the background material in this connection.

First of all I should state that on only three occasions since the origin of disability pensions have persons outside of parliament been called upon and authorized to inquire into the operation of the Canadian Pension Commission or the operations of the predecessor of the Canadian Pension Commission, the Board of Pension Commissioners. There was a review in 1922 by a royal commission which is now referred to as the Ralston Commission. Ten years later, in 1932, a committee chaired by the Hon. Mr. Justice Rinfret and later by the Hon. Louis Arthur Audette was appointed to inquire into the administration of the Pension Act. The third occasion was September, 1965 when my predecessor, the Hon. Roger Teillet, appointed a committee to survey the work and organization of the Canadian Pension Commission. This committee was under the chairmanship of the hon. Mr. Justice Mervyn J. Woods.

The terms of reference of the Woods Committee were broad in scope. The committee was expected to bring in a report in 90 days. The members of the committee, however, discovered that the matter was so complex and the roots of the ramifications so deep that it took them two and a half years to bring down a report. I should point out that these three commissioners were highly experienced veterans, including among the three two very able justices one of whom was a past president of the Royal Canadian Legion. Yet those three people took two and a half years to prepare their report. It is understandable that we should be given at least half that time to bring this report into fruition.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The three commissioners conducted a very extensive investigation into the organization, methods, procedures and interpretations used in the adjudication of disability pensions. The response to the appointment of the Woods Committee exceeded all expectations. As a result, the committee conducted 41 hearings in Toronto, Quebec City and here in Ottawa. Those appearing before the committee included representatives of 14 veterans organizations, 13 members of parliament, the Canadian Pension Commission, the Veterans Bureau and representatives of the Canadian Armed Forces. The Woods Committee recorded many hundreds of pages of testimony; it carried out research, and finally, after the time-consuming task of evaluating the mass of material gathered, submitted a report of three volumes totalling 1,319 pages. If I recall correctly, the report contained 148 recommendations.

As soon as the report was handed to my predecessor he tabled it and an interdepartmental committee was appointed to study in depth the 148 recommendations contained in the report. The committee of officials completed its exhaustive review. I, of course, had to digest these studies in order to make my own recommendations, which are now under intensive study by the government of Canada. Hon. members will appreciate that any such study, if it is to have any value at all, requires searching analysis; we have to determine the social, legislative and financial implications involved in the recommendations. As I said before, many of the recommendations are complex in nature. Furthermore, it is necessary to consider whether in some cases more appropriate solutions can be found than those proposed by the Woods Committee.

As I have mentioned in the house on several occasions, a white paper outlining the views of the government will be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs for study in conjunction with the Woods Committee report.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Dubé: During the session, as I have said all along. The white paper will encompass all the recommendations of the Woods Committee and indicate the government's position on how the Pension Act should be improved to enable it to meet present-day needs. The hon. member asked, "When?" He should look at *Votes and Proceedings* and he will see a notice of motion referring the report of the Woods Committee to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. If hon. members are so anxious to have the Woods Committee report and the white paper referred to the committee, I would expect them to give swift and unanimous approval to that reference when we move the motion. As a matter of fact, if there is unanimous consent I would move the motion right now.

Mr. Peters: Doesn't the minister know there will be no time for the committee to meet?

Mr. Dubé: When hon. members return in September it is my understanding that before the house meets the committee will sit. I presume this will be one of the committee's tasks. It will be given every opportunity in the world to study the Woods Committee report. When the members of the committee have read the report they will understand exactly what I mean when I say it is very complex and comprehensive. Of course, when the committee has studied the report and the while paper it will be up to the government to enact legislation based upon decisions reached by the committee.

The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe was anxious to tell the house that in his opinion the government of Canada was doing very little for our veterans. He went on, if I understood him correctly, to imply that the government should not be dealing with Latin America. If that is the case, I would like to know the policy of his leader and his party in this matter. The hon. member also complained that the government was spending too much money on foreign aid. Again, I would like to obtain the opinion of his leader and party in this regard. I would also be interested in knowing whether he was speaking on behalf of his party when he complained about our proposed recognition of China. He did not appear to be very happy about the sums of money spent during centennial year; yet the National Centennial Act which established the basis for those celebrations was enacted in 1961 by his party. Is it the position of his party and his leader that the money spent in 1967 for celebrating the 100th anniversary of Canada was not well spent? We would like to hear about that.

The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) covered very much the same points. He dealt at random with several points without really making one. The only one I can remember dealt with the Hong Kong prisoners. I am very familiar with the plight of the Hong Kong prisoners; several of them come from my native village. This recommendation, like the 147 other recommendations, is part and parcel of the Woods Committee report. I cannot discuss that report at the moment without first knowing the policy of my government in the matter.

I do not wish to take up more of the time of the house. I think I should conclude by saying that the government of Canada is not neglecting our veterans; in fact, in the past fiscal year we spent over $400 million in assisting them. The budget of the Department of Veterans Affairs has been increasing every year. We have in the department very able personnel. I believe most veterans across the country would agree with that. It was said by one hon. member that the government of Canada does not recognize the special debt owed by Canadians to our veterans. This is not true; we treat our veterans in a very special way. We do recognize that the citizens of this country owe them a great debt. We are providing our veterans with more advanced veterans legislation than can be found anywhere in the world. Canada is one of the few countries that still has a department of veterans affairs. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is an excellent department, doing an excellent job.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRIVILEGE

MR. LEWIS—HOLDING OF PRESS CONFERENCE BY SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS BEFORE MAKING STATEMENT TO HOUSE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I learned of the matter I wish to raise only at lunch time, so this is the first opportunity I have had to raise it. I might have done it at two o'clock but I did not want to interrupt the remarks of the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Dubé). I am sorry that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not here and that no minister other than the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) is present, but I hope that the minister will convey to the government my strong protest, and I am sure the protest of every hon. member who thinks about the matter.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I learned at noon hour today that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) has arranged to hold a press conference at four o'clock this afternoon to make a statement and to answer questions regarding his recent trip abroad. Hon. members will recall that this morning the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) asked the Prime Minister whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs would be here on Monday and whether he would make a statement on his trip. If my memory serves me right, the Prime Minister said that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would be

here on Monday and would make a statement on those aspects of his trip upon which he considered it necessary to report. I am not suggesting that the Prime Minister knew at the time that the Secretary of State for External Affairs had arranged for a press conference this afternoon.

Together with all other hon. members, particularly those sitting on the opposition benches, I am becoming more and more enraged by the attitude of the members of this government toward parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: It is not unreasonable to expect that when a minister of the Crown makes a special trip abroad to meet the governments and authorities of other countries on matters about which we do not know he ought to report to the House of Commons before he reports to the press, and that the members of this house have a right to hear him before the press does.

I made some inquiries about the time of the minister's arrival in Ottawa. I cannot be sure about the details, but I am told that he arrived in Ottawa before the house started its sitting this morning at eleven o'clock. But whether or not he did—and I think my information was pretty reliable—the Prime Minister knew perfectly well that the house would agree to revert to motions at any time during the day, even during an allotted day, for the opposition to hear a report from the Minister. The minister could have come here at two o'clock and given us his report, after which he could have gone to the press conference at four o'clock.

I want to know what it is that is making the government act this way. I said in an interview which was published in an Ottawa paper some time ago that I had the impression that the present Prime Minister really had no use for parliament, that it was a kind of necessary unavoidable evil for him to have to appear in the House of Commons and to allow the other ministers to waste their time here. This is the way it seems to me that he looks at the situation. Every time there is an important matter about which parliament should hear, we read about it in the press before the minister involved appears in the house to tell us what he is doing. Why are the ministers of the Crown so insistent on downgrading the purpose and usefulness of parliament, particularly of the poor hon. members who sit behind the treasury benches, who I understand are going to meet to see whether they cannot persuade the government to assign some role to them in parliament which will lessen their frustration?

Mr. Cullen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am on a question of privilege.

Mr. Cullen: The hon. member is berating the backbenchers, but I think he has already put his question of privilege and now we are hearing a harangue about his feelings. I think he should confine himself to his question of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member is taking a little too much upon himself in telling other hon. members how to put their questions of privilege. I have not been here many years longer than he has but perhaps he should wait a little before giving that kind of presumptuous advice.

My question of privilege concerns every member of this house, including the hon. member who just rose so plaintively to make a point that had no point to it. I do not understand why the government should treat parliament in this cavalier fashion. I cannot understand why the government chooses to downgrade the value of the house and to prevent the possibility of comment on what they do. The only conclusion I can come to is that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would much rather speak to the press than face the Leader of the Official Opposition and the spokesmen for the other parties.

There must be an end to this practice. On occasion ministers make announcements outside the house when they cannot avoid it. I am the last person in the world to berate them for that, but when this house is in session on the day on which the minister comes back from a trip, then it is to this house that he ought to make his report and not outside it.

I protest in the strongest possible terms against what is happening. I say that the thing to do is for the house to declare its readiness to revert to motions at four o'clock and invite the Secretary of State for External Affairs to come here at that time to make his statement and delay his press conference for half an hour.

I should like to move therefore—and I do not have my motion in written form:

That the house agree to revert to motions at four o'clock and invite the Secretary of State for External Affairs to appear before it to make a report on his overseas trip.

Question of Privilege

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to second this motion and support the position taken by the members of the New Democratic party in this respect. I must say that I find it impossible to understand why the Secretary of State for External Affairs should have a press conference rather than come to the house and make a statement on a matter that is evidently of great interest to members of the house. I also find the attitude of the government toward the house impossible to understand. I have always taken it for granted that when a minister has an important statement to make and the house is in session he makes it to the house.

I cannot understand the attitude of the present government. Is the government taking this attitude because the opposition parties have been co-operative and have agreed to abandon some of their ancient rights with regard to holding up supply? Is it for this reason that we are not getting straightforward answers and have to put up with statements such as the one made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) upon his return from the NATO meetings?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, if the two hon. members who spoke before me took the trouble to read the regulations again, they would see—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. There is already a question of privilege before the house, and the Chair can consider but one at a time.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long because it will not take me long to make my point. My point is that the fact that members of the opposition parties have been co-operative in expediting the business of the house does not mean that we will lie down and tolerate this sort of thing, nor would the people of this country expect us to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: Therefore the point must be very obvious to all of us, and I have great pleasure, although I find it regrettable that I have to do this, in supporting the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I am sure every member on this side of the house at least will support him. If the Secretary of State for External Affairs has a statement to make, let him make it in the house. The house will afford him every accommodation for doing so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few moments of the time of the house to say that I support the question of privilege of the hon. member of the New Democratic party, asking for the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) to come and make his statement before the house, to which he is responsible, around four o'clock, before imparting it to newspapermen, as it happens most of the time.

I also want to support firmly the two members who spoke before me and tried to bring the government back to democratic reason. As for us, we have honestly and sincerely been asking ourselves since the election of this government if, in reality, we are faced with a dictatorship or a democracy.

If there is friction throughout the country, that is due to the dictatorial attitude of the members of the cabinet of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). If the Prime Minister encounters closed doors in various places, he can beat his own breast, since we are supposed to live under a democratic regime and we strongly believe that the democratic principles should prevail. Therefore, I urge the ministers and particularly the Prime Minister to act accordingly. The Prime Minister's ideas should be in accordance with the democratic principles and not his socialist leanings.

I wish to make it clear here that we labour under the socialist rule, and that we must absolutely escape it and revert to true democracy. That is why I gladly support the motion brought in by a Socialist who is for democracy. That is why I am most pleased to support this motion as a Democrat, and I want to call the people's attention on such infringements to democracy. We must absolutely put a stop as soon as possible to such doings if we do not want to be ruled within a year by the worst dictatorship of all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The Chair believes that the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for York

South (Mr. Lewis) is not justified. The hon. member may have a grievance against the government but I find this is a bad moment to raise the matter because he will have the opportunity to do so in due time.

Now, I would like to quote citation 88 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

(2) All motions referring to the business of the house should be introduced by the Leader of the house.

Consequently, I do not think it proper to deal with the question now.

Mr. Lewis: What paragraph did you quote, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Citation 88, paragraph 4, Beauchesne's fourth edition. We are dealing with the business of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to point out that no question of privilege was involved.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION OF THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Marshall.

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks in this debate may I say I am pleased to see the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) in his place to hear the observations of members of the opposition and all those who are interested in the welfare of war veterans. I was also pleased to hear him refer to the Woods report which is much in the minds of members of the opposition parties, as it is in the minds of veterans across the country. As the minister reminded us, this committee was established on September 8, 1965, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Mervyn Woods. It produced a most voluminous and comprehensive study. The veterans magazine has this to say about it:

Months in preparation, meticulous in detail and bristling with 149 recommendations the Woods report is hailed as a momentous production.

Mr. Ron MacBeath, past president of the Legion, had this to say:

Every aspect of war disability pensions has been gone into thoroughly. There are 149 specific recommendations for improvements and beneficial changes—

All veterans organizations hailed this report as marking a turning point in government treatment of veterans and their problems. What is bothering everyone is the undue delay in the implementation of the recommendations of the committee. The house has not even been given an opportunity to debate most of these recommendations.

On February 3 the Minister of Veterans Affairs announced that the government was preparing a white paper and would not send the Woods report to the standing committee until the white paper had been published. Well, we are still waiting and we are doubtful now that any action will be taken before the summer recess. The minister has endeavoured to justify the delay that has taken place but we have certain suspicions about what has really been happening. I will come to this later.

While the government has been declining to take action, the cost of living has continued to rise. The cost of the groceries which war pensioners buy for their tables, the rent for the homes in which they live, their bills for heating, lighting and taxation, if they own their own homes, are rising steadily. For others in our society incomes are rising. But the veterans can do nothing about their situation. They are trapped in the stagnation of fixed pension incomes. The income of veterans ranks lower and lower on the totem pole of our society, in a society which seems to determine its classifications in accordance with financial position. The Legion's national magazine looks at the situation this way from the point of view of the war pensioner, especially in relation to housing:

Housing for our senior citizens has depreciated to the point at which the situation can be considered a crisis. This is especially so for those in a fixed income bracket. Having no means of supplementation they find their standards of living rapidly deteriorating by reason of the present economic situation.

Surely the minister can muster compelling arguments before his cabinet colleagues that an interim supplementary pension is in order until the course of action recommended in the Woods report can be implemented. We have gone almost a full year without anything being done, and still there is no glimpse of

light. The subject must go before the committee for discussion. Legislation must be drafted and brought forward. It may well be another year before anything can be done on behalf of our veterans. Surely it is reasonable to suggest that an interim supplementary allowance be made to these people who are experiencing such hardship in the present circumstances.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The suspicion arises that the government is not only producing a white paper but is drafting legislation in advance of hearings. We are suspicious because of the treatment that has been given the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. We remember that the transportation legislation had already been drafted by the government even before the report was presented. We are also witnessing the sad spectacle presented by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) who has told the house that his department has already made up its mind in regard to legislation on smoking and health. In light of this, our veterans organizations that wish to present their views on the Woods committee recommendations to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs have good reason to fear that they will be unable to do so or that their recommendations will not be embodied in the legislation which is to come about.

Ten of our national veterans organizations have joined in preparing a united brief which they hope to present to the Veterans Affairs Committee. However, since this opportunity has been denied them for some time now their recommendations have been mailed to each member of the house. They put forward four major considerations that should be uppermost in the mind of the government. The minister knows what they are and does not need to be reminded of them, but I should like to place them on *Hansard*.

First of all, they recommend that there should be an independent pension appeal board and, second, that more adequate compensation should be paid to our Hong Kong veterans. I was glad to hear the minister say that he was sympathetically disposed toward these veterans, even though he had not had first-hand experience of their plight, as I have. Third, they recommend that there be more adequate compensation for pensioners who are suffering from multiple disabilities. I believe the veterans organizations are asking for a 300 per cent increase in this compensation, perhaps a little steep but nevertheless a matter we should concern ourselves about. The fourth area concerning veterans groups all across the country is the need to establish a basic rate of pension related to the income of the unskilled labourer in government service. If that were done our pensioners would not find themselves in the economic trap they are in today.

In order that I do not talk only theory and complain of what the government is doing or failing to do, I should like to speak about conditions as they are at the grass roots of the problem. I refer to those men and women veterans, particularly the men, for whom the whole program was designed and whom it serves. I have been in touch with some of the welfare offices in the seven Legion branches in my riding and ascertained some of the matters that are of immediate concern to them. I trust that the minister is aware of them. First of all, the burnt-out pension should be increased. That view was expressed to me by the service officer in the Delhi area.

In the Hagersville area the matter bothering them the most was one we have already discussed, namely, the implementation of the Woods report. Another matter that welfare officers are constantly running into in trying to solve the problems of our veterans is that the wife of a veteran who is on pension can earn only $1,250 without her husband's pension suffering as a result. In view of the rising cost of living, the increased cost of practically everything required to maintain a household, surely this figure is totally unrealistic. Even an adjustment of this sort would give some help to the people now suffering and awaiting the implementation of the Woods report.

Welfare officers of the Legion branches are also concerned about another matter. They feel that the reference to overseas service should be deleted from the conditions under which veterans may obtain relief. After all, it is not always the fault of the veteran that he was not sent overseas. He was under the command of the Department of National Defence or the Canadian forces and went where he was sent. He had no control over this. Surely this condition should be deleted from any consideration relating to assistance.

In the Waterford area the Legion officer underlined a point I have already made. He mentioned that a veteran who is partially disabled can earn only $900 without reduction of his pension taking place. In light of the present-day increase in the cost of living this amount too is totally inadequate. These are

all matters that I ask the minister to look into before the Woods report is implemented, which I understand may be a year away.

In the Simcoe area the service officer of the Legion expressed concern at the phasing-out of Sunnybrook Hospital in Toronto where many veterans in this area had been sent. He is concerned lest the load now placed on Westminster Hospital in the London area will overtax the facilities at that hospital and our veterans will find themselves without hospital services. I trust that the department is keeping abreast of the problem and is estimating the admissions that will be required during the next few years, so that Sunnybrook hospital is not phased out too early. These are some of the matters of vital concern which go to the grass roots of the problems of our veterans.

Before I conclude I would ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs to use his good offices to speak to the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), a tough man to deal with as we all know, about the new postal rates, the effect of which is placing an undue burden upon the *Legion*, formerly called the *Legionary*, the magazine of the Royal Canadian Legion. Not only have the postal rates been increased but the magazine has been excluded from the preferred rate given to newspapers and magazines. As a result the cost of mailing this national magazine to our veterans has increased by 1,400 per cent. Surely the Minister of Veterans Affairs can do something to see that the magazine is at least placed on the preferred list.

Having made these comments, I urge the Minister of Veterans Affairs to take into consideration some immediate plan of action to help our veterans until the recommendations of the Woods report are implemented.

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to preface my remarks in this debate with a brief account of my participation in the celebrations in France and Belgium marking the 50th anniversary of the 1918 armistice. The government of Canada provided 100 first world war veterans with transportation and all the facilities for what proved in reality to be a great pilgrimage superbly organized by the minister and officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The pilgrimage was to pay our tribute to the comrades left behind forever on foreign soil.

Canada has in France and Belgium 13 battlefield memorials commemorating the exploits of Canadian and Newfoundland troops. We visited every one of them, and at each one a memorial service was held and wreaths laid by representatives of each unit that made up the Canadian expeditionary force; and on each occasion a wreath presented on behalf of the government of Canada preceded the wreath-laying ceremony.

During almost two weeks of ceremonies and receptions I was astonished at the military precision of event following event, a prodigious triumph of organization on the part of the Department of Veterans Affairs, led by the then deputy minister of veterans affairs Ernest Coté, himself a veteran of the second world war. His organizing ability, ably assisted by other officials of the department, made the entire trip a pleasure for everyone participating in one of the most colourful, brilliant conceptions of commemorative ceremonies that I have ever seen. It was one of the greatest patriotic demonstrations Canada ever staged on foreign soil, most of the credit for which should properly go to the untiring efforts and hard work of the officials of the department.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I think I am expressing the views of my colleagues on this side of the house when I say that this debate is worth while and welcome because it reflects the interest of members of all parties in the human side of the subject. In all the years I have been a member of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs I have never encountered partisanship when the needs and aspirations of our war veterans have been dealt with. The mover of the motion under consideration is to be congratulated for his report on the 25th anniversary of the cessation of hostilities in the European theatre of war. All the same I disagree most emphatically with his suggestion that the government is dictatorial and not doing its utmost on behalf of veterans. I regret the irresponsible statements the hon. member made. They were adequately and effectively answered by the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I congratulate the minister on his very fine presentation.

The minister has pointed out on several occasions that it is the government's duty to consider the problems affecting the one million veterans of Canada. Happily, not all of them require assistance, nor do all especially need to appeal to the government. However, of the one million veterans, 14 per cent are pensioned, about 8 per cent are in need of veterans allowances and about 1 per cent are

continuously in need of hospital care. For those in need, and an appreciable number of our veterans are in need, provision was made and included in the 1968-69 estimates to the extent of about $426 million. This is an increase of $19.1 million over the 1967-68 estimates and reflects the concern of the government about the welfare of veterans and their dependants who need help.

There have been three revisions in the pension rates since 1964. The first one was effective from September 1, 1964, and represented a 10 per cent increase across the board. The second increase became effective on September 1, 1966. It represented a 15 per cent increase in the basic rates in the pensions for veterans and widows. The third revision, which went into effect on January 1, 1968, brought in a 15 per cent increase for all veterans in all cases. No Canadian war veteran needs to apply for charity for himself or his family. I am confident that the government will enact legislation which will make unnecessary the humiliating recourse to public welfare.

The recommendations placed before the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs by several veterans organizations have been most helpful to members of that committee on which I have been most happy to serve. I can say that submissions were made with dignity and restraint. I am sure the government has taken note of them. The minister pointed out to the committee on April 17, 1969, certain matters of importance to veterans. I quote what he is reported to have said:

> First, the program of welfare services, allowances and other benefits is one that seeks to ensure that all persons eligible for war veterans allowance, civilian war allowance and other veterans benefits are assisted to the full extent of the provisions of the various statutes affected.
>
> The second is the pension program administered by the Canadian Pension Commission, which is a quasi-judicial body reporting to Parliament through the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Under this program, pensions for disability and death are provided as set forth in the Pension Act. The program also includes the adjudication of claims for pensions under several other statutes including The Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the R.C.M.P. Superannuation Act and the R.C.M.P. Pension Continuation Act.
>
> A third program is concerned with the provision of treatment services to veterans and to other designated classes of patients as authorized by the veterans treatment regulations.
>
> Fourth, the Soldier Settlement and Veterans Land Act program seeks to effect the successful settlement of qualified veterans as farmers, small holders, commercial fishermen and homesteaders, including Indian veterans on reserves.
>
> [Mr. Badanai.]
>
> The fifth of the programs, departmental administration, is concerned with the effective and efficient provision of a number of common professional and administrative services.

The opposition has been rather harsh in criticising the unavoidable delay in referring the Woods committee report to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs for study and recommendation. This report is merely a survey of the work and organization of the Canadian Pension Commission and was presented to the former Minister of Veterans Affairs in March, 1968, shortly before the dissolution of the last parliament. I assume that hon. members have read this very thorough study of the organization and operation of the Canadian Pension Commission. The study contains some far-reaching recommendations, many of which will undoubtedly result in major amendments to the Pension Act. Hence we have had the unavoidable delay in dealing with this legislation.

One recommendation of the study is the establishment of an appeal board which will have jurisdiction over the Pension Commission. Under the present system appeals may be heard by commissioners. An applicant must present his case to commissioners working with colleagues who may already have ruled against the applicant. There is no appeal to an independent body. The Woods Committee report states that when an applicant's claim has been denied there is no agency or court to which he may take his case. It is therefore perfectly clear that the system is inadequate in ensuring justice. The objection to what is recommended may stem from the assumption that the appointment of a pension appeal board would result in superimposing upon the commission a superior authority. I agree with the report where it says that, in essence, the commission should be an administrative body which can operate satisfactorily only if the responsibility for final decision is transferred to a senior body such as a pension appeal board.

Cases involving claimants in my constituency have been brought to my attention. After having been rejected by the commissioners these claimants have gone to their own doctors and the medical reports of those doctors were turned down by the pension commissioners. This leads one to believe that there is a form of discrimination in the handling of independent reports. When I made representations on behalf of some of these unfortunate claimants I was told politely that the private doctor's report had been considered by the commissioners but that the orginal diagnosis

would still stand. All this is an additional reason for my wholehearted support of the Woods Committee recommendation that a pension appeal board be appointed.

The government has given a great deal of consideration to increases in federal pensions, old age pensions, retired civil servants pensions, and veterans pensions. I am confident that when the whole social security review has been completed a policy will be established in keeping with our well-rounded national social welfare program.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé), who is following this debate with the interest I would expect him to show, feels that because he could say that last night he introduced a motion to refer the Woods report to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs he has scored a debating point. I am afraid I must say to him that that is all it amounts to—a debating point. The basic unfairness in the way in which the government has handled the Woods report still stands so far as veterans and veterans organizations are concerned.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Let us take a moment to look at the record with respect to the handling of this very important study of the administration of the Pension Act. As the minister pointed out, the Woods Committee was set up in September, 1965. It soon found that it had more to do than could be done in a few months. Indeed, it was March 22, 1968, before its report was presented to the government. I should also mention another date, namely, March 26, 1968; that was the date on which the report was tabled in the house.

The next important date in connection with the Woods report is September 13, 1968, when the minister was asked in the House of Commons about the reference of the Woods report to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. These are the words he used in reply to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I quote from page 24 of *Hansard* for Friday, September 13, 1968:

> In reply to his question may I say it is our intention to have the Woods Committee report referred to the House of Commons Committee on Veterans Affairs as quickly as possible, and to act on the recommendations of that committee as soon as we received them.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that statement was very clear and the commitment involved in that statement was clear and solemn.

Veterans Affairs Committee Report

Later in that same month, on Monday, September 30, the minister was again questioned about the Woods report. As recorded at page 564 of *Hansard* the minister stated:

> First of all the Woods report will be referred to the Veterans Affairs Committee. We will have to ascertain what decisions the members of that committee will take before the minister can decide what legislation will be enacted.

I submit that the position of the government in September of last year was very clear. The government promised that the Woods report would be referred by itself to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs and the members of that committee would be given an opportunity to study it and make their recommendations to the minister and the government before the government had decided what was to be done concerning the recommendations of the Woods report. That has all been changed, Mr. Speaker. That commitment has not been kept.

On February 3 of this year the minister was asked by the chairman of the standing committee, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), when he intended to refer the Woods report to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. At page 5045 of *Hansard* the minister said:

> Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to advise the hon. member and the house that at the present time we are preparing a white paper respecting veterans pensions and the Woods committee recommendations. This white paper is being given high priority and we expect later on this session to be able to refer both the white paper and the Woods committee report to the House of Commons committee.

When that reply was given, it seemed harmless enough. However, during the weeks and months that have gone by since then we have realized what a change of position has taken place. Originally the committee was to get the Woods report and advise the government as to what it felt should be done with regard to the recommendations in that report. The Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs will not now receive the Woods report by itself, but the Woods report plus a departmental white paper which sets out, before the members have any chance to express their views on the Woods report, what the government is going to do about it.

I have not seen the white paper. I do not know what is in it. I have a pretty good idea it will be a document which will declare that many of the things in the Woods report have already been put into effect in one way or another. It will be a document which will indicate the difficulties and financial problems

associated with some of the recommendations in the Woods report. Then it will probably list those recommendations in the Woods report which the government is prepared to accept.

This is not being fair to the committee system of the House of Commons. The whole idea of the beefed-up or rejuvenated program of activity for our committees is that private members of parliament shall have more say about what is going to be done. Are the committee members going to have an opportunity to deal with the recommendations of the Woods report directly, or are they simply going to be told the decisions the government has already made and only be given an opportunity to concur in those decisions?

The minister expressed the hope there will be ready consent to the passing of his motion to refer the Woods report to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I have no objection to this. The motion will be on the order paper on Monday and it can pass without debate at that point so far as I am concerned. I suggest, nevertheless, that it is a case of breaking faith with veterans and veterans organizations to do it this way as opposed to the way it was promised to be done in September of last year.

As has already been pointed out, any item that is referred to committee next week can hardly be dealt with by the committee next week. Maybe we will be here longer than we anticipate. We may be here for the month of July, taking into consideration what has happened here today. I would love to stay on.

An hon. Member: We know that!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If some of the hon. members in the back row on the other side of the house do not want to stay, they can persuade the government to drop the proposed Standing Order 75C.

As the minister stated in his remarks earlier today, the best that can happen is for the report to be in the hands of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in September, 1969. The promise was clear in September, 1968, that the report would be referred to the committee as quickly as possible. When the committee gets the report in September, 1969, instead of getting it with a free hand to listen to the veterans organizations and make the recommendations that the members of their own free will might have made, they will get it with a government document telling the government members on that committee, at any rate, how far the government will go. The chance of anything coming out of the committee beyond what is in the white paper is very slim. In fact, it is just about nil. That is not playing fair with the veterans of this country.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai), the minister and the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), if he gets into the debate before it is over, can tell us all the wonderful things that have been done and how good the programs are. What counts is what is being done now for the veterans, and we think this treatment is unfair to them.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Despite the fact that other members have referred to them I think I should say a word about the many things in the Woods report that need to be acted upon. My namesake, the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), pointed out that there are four things that have been singled out for top priority so far as veterans organizations are concerned. They are the question of an appeal board, dealing with cases of multiple disabilities, special treatment for the Hong Kong veterans, and the whole question of establishing a proper arrangement for a basic rate of pension.

But when one looks over the Woods report, its three volumes and its many pages, he finds it deals with a great many questions, many of them the concern of veterans across the years, such as the matter of pre-enlistment conditions, questions about blindness, the re-opening of claims, the benefit of the doubt clause, attendance allowances and so on. There are questions relating to widows, and many others of that sort.

Then on the fringe of all this there are questions relating to the War Veterans Allowance Act, to the situation faced by the Dieppe prisoners of war, merchant seamen, firefighters, and so on. There is a great host of problems of this kind, many of them dealt with in the Woods report, others not dealt with but related thereto, all of which make this a terribly important document, and we think it is most unfortunate that a whole year will have been lost because the government failed to keep its commitment made on Friday, September 13, 1968.

The minister says that the standing committee can meet in September after this motion is passed early next week. Well, if we are going to be here next week, and maybe the week after, and the week after that again, the committee does not need to put off its work until September. It might as well sit

while we are debating matters of procedure here in the House of Commons unless, of course, the government comes to its senses.

Some of us regret that with all the attention we have been forced to put on the Woods report the whole question of the War Veterans Allowance Act seems to have been lost in our concern about the Woods report. After all, the Woods report deals only with that section of veterans legislation that relates to disabilities, and pensions paid under the Pension Act and some other acts related thereto. But a great many of the veterans of this country get some financial recognition for their condition and suffering, because they served their country in war, only under the War Veterans Allowance Act, and we feel there are improvements that need to be made in that legislation that are just as important as the improvements called for in the Pension Act and other veterans legislation.

Ever since this parliament began I have been pleading with the new minister that the War Veterans Allowance Act be referred to the standing committee along with the Woods report. His answer has been that that is up to the committee. That is one way to answer such a question, but of course it is up to the government to make the kind of motion that will produce an actual reference. I still feel that if the position of veterans generally is going to be considered by the committee it should have before it not only the Woods report and all those matters that relate to disability pensions, but also the War Veterans Allowance Act, an act in which real improvements are needed.

I know we can be told by the minister that changes have been made in recent years. In fact he went back to tell us what veterans were getting in 1919 and 1920. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1920 I got summer work at 25 cents an hour and thought I was getting pretty good pay. Possibly some people may think that is all I should be getting today. It is no good talking about rates of veterans pensions in those years, or the rates five or ten years ago. The fact is that we are living under a new set of conditions, and if any group of people in our society deserves the attention of government and parliament it is the veterans, their families, their widows and others that they have left behind.

I have made one or two specific references to the War Veterans Allowance Act. There is one item in particular that I admit I have spoken of a good many times and which I think is a piece of hypocrisy to which our veterans should not be subjected. I refer to the situation that obtains as between the guaranteed income supplement and the war veterans allowance.

When the guaranteed income supplement legislation was put through the House of Commons much was made by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen), then the Minister of National Health and Welfare, about the fact that the income test in the guaranteed income supplement would not take into account any pension received by veterans, whether a disability pension or a benefit under the War Veterans Allowance Act. And that is true. When a person applies for the guaranteed income supplement any money he is receiving under the War Veterans Allowance Act is not counted as income.

Big deal, Mr. Speaker! The same veteran who gets the guaranteed income supplement, despite the fact that he is getting money under the War Veterans Allowance Act, then finds that because of the means test in the War Veterans Allowance Act the money he is receiving as a guaranteed income supplement counts as income for the purposes of the War Veterans Allowance Act, and what he receives under the act is cut back.

We think it is bad enough that there is no improvement for veterans because of this new legislation—at least it was new then—but to maintain that piece of hypocrisy, telling the country and the veterans that war veterans allowance income does not count against their guaranteed income supplement, when the reverse is the case, is no way to treat the veterans of this country. That is an anomaly which I think should be straightened out. It is not something which happened by accident. We debated it at length when we were discussing the guaranteed income supplement, but we could not seem to involve the Minister of Veterans Affairs of that day in any campaign to get the situation changed. But we think it should be changed now.

This is one of the reasons I feel that when the Woods report is referred to the standing committee, and for my part that can be done on Monday, there should also be referred the War Veterans Allowance Act so that the whole position of our veterans can be gone into by that committee. As I have already said, at the risk of seeming to be a killjoy and wanting to spoil some of our members' summer plans I would like to see that committee meet soon rather than in September, a full year from the time when the promise was

first made to refer this matter to the standing committee.

In his eloquent remarks the hon. member for Fort William expressed complete confidence that when the government finishes all its reviews of old age pension matters, blind pensions, the Canada Assistance Plan, retired civil servants, veterans and all the rest, it will come up with a plan that will improve things for everybody. I am afraid I do not have that kind of confidence in the government. Having raised pension matters time and again since we first met here last September, I am afraid my feeling is that the government just does not care about our older and retired people, just does not care about the people who have to rely on these kinds of pensions for a decent standard of living.

What bothers me, and I think in his heart of hearts the Minister of Veterans Affairs shares this concern, is the lack of concern on the part of the Prime Minister and the present government for people in these categories, retired civil servants, old age pensioners, retired employees of the C.N.R. and veterans. These people cannot live on reviews, they cannot live on studies being made of all these various programs, they cannot live on fine statements about these things being involved in the problems of inflation, taxation and all the rest of it. If these retired people, these older people, these veterans, deserve our attention let us give it to them with good grace. Let us give it to them in a generous way. Let us not mistreat them. Let us not treat them with bad faith as, in my view, has been the case with veterans since this government came into power.

I regret very much the long delay in dealing with the Woods report and all these other matters, but now that a motion is on the Order Paper let us have the matter referred. Even yet I wish the minister would hold back his white paper and allow members of the standing committee, on the basis of the representations that the various veterans organizations will make to it, to make their own recommendations to the government in line with the clean and solemn commitment he gave on September 13, 1968.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I know there is by agreement a cut-off on this debate at four o'clock and I am also aware that other hon. members wish to speak. Therefore I shall be very brief. I wish to put on the record the facts concerning the

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

standing committee which dealt with the estimates in the hope that I will be able to correct a misunderstanding which apparently has arisen in some quarters. The estimates of the department were referred by order of the house of February 20 to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs of which I have the honour to be chairman. Under the rules of the house there is no doubt that the committee could deal only with the estimates which were referred to it. I shall cite citation 304, sections 1 and 2 in Beauchesne's fourth edition, page 244:

1. A committee can only consider those matters which have been committed to it by the house.
2. A committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the order of reference.

In considering these estimates the committee met on April 17 at which time it heard from the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé). It met again on April 23 and again on April 25. On April 17, as the result of a question specifically asked by one of the members of the committee, the chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission placed on record a series of statements relating to those aspects of the Woods committee recommendations which had been implemented by the department. He placed on the record of the committee a series of detailed comments. That was on April 17. The committee was adjourned at that time. As chairman I pointed out to hon. members that it might be their pleasure to await the transcript which would provide an opportunity for detailed cross-examination of the witness. On April 23 when the committee met again the transcript was not available. The committee proceeded to hear other witnesses and to ask questions of the chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission.

On April 23 a letter was prepared and delivered the next morning to members of the committee. It was signed by the Dominion Secretary of the Royal Canadian Legion. With the permission of hon. members I should like to insert this letter in *Hansard* or place it on the record. I hope I have permission to insert this letter of April 23 signed by D. M. Thompson and addressed to the chairman and members of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am not quite sure whether the hon. member would like to have the letter appear as an appendix to *Hansard* or whether he would like to read it into the record. I might caution him

as I have other members, that it is an irregular practice to do this. The hon. member has the option to read the letter into the record, although we try to discourage this. Of course the letter could, with unanimous consent, be placed on the record.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I would normally read it but in the interest of saving time I am trying to adopt an expeditious procedure because I know other hon. members are anxious to speak. I shall cite one paragraph:

> In the event that further information on this matter is desired we would be pleased to make ourselves available to appear before your committee.

On April 25 the committee again met. I presume individual members of the committee had received this communication from the Royal Canadian Legion. There was an opportunity to cross-examine any of the witnesses. They were all available before the committee at that time. On April 25 the committee terminated its hearings and reported back to the house the estimates of the department in accordance with its terms of reference.

I think there has been some misunderstanding here because some members seem to think the committee was then at liberty to call the Legion personnel to give testimony before the committee because they were most anxious to make comment in respect of the testimony of Mr. Anderson. The fact is that the committee had very specific terms of reference, the estimates of the department, before it. According to the citation I have read there is no question that the committee did not have the discretion to depart from those terms of reference at that time.

There is now before this house a notice of motion which will come up on Monday next to refer the report of the Woods committee to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. It has been indicated by the spokesman for the New Democratic party that the members of that party are prepared to give unanimous consent to this motion. I hope at that point there will not be prolonged debate because it is obviously in the interest of the veterans of Canada that the committee should meet to set up an orderly procedure for dealing with this report at the earliest possible time. Upon the adoption of this motion, which I hope will be dealt with in the same non-partisan way in which other similar matters are dealt with by the house, I intend to call a meeting of the steering committee to discuss the most appropriate time for the committee to meet to deal with the recommendations of the Woods committee. There have been suggestions that the committee should meet in September. There are other matters which will have to be taken care of before the committee can make this decision but I hope that this suggestion which has been made from more than one quarter of the house will be given earnest consideration by the committee.

I hope this will clarify a misunderstanding which apparently has arisen in some quarters of the house concerning the work of the committee and the opportunity of a group such as representatives of the Royal Canadian Legion to take part in the committee's hearings at a time when there was a specific reference before the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, while listening to my colleague from Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), I noticed that he asked permission to have a letter inserted in *Hansard* and that you were about to ask unanimous consent of the house, but this did not materialize. I want to know if my hon. friend is insisting to obtain unanimous consent of the house in order to place this letter on the record.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the point of order may I say that it is entirely up to the hon. member for Ottawa West if he wants to insist that the letter be tabled, but I should point out that it is an irregular practice to table letters, speeches or charts. However, perhaps there is consent by the house that the hon. member for Ottawa West may include this in his remarks. This is a matter which is entirely up to the house.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not wish to be difficult, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think there is any point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There might not be a point of order but I am trying to clear up what appears to be a misunderstanding. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Veterans Affairs Committee Report

Mr. Francis: The letter from the Royal Canadian Legion to the chairman and members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, dated April 23, 1969, reads as follows:

Gentlemen: We were very interested in the statement made to your committee by the chairman of the Pension Commission on 17 April 1969. In his statement Mr. Anderson dealt with a number of the recommendations of the Woods Committee which according to him have been implemented or are in the process of implementation.

In accordance with our usual practice we analysed the information given by Mr. Anderson in the light of our experience in the field of pension work and the knowledge gained as a result of our intense study of the entire Woods Report.

Knowing the deep interest of your committee members in the Woods Report, we felt that you and your colleagues might find a copy of our analysis of Mr. Anderson's statement helpful in your deliberations. We are therefore providing sufficient copies for each member of your committee.

In the event that further information on this matter is desired we would be pleased to make ourselves available to appear before your Committee.

We are sending copies of this letter with our observations to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission.

Yours very truly

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) for introducing in the house a motion which gives members the opportunity to discuss some of the problems of Canadian veterans. I also wish to congratulate him on the effectiveness of his action. He has finally smoked out the minister from behind his cloud of secrecy.

Mr. Stanfield: Do not be too optimistic.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): I will try not to be. It seems to me to be more than a coincidence that this notice should appear on the order paper on the eve of a motion to refer the recommendations of the Woods Committee to the standing committee. So I want to congratulate my hon. friend for his counter-attack in trying to get some action from the minister.

This motion gives me and other members an opportunity to add our protests to the protests of every veterans organization and all the veterans throughout the country who cannot understand why the government has been dragging its feet in respect of such important legislation. I have heard one or two government apologists make the statement that all is rosy and that the department has done wonders for the veterans. If this is the case, why then has every veterans organization throughout the country sent letters and telegrams protesting the manner in which the minister has been conducting the affairs of his department? This does not add up. I think it is rather tragic that we have not had more action by this new minister who was appointed to his portfolio with a great fanfare of trumpets. The veterans and veterans' organizations of this country had high hopes that action would be taken because new blood was coming into the department. They believed he would finally get something going in the department, and expected great things to be done for them.

• (3:30 p.m.)

What has happened since the minister's appointment? The great things that were expected have fizzled out miserably. The Woods Committee report was presented to the then minister of veterans affairs in March, 1968. It is now June, 1969, and the minister has taken his first action in connection with a study of that report.

I emphasize what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said a few minutes ago. I, too, deplore the methods the minister has used and the action he has taken in this regard. He has not played fair with the committee. He has told the house repeatedly that the study of the report had been delayed in order that a white paper could be prepared and presented to the standing committee at the same time as the report. I refer to the minister's words as reported in *Hansard*. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre dealt briefly with this matter. On September 13 last year the Minister of Veterans Affairs promised that the report of the Woods Committee would be referred to the appropriate committee of this house as soon as possible. He confirmed this on September 30. On February 3, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), the minister replied, as reported at page 5045 of *Hansard:*

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to advise the hon. member and the house that at the present time we are preparing a white paper respecting veterans pensions and the Woods Committee recommendations. This white paper is being given high priority and we expect later on this session to be able to refer both the white paper and the Woods Committee report to the House of Commons committee.

What has happened in the meantime? It could be that some members of the government did not agree with the minister's

avowed intention to have the committee study the Woods Committee report. The minister then started to hedge on this question. On February 27, as reported in *Hansard* at page 6007, the minister gave the following reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall).

> Mr. Speaker, as I answered before, the government is now preparing a white paper and both the white paper and the Woods Committee report will be referred to the committee later this session.

That reply would certainly indicate that the white paper and the Woods Committee report would be presented together to the committee. Then, on March 17, as reported at page 6726 of *Hansard,* in reply to a question asking what was happening with regard to the report of the Woods Committee, the minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, as I already said, the Woods report has certainly not fallen into oblivion. The government is preparing a white paper to be submitted to the Committee on Veterans Affairs simultaneously with the report—

That is clear enough. On March 24, as reported at page 7007 of *Hansard,* the Minister of Veterans Affairs in reply to a question used the following words:

> As I said before, Mr. Speaker, the government at the present time is preparing a white paper on this matter. Both the white paper and the Woods Committee report will be referred to the proper house committee later in this session.

He confirmed that on April 14. Then on April 28, as reported at page 8048 of *Hansard,* the minister in reply to a question about the Woods report said:

> As soon as the white paper is ready we shall refer it to the appropriate committee.

The minister's statements are self-explanatory. All through the session we on this side of the house have pressed him to take action on the Woods Committee report. He first said it would be presented to the committee right away. This is standard phraseology on the part of the government; it always says that action will be taken soon or in a few days. The minister told us repeatedly the report would be sent to the Veterans Affairs Committee for study. Suddenly, there was a change in emphasis and he said the report could not be presented to the committee because the government had decided it was not thorough enough and was preparing a white paper on the subject. For this reason, said the minister, the report of the Woods Committee could not be presented to the committee of the house until the white paper had been prepared. He told us this as late as April 29. Suddenly, we find that all the assertions of the minister that the Woods Committee report had to be supplemented by a white paper are out the window and the report will be referred to the committee. Why?

Mr. Stanfield: Because the policy has again been reviewed.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): As my leader says, the policy has again been reviewed. I asked the minister a question today and he said the policy would be introduced in this session. We do not know how much longer the session will last, but I do not think he has very much time in which to present the government's policy in this regard.

Mr. Dube: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I never said I would bring in legislation. I said the report would be presented to the committee.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): I apologize to the minister, Mr. Speaker. At least the report is being presented to the committee; we have that much action from the minister. I vigorously protest the action taken by the minister in this respect. I ask how he can expect the thousands of veterans throughout this country to place any reliance upon his statements. He has been telling us all along that the presentation of the report was delayed because he was waiting for a white paper to be prepared, and the committee could not act on the report until the white paper was presented to it. How can he expect the thousands of veterans in this country to place any reliance on the statement that the legislation will soon be forthcoming? The minister is no longer credible.

Before resuming my seat, I want to make it quite clear that any criticism I have made is directed mainly toward the inaction of the minister. We on this side of the house are perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the officials in the department; they are honest, hardworking, dedicated civil servants and we have no quarrel with them. All we ask is that the minister give them the tools with which to work so they can go ahead and do that which should be done for our veterans. I therefore say to the minister in all sincerity that he should prevail upon those in the cabinet who have apparently been bucking his attempts to introduce legislation which is necessary to improve the situation in which our veterans find themselves. If he does this he will restore some of the shining image he had when appointed to this portfolio.

Veterans Affairs Committee Report

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I say at the outset that I am not a veteran. I mention this simply to indicate that I have no personal axe to grind. Those who did not serve in the armed forces have a tendency to be impatient with those who did, because we cannot share their comradeship born out of wartime service, sacrifice and association. I share no such impatience. A veteran can bend my ear at any time, on any subject, at any place, and I am flattered to say that some veterans do. I think this arises in part out of my maiden speech, which was given some publicity in so far as veterans associations are concerned, and also the articles I have from time to time written in veterans publications.

• (3:40 p.m.)

When the Dieppe Prisoner of War Association recently met with the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé), I made a point of being present to hear and support the brief they presented. All too often we feel, when dealing with this great juggernaut called government, that there is little purpose in preparing briefs or attending meetings with ministers. Fortunately, the Dieppe P.O.W. Association received a splendid hearing, and the minister undertook to examine a representative number of files to determine if there is a disability common to the Dieppe ex-prisoners of war. The men presenting the brief undertook to provide the minister with a list of the men on their roster. It was gratifying to me personally to find that the list sent by the Dieppe P.O.W.'s was sent to my office for presentation to the minister. Arising directly out of that particular meeting, more than 800 files of Dieppe ex-prisoners of war have been examined and a catalogue of complaints and ailments has been made. I do not know the results of the report but it is gratifying to know that there is a minister who will listen to the veterans of this country.

This interest that I have in veterans affairs is born, I suppose, out of a lifetime of brainwashing because my father saw service in both world wars; in the first one in the Royal Naval Air Service and in the second war in the Royal Canadian Air Force as a squadron leader. One would have thought that this would have been enough, yet he saw fit to join the Department of Veterans Affairs and to give 20 years of service to it. Just before his retirement, he worked as a district administrator for D.V.A. I know the house will pardon this personal reference, but, I hope the house can appreciate it is as a result of this background that my concern for the rights

[Mr. Thomas (Moncton).]

of veterans arises. Party loyalty will not divert me from this concern.

High on my list of sources of information dealing with veterans is the magazine *Legion*. I commend to the attention of all hon. members the February 1969 issue. Pages 13 to 22 of that issue contain an excellent treatise or summary or, as the magazine puts it, "a simplified outline of the facts supporting the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Woods and his committee". This should be required reading for all members of the Veterans Affairs Committee and, most assuredly, required reading for all officials in the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as for the minister himself.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We could put it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Cullen: I have a copy here also. In my considered opinion, no veteran of any war has received more attention, more consideration, better hospital care or more assistance in training for work and in seeking employment, or more financial help toward an education or toward building a home, than has the Canadian veteran. I do not say this to provoke an argument. I say it primarily because I think it is true, but also because I want to add that we can and always should be looking for ways to do more for the Canadian veteran.

The *Legion* magazine states in part as follows:

> Months in preparation, meticulous in detail, bristling with 148 recommendations, the Woods report was hailed as a momentous production when it appeared last March.

This report is contained in three volumes in excess of 1,300 pages. The pages overflow with wisdom, and there is little doubt that the survey of the organization and the work of the pension commission results in many outstanding recommendations which, if implemented, would be of considerable long term value to veterans and their dependants.

The Legion and 10 other national veterans' associations met at least three times to discuss this report. While some groups are more concerned than others with the specific aspects of the report, there is unanimity in that they all support the report and urge its implementation. I say, "Amen", to that, but I have a lawyer's qualification. I think early implementation is great, but I do not want to see hasty implementation. I am unalterably opposed to it, whether it be for political advantage or whether it be to remove the

pressure. There are 148 recommendations, as I said before, and 10 veterans' groups and the Legion itself cannot agree even among themselves on all the recommendations which should receive top priority.

To be fair to these organizations, I think there is general agreement in four areas: the pension appeal board, multiple disabilities, the basic rate, and Hong Kong veterans. In my address I have not catalogued the 148 recommendations, but can the country, and hopefully the opposition and the veterans, see the magnitude of the task facing the government? I urge the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) to play it cool. I ask him not to seek political advantage. I ask him not to give in to the pressures which are being brought to bear upon him. I ask him not to be rushed into hasty action.

Mr. Nesbitt: Such as in four years.

Mr. Cullen: My friend will have an opportunity to speak later. I did not know he would want to butt in at this time. I am trying to speak on behalf of the veterans of this country. A report that the Legion calls "meticulous in detail" has earned the right to careful appraisal.

I salute the veterans groups, and I salute some members of the opposition as well as some members of my own party who keep the pressure on because it must be done. The Woods report cannot be permitted to gather dust. I venture to say that there is not one copy of this splendid report in the hands of the Department of Veterans Affairs that is gathering dust. I will bet that they are dogeared, read and re-read, considered and re-considered.

I do not have the foggiest notion right now what recommendations will be accepted. I do not intend either to speak on all of them, but I do feel that many recommendations should be automatic, and I cite the following examples. First of all I wish to mention routine decisions. Why should hearings and a mountain of paper work be required to decide that a pension should continue to be paid while a child of a pensioner continues to attend school?

The second point concerns hearings. If a veteran is to receive a hearing, then let us not make it a hearing in name only. It is ludicrous and unfair to place a pension claim before a tribunal without the veteran or his representative being present, and to call that a hearing.

I should also like to say a word on multiple disabilities. Very early in the fall, as an extremely green backbencher—having tangled for a few minutes with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) this afternoon I realize that perhaps I am greener than I thought—and without knowing all of the recommendations of the Woods committee report, I asked the following question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs:

> Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. While awaiting the completion of the Woods committee report, would the hon. gentleman consider allowing an interim increase, possibly beyond 100 per cent, to triple and quadruple amputees?

I can appreciate the fact that the minister may not wish to deal in a piecemeal way with the recommendations of the Woods Committee report and that he will probably bring in his report in the form of a white paper. However, of all the recommendations, this is surely one in connection with which the minister might wish to give serious consideration to amending the legislation straight away. When one considers the situation of a man who has lost one leg and receives a 70 per cent disability pension and of another man who has lost two legs who receives a 100 per cent pension, one realizes that the loss of one leg is considered to be a 70 per cent disability but the loss of a second leg is only an additional 30 per cent disability. I think this is ridiculous and very unfair to the triple and quadruple amputees.

The fourth point concerns representation. One point to which I should probably have referred earlier in the course of my remarks, and to which I meant to refer earlier, is the question of representation and hearings before the pension commission. At the present time there is an agency charged with the responsibility of defending a veterans case for a pension. This is very commendable, the right kind of thinking and a great approach. The Legion itself calls it a "lofty ideal". But it is a role which has been restricted by the legislation which requires this agency to present both sides of the argument when submitting a case to the pension commission. The Woods committee suggested, and I concur, that a strong lawyer client relationship should exist between the veterans' bureau and the applicant. The committee recommends that the bureau operate as a separate and independent agency charged only with the task of representing the applicant. Who can disagree with that logic?

Veterans Affairs Committee Report

Another matter with which I should like to deal concerns pensioners involved in damage claims. The *Legion* magazine says it more colloquially but quite succinctly with the following phrase "sorry, ma'am, you can't have both the pension and the insurance payment". The widow who has lost a pensioned husband in an automobile accident would be shocked, says the *Legion*. I hope this widow would have the presence of mind to blurt out "why not?". Surely, a pension is a matter of right. The Woods committee agrees and says, further, that the pension should be paid regardless of any other payments which may be made to the pensioner or his widow from other sources.

The next point on which I should like to speak is the stabilization of pensions. This is an area where I have some first hand knowledge. The reduction of the percentage of pensionable disability has often had the effect of cutting out a pension which would be paid to a veterans' widow. This must happen in many cases. The sad truth is that a veteran has had little enough opportunity to build up an estate and when he has reached a certain degree of pensionable disability, then on his death his wife receives a pension whether or not his death is attributable to wartime disability. Consider the case of a veteran who has received a percentage of disability allowance necessary for his widow to receive a pension. Suppose he has been receiving this disability pension for a period in excess of five years. Surely, after this length of time he would come to rely upon the supposition that his widow would continue to receive her income, and take this into account when planning his estate. Can hon. members imagine his disgust, and the concern he feels for his wife's position, when, after this long period of time his case is reviewed and he is told he is no longer in the same high category and that the amount of his pension is to be reduced, with the result that his wife will not receive a pension?

• (3:50 p.m.)

I agree that veterans receiving disability pensions should be subject to a series of medical examinations to determine whether or not the percentage of pensionable disability should be reassessed, but surely after a period of three, four or five years—whatever the minister and his colleagues in their wisdom may decide—the percentage of pensionable disability should not be subject to reduction. In effect I am agreeing with the Woods Committee recommendation that a stabilization policy should be established for the guidance of the veteran.

Unfortunately, time does not permit me to put all my views on the Woods Committee report before the house. I have tried in the short period to highlight some of the areas which I feel need attention. We on the government side do not have the leeway available to the opposition because we have the obligation to govern, with all the responsibility which this entails. In this case it means we are responsible for finding taxpayers' dollars with which to meet the recommendations. If an hon. member on the government side suggests that maybe, just maybe, we cannot afford it—that is to say, the taxpayers cannot afford it—

Mr. Nesbitt: Every year, $155 million for the C.B.C.

An hon. Member: Quiet.

Mr. Nesbitt: I will not be quiet. He is using up the time so that I shall not get a chance to speak.

Mr. Cullen: It is gratifying that the hon. member is listening to my address.

Mr. Nesbitt: Seventy-five million dollars to Ford.

Mr. Cullen: To suggest that perhaps the taxpayers cannot afford it is almost heresy in the eyes of the opposition. The veteran has been prepared to give his life. How can we talk about not being able to afford it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cullen: Maybe if the hon. member listens he will learn something.

Mr. Nesbitt: I have active knowledge of what the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Can we have order in the house?

Mr. Cullen: We have an obligation to the taxpayer, certainly, but I say we have a still greater responsibility to the veteran not to hold out false hopes, not to have him believe that every one of these recommendations will be accepted, not to have him feel that every request made by the Legion or by other veteran's associations is going to be met. I believe it is incumbent upon the government to do all it can to assist veterans and their dependants within reason, and, where possible, I believe the government has an obligation to extend its facilities or to increase the

amount it is prepared to pay if the request is reasonable.

If we can afford more by way of pensions, medical attention, V.L.A. loans and so on, who would vote against those increases? We are less callous in telling the veterans we cannot afford it than is any member of the opposition parties who would hold out false hopes to them. I am thankful for the opportunity to express in the few minutes allotted to me my views on the Woods Committee report and some of its recommendations and, once again, to ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) not to be rushed into a hasty implementation of some of these recommendations.

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I realize that time is limited; I shall be as rapid as possible. I rise to take part in this debate in gratitude and with profound respect for the gallant men and women who have served as members of the Canadian Armed Forces in fields of conflict around the world. These are men and women who gave their all to bring freedom to an oppressed world and to protect and preserve a heritage they held dear—and one which at one time all Canadians held dear. After listening to some of the remarks made today in the house I wonder whether some of us still do.

It is a heritage which the present generation and this government are allowing to erode. These men and women fought for us all—for those of us who were unable or unwilling to do our own fighting. What have we done for them in return? Very little, I submit.

Fifty-one years ago they were told they had won a war to end all wars. Twenty-four years ago their sons and daughters were told the same thing. These were the promises made by the statesmen of the day: these valiant warriors were to return home to a brighter future and a better life provided by a grateful nation. But it seems the grateful nation suffers either from a defective memory or from a conveniently short one. We are more interested in improving the lot of the hardened criminal, the homosexual and the marxist agitator—and let us not forget the deprived high income earner who, in the Finance Minister's own words, is carrying too heavy a tax load. Millions of dollars are being poured into bilingualism. The government somehow managed to find an amount in excess of $46 million to finance that cultural centre down the street. It is easy to see there is federal money for projects dear to the heart of the present government.

We have to economize somewhere though, and that somewhere is in an area not so dear to the government's heart. Veterans pensions, along with old age pensions, civil servants pensions and public housing, apparently fall into this category. There is money available to provide departmental heads with salaries of $40,000. There appears to be an unlimited source of money to meet the requirements of the Prime Minister's bloated personal staff. Money is available to provide a court jester for the City of Vancouver and to assist in the education of a self-confessed anarchist in Montreal. Money was even made available, as I recall, for a young Canadian to travel to New York City to demonstrate his remarkable talent for smashing pianos. Is the government trying to tell us that the contribution to Canada's wellbeing made by these people is greater than the contribution made by our veterans?

How many times were our servicemen sent into battle ill-equipped by shortcomings in training and experience to endure the hardships of mud and vermin, the horror of seeing one's friends being slaughtered? How many times were they sent into battle with insufficient equipment, insufficient rations and insufficient sleep? They faced these adversities and they faced death or dismemberment without complaint. For those who survived the bombs, the bullets and the bayonets, there remained the uncertainty of a life marred by the effects of tuberculosis, malaria and countless other physical maladies, of broken bodies and broken spirits. They earned a reputation for Canada that people throughout the world still look up to. But that reputation was earned at a heavy price. Thousands of white crosses in far distant lands are testimony to the price which was paid. To the men who lie at rest under those crosses, we can only say thanks for a job well done. But, to those who survived, we can surely offer more tangible proof of our gratitude. These men assured our very presence here today as Members of Parliament. Without their willingness to risk life and limb in the cause of freedom, we would not be here at all, spending the taxpayers' money, disputing the virtues of bilingualism. If we had lost the war the men who might have occupied these seats would have imposed their own language, and French and English would have been rendered as useless as the language of ancient Rome. We sit here in this chamber through the efforts of the men who,

in two world wars and in the regional conflicts of recent years, thought freedom was worth fighting for. Yet we hesitate to pass legislation which would make life a little less burdensome for these men. They are not asking for very much, just enough to permit them to live their lives in dignity. Why do we hesitate in this regard, Mr. Speaker?

• (4:00 p.m.)

I should like to read into the record an excerpt from a letter that I received from one of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Unless the house directs otherwise, I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that, pursuant to the order made earlier today, the item under consideration is now deemed to have concluded and we must move on to government orders.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISIONS RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, June 18, consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and motion No. 3 (Mr. McQuaid), and the amendment thereto of Mr. Lewis.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this amendment, may I say it goes a long way towards setting at rest the fears of those who are suspicious of this bill. Someone once said that it is not enough for justice to be done, but that it must appear to be done. That is at the back of the minds of many people when they think of this legislation. They are suspicious of it. They are suspicious of its administration and of its application.

In an earlier amendment to the bill, we attempted to bring about a position where all provinces in Canada would be assured of at least one representative on the advisory council. This amendment did not find general approval, though I still hope government members will reconsider their position with regard to it and that when a vote is taken on the first amendment will see their way clear to voting for it. I also hope they will find their way clear to vote for this amendment,

[Mr. Scott.]

because if all seven of the amendments were adopted the fears of many people about this legislation would be set aside.

The other evening the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said that this piece of legislation concerns only the linguistic ombudsman;—I paraphrase his remarks reported at page 10368—that this ombudsman has no powers; that there are no penalties involved, and so on. I suggest the commissioner does have powers, and these are clearly set out in clause 28, with which the amendment would seek to do away. He has great powers. He can make recommendations. In recommending that certain action be taken by the government he expects that recommendation to be followed. He is appointed by the government and for the government. He can be removed at very short notice by the government. Therefore, he carries out the wishes of the government in recommending that action be taken by the government. They both work in harmony.

Clause 28 specifically provides that no person is entitled as of right to be heard by the commissioner. It also provides that hearings shall be held in private. However, if in the middle of a hearing the commissioner feels that some evidence or his recommendation will be detrimental to any person or department, he can summon them before him.

The Minister of Justice spoke at length on this subject on the last occasion we debated the bill, which was two days ago on June 18. The minister implied that on every occasion that somebody is adversely affected by the legislation he shall be heard. Clause 28 makes no reference to the word "shall". It does refer to "may" and "if". At line 31 the clause provides:

> —if at any time during the course of an investigation it appears to the Commissioner that there may be sufficient grounds for his making a report or recommendation that may adversely affect any individual or any department or other institution, he shall, before completing the investigation, take every reasonable measure to give to that individual, department or institution a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism—

I ask the house to take particular note of the words "if" and "may". The whole case rests on the commissioner. If he is sensitive to the feelings of somebody he is investigating, then he may give him a hearing. The point I want to make, and which I do not think has been brought out forcefully enough, is that in the middle of a hearing, after he has made up his mind that he is going to bring in some recommendation that is going

to adversely affect somebody ,he may give that person a hearing.

I suggest what would happen would be this. A commissioner makes an investigation. He makes up his mind to bring in a recommendation. He then stops and says to himself: "If I bring in this recommendation, an individual or a department may be adversely affected, so I had better hear from them". This person or department would then be heard, but after the commissioner had up his mind. I ask the house whether this is the kind of treatment we are to expect today in this just society. I say this is wrong. I say that if the commissioner is going to investigate a department, or one area of activity of a department someone is responsible for administering, he should notify that person and allow him to attend the private hearing. I know the public is not allowed to attend, but at least the person concerned should be allowed to appear and prepare a defence, if that is necessary. He should be allowed to do so before any recommendation is drafted, and certainly before the commissioner reaches the conclusion that he is going to make an adverse recommendation. This, to me, is part and parcel of our system of justice in Canada.

I have always found that if I wanted to convince somebody to take a certain stand it was best to do so before he had had the opportunity of making up his mind. At this time he will listen much more attentively and concern himself with both sides of the question. No such problem arises under clause 28, because the mind of the commissioner is already made up. It is only for the purpose of giving the person concerned what appears to be fair and equal treatment that the commissioner calls him in and gives him a brief hearing. I think it is safe to say that he will not be listened to very attentively or with any interest. This is making a mockery of the system of justice with which we have lived for years.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Perhaps the Minister of Justice will tell us that the commissioner will not do anything. Perhaps he ought to read clause 28 again. It reads in part:

> —to answer any adverse allegation or criticism, and to be assisted or represented by counsel for that purpose.

It is obvious that any recommendations the commissioner may make will be recommendations affecting adversely some person. The Minister of Justice cannot say that the commissioner does not occupy the position of a judicial body in this country. Any person who hears evidence and makes recommendations on that evidence occupies the position of a judicial body. It is true that the commissioner cannot impose fines or penalties; but he has the power to report, to recommend and, above all, to condemn. Clause 28 specifies those powers. From my reading of the clause, it is clear that once the commissioner has made up his mind to condemn someone he may call that person before him before all the evidence on which the condemnation is to be based has been gathered. I hope the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) understands me. To judge from his frown, he appears to misunderstand me. It is because clause 28 is included in the bill that many in this country are suspicious of this entire legislation.

The N.D.P. member for York-Scarborough spoke at length about how necessary it is for the government to display the right spirit in implementing and enforcing this legislation. That is not good enough for me. The N.D.P. may be content with this legislation, but I am not. The N.D.P. has always been a party that believes in authority. They have always believed that the authority of the government should be supreme in all phases of a country's life. That is why they buy this bill 100 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member wishes to insult me, at least he could have the courtesy of referring to my constituency in a proper way. I represent the constituency of York South.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanbury: I was flattered to be singled out.

Mr. Horner: Never mind, Mr. Speaker. I may not have named the correct constituency but I put my finger accurately on the philosophy motivating the N.D.P. From time immemorial they have believed that the authority of the government should be supreme in all phases of life. They want the government to manipulate and control people. That is why they want this legislation. And look what happens to people when the government is all powerful and all supreme. Look what has happened in Soviet Russia and in Communist China. The governments of those countries are authoritarian and socialist. I well remember what happened in Saskatchewan, where I was born and bred, in the early 1940's when the leader of the present New

Democratic Party went tramping across the country preaching to the people that governments should be all powerful and control everybody in the country. The experience of 20 years has mellowed the hon. member. The N.D.P. no longer supports the Regina Manifesto. Now, they have the Winnipeg report, a watered down version of their original ideas. But they still believe the government should exert supreme authority in the country. They still believe it should be all powerful and that it should control everybody and everything. That is why they support this legislation.

Although the hon. member for York South is a lawyer of fair renoun, he supports the present legislation which is a travesty of justice and which ignores all the safeguards built into our legal system. He accepts his party's position that the authority of the government must be supreme everywhere and that the government must control everything in a country. I do not support that concept. I believe individuals should live in freedom and be free to express themselves as they wish. They should not be subjected to socialist authoritarianism. I say this knowing full well that not all socialists in this house are in the N.D.P. The three wise men, as they were called, are still socialists.

I am surprised at the Minister of Justice. Why is he tarnishing a good reputation by supporting this authoritative piece of legislation. Why did he, with his learning and love of justice, talk at great length on June 18 in defence of clause 28. His remarks cover pages and pages of *Hansard*. At one time the minister was concerned about individuals. That is no longer true. Today he supports this legislation which will give the commissioner the power to peer into every nook and cranny of Canada and to snoop into all our lives. This all powerful Czar will not be able to snoop into the offices of Members of Parliament. But that is the only limitation to his power.

In my opinion the key words in clause 28 are "if" on line 31 of page 16 of the bill and "may" on line 35. The clause does not say "shall adversely affect" or "will adversely affect". It merely uses the word "may".

Clause 28(2) reads in part:

> —if at any time during the course of an investigation it appears to the Commissioner that there may be sufficient grounds for his making a report or recommendation that may adversely affect any individual or any department or other institution, he shall, before completing the investigation, take every reasonable measure to give to that individual, department or institution a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation—

It is clear that those supporting the legislation also support a philosophy which says that the government must be all powerful in all areas of a country's life.

I now wish to deal with clause 30 which is every interesting and which reads in part:

> (a) to summon and enforce the attendance of witnesses and compel them to give oral or written evidence on oath, and to produce such documents and things as the Commissioner deems requisite to the full investigation and consideration—

• (4:20 p.m.)

This clause gives the commissioner quite a lot of power. Clause 28 of the bill relates to some person or department about whom the commissioner is concerned. That party can be called before him and made to produce documents and evidence which will, in a sense, condemn him. Fortunately, the last line of clause 28 states that the person or department is allowed to have counsel. That was a generous stroke of the pen. They are giving a condemned person a right to counsel.

Mr. McQuaid: Far too late.

Mr. Horner: The hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) says, "Far too late".

Clause 30 reads in part:

> —under this act, in the same manner and to the same extent as a superior court of record;

Subclause (c) of clause 30 reads:

> —whether or not such evidence or information is or would be admissible in a court of law;

This power is far beyond that given to a court. The government is not worried about how it gathers evidence. There has been a great deal of discussion in the last two or three weeks regarding wire tapping, which is not really admissible in a court of law. That would not bother this group. They would use any evidence, no matter how it was obtained or how fair or just it was. They would use it whether or not it would be admissible in a court of law.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret I have to inform the hon. member his time has expired. Unless there is agreement on the part of the house—

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement. I regret to advise the hon. member there is at least one "no."

Mr. Horner: They must not like what I am saying.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Speaker: I again ask if there is unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Horner: It does not really matter. They do not listen anyway. Once before the hon. member tried to give me additional time but his group would not listen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Is the house ready for the question on the amendment of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment will please say, yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say, nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it, and the amendment is lost on division.

Amendment (Mr. Lewis) negatived, on division.

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on the main motion. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say, nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Orders and the advice I gave to the house earlier this week, this vote will be deferred.

Perhaps I should be allowed to express an afterthought in connection with the motion proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). As hon. members will note from a reading of pages 4 and 5 of today's order paper, that motion proposes to amend clauses 28, 29 and 30 of Bill C-120. It appears each motion at the report stage should actually be directed to a specified clause of a bill rather than a number of clauses. Such motions, I submit, should not relate to two or more clauses, as in the case of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan. It is my submission that at the report stage of a bill it is intended that every provision of a bill may be isolated and dealt with directly.

The motion proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan, which will be voted upon later, tends to thwart the operation of that principle. A complex motion dealing with several clauses of a bill inevitably leads to complicated amendments which further confuse and becloud the question being considered. I think my point will be apparent to those hon. members who studied the amendment to the motion which was advanced by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I might say it was actually the amendment moved by the hon. member for York South which made the Chair realize that perhaps the motion, as it had been proposed, should have been split in three. I should say that the motion of the hon. member for Cardigan should have been split into three motions rather than a single motion, but this perhaps may be a bit too technical.

I say this to protect the position of the Chair if on other occasions motions of this nature are proposed at the report stage. All this having been said, it is in the nature of an afterthought because a motion had been accepted, put to the house and will be voted on in due course.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I be permitted to add a postcript to Your Honour's afterthought? This problem concerned the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) and others in this party. Possibly what I have to say should be directed not only to Your Honour but also to members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization when they deal in the future with matters more important and more consequential than the report which was filed today. As Your Honour realizes, we are groping around trying to find our way through the new rules.

Frequently an amendment involves a certain number of clauses. In order to secure an appropriate consequential amendment, it may be desirable to try and include in one motion the various clauses of the original bill which have to be modified to bring about the principle which the mover of the amendment has in mind. I just mention this, your Honour, so

that when in their infinite wisdom the members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization come to review this part of our procedure they might keep in mind Your Honour's words, as well as the problem that is created when a bill contains in several clauses a principle that the mover of an amendment is trying to change.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan) moved:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 34 thereof the following subclauses:

"(4) Where a member of the House of Commons, on or before the third sitting day next following the day the Speaker of that House tables any report made by the Commissioner under section 33, asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the report as a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, the matter shall be deemed proper to be discussed and shall thereafter be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the standing order of the House applicable to the subsequent stages of the proceeding.

(5) The annual statement to Parliament made by the Commissioner under this section, when tabled respectively in the Senate and House of Commons, shall thereupon be referred in each House to a committee designated by the Speaker."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is intended simply to act as a very necessary check on the manner in which and the degree to which this bill, if it is enacted as law, will be administered. I have previously mentioned, and I submit again today that it is purely an administrative bill.

So far as the apparent principle of the bill is concerned, that is the provision of bilingual services in those areas where a sufficiently large number of people require them, and so far as the idea is concerned of trying to make everybody feel at home no matter where they are in Canada, I entirely agree. But I still maintain that the bill, from clause 1 to clause 41, is a purely administrative one, and the purpose of this amendment is to try and place some safeguards around the proper administration of it.

I wish to sound a very sincere warning. If this bill, when it is enacted as law, is not properly administered then the government is in very serious trouble. The whole success of the bill is going to depend on its proper administration. A great deal of the success of the bill is going to depend on the man who will be designated as commissioner. That is one of the reasons why, a few moments ago, we called for a vote on an amendment with respect to the powers of the commissioner.

I am afraid that the commissioner is not going to be the little, innocuous, harmless individual that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) tries to paint him. Certainly, the powers to be given to him under this legislation would not lead one to believe he will be an innocuous individual. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Canada are making no mistake about it, this man will be a very powerful individual unless some of the safeguards suggested in our previous amendment and in this one are written into the bill.

I do not know whether it was done deliberately or otherwise, but the fact is that the bill provides no effective method for reviewing the operations of the language commissioner. I have studied it carefully and I can find nothing in it that gives anybody any power to review the operations and functioning of the language commissioner. Therefore, this amendment is intended to check to some degree the manner in which the bill will be administered.

I suggest that centuries of experience have taught all people who favour a democratic form of government that the powers that are given to the executive, the powers that are given to parliament, and the powers that are given to the courts must be checked by counter balancing powers given some other authorities. Take the example of our courts. We start with the lowest court in the land, the Magistrates court. If I am not satisfied with the decision handed down in the Magistrates Court, I have the right to appeal to the Supreme Court of the province. Under certain circumstances if I am not satisfied with the decision of the Supreme Court of the province, I can appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. There must be counter balancing powers, but in this bill unfortunately there is no right of appeal. This is something which we will raise later on by way of another amendment. There is no appeal against the decision that the commissioner will have the power to make.

The administrative powers given to the executive are subject to known check, either by the judiciary, or in many cases by parliament itself. But there is no power of review or appeal in this legislation. There is no appeal to the courts or to anybody else. Since there is no power of appeal, then we say that the controlling power should be right here in parliament. This is why we are trying to

insist that the report of the commissioner should be subject to scrutiny by parliament.

Let us examine the bill. Clause 19 reads:

(1) There shall be a Commissioner of Official Languages for Canada, hereinafter in this Act called the Commissioner.

(2) The Commissioner shall be appointed by Commission under the Great Seal after approval of the appointment by resolution of the Senate and House of Commons.

I think at this point it is worthy of note that except for the concession which is apparently given to parliament of hiring and firing this very powerful man, parliament is to have no further knowledge of him. In other words, we are given the power to take him on in the first place. We are given the power to fire him if he does something wrong while the house is in session. We see him coming and we see him going, but apparently that is all we are going to have to say about him.

• (4:40 p.m.)

This bill fails to designate a minister to answer for the commissioner. This is very strange in respect of a bill of this nature. Who is the minister to be who presumably will try to exercise some power at least over this very, very powerful commissioner? Why did the government not have the courage to name in this bill the member of the executive council under whose jurisdiction this man will work? Why did they not have the courage to tell us under which department this person will work? Perhaps he will be the Secretary of State. We do not know. Stranger things have happened. I remember not too long ago in this house we debated for many days the organization of the Canadian Transport Commission. Not long after the debate was concluded the minister who piloted the bill through the house saw fit to resign his seat. Then, not many weeks after this he was appointed to head the commission. Is the same thing to happen in respect of the Secretary of State? He is helping to pilot the bill through the house. Will he be the commissioner? I think members of this house would like to know under whose jurisdiction this person will operate.

We are not told who will exercise this very valuable check on the administration of the act. We suggest this information is unjustly refused. Those who are promoting the bill tell us there are other checks. Let us examine again clause 33 subclause (1) of the bill. It reads:

If within a reasonable time after the making of a report containing any recommendations under section 31, no action is taken thereon that seems to the Commissioner to be adequate and appropriate, the Commissioner, in his discretion—

Mind you, this is only in his discretion.

—and after considering any reply made by or on behalf of any department or other institution concerned, may—

Not "shall" but "may".

—transmit a copy of the report and recommendations to the Governor in Council and may—

Again, it is permissive.

—thereafter make such report thereon to Parliament as he deems appropriate.

According to that clause, it is entirely permissive for the commissioner to make a report to parliament. It says he may in his own discretion. If he is unhappy because a department or institution ignores one of his reports, he may complain to parliament if in his opinion the nature of the report is such that it should be brought to the attention of parliament without delay. Then, clause 34 (1) reads:

In addition to any report that may be made by him under section 33, the Commissioner shall—

This is obligatory.

—each year prepare and submit to Parliament a statement relating to the conduct of his office and the discharge of his duties under this Act during the preceding year including his recommendations, if any, for any proposed changes in this Act that he deems necessary or desirable in order that effect may be given to this Act according to its spirit and intent.

This clause requires the Commissioner to make an annual report to parliament. The net result is that the only certain control parliament has over the languages commissioner is, first, to participate, for what this is worth, in hiring and firing and, secondly, the privilege of reading the annual report of the commissioner. Parliament may, on occasion when the commissioner considers he has a case so flagrant that he believes he should report it to parliament without delay, read such a report. That is the only concession extended to us. We are given the right to read the report. The important thing is that as the bill stands today there is not one provision in it which requires this report to be taken off the table and debated in this house. That is the weakness of this bill. That is the reason we are asking that this bill be amended, so that the report of this very powerful and influential man to parliament can be taken from the table and discussed in this house where it should be discussed. I do not think that is an unreasonable request.

Government members may say there are various ways to get the report off the table. No doubt they will point out that we now have opposition days and that this matter could be taken up on opposition days. I say there are enough things going on over there to occupy all the opposition days the government has seen fit to give us without discussing the report of the languages commissioner. We should not be required to use an opposition day to discuss such a report. Surely, the representatives of the people of Canada should be given something more than an opportunity to read the report of the languages commissioner. Surely, they should be given the opportunity to discuss that report in parliament. In essence that is all the amendment we are introducing now asks. We raised this matter before the committee. The government members saw fit to argue that if we extended this privilege to parliament we would be taking away some of the powers of Mr. Speaker; that we would be interfering with the procedures of the house, that the house is master of its own rules and that no statute of parliament should regulate the procedure of this house.

I suggest, with all respect, that there are today laws of this country which do regulate the procedure of parliament, and no serious exception has been taken to them over the years. If we examine the British North America Act we will find that sections 44, 45, 46 and 47 deal specifically with the Speaker of this house. Section 48 of the British North America Act deals with a matter so important as our quorum. Section 49 deals with a matter so important as our voting. Sections 53 and 54 deal with the procedure in respect of our appropriations, and tax bills as well as money bills. Section 91 of the British North America Act has a provision which requires a two-thirds vote on a particular question. These are examples of the procedure of this house being regulated by statute and incidentally by a statute which actually is not a Canadian statute. The British North America Act is a statute passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Since the 1949 amendment we have been able to amend certain of our rules of procedure, but we have to do so, by an act of parliament and not by a standing order of the house. So we say in all seriousness that it is not valid to object to the amendment on the ground that we are trying to control the actions of the house by a statute, and this was never done before. It has been done before. We suggest that this safeguard should be written into the act. Subclause 4 of our amendment reads as follows:

> Where a member of the House of Commons, on or before the third sitting day next following the day the Speaker of that house tables any report made by the commissioner under section 33, asks leave to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing the report as a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, the matter shall be deemed proper to be discussed and shall thereafter be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the standing order of the house applicable to the subsequent stages of the proceeding.

I realize that the amendment does in a sense take away from the Speaker some of the powers he ordinarily exercises under our standing orders. When we introduced the amendment we had in mind the intent of the bill itself, namely, that if the commissioner considered a matter to be so urgent that it required immediate attention, he would not have to wait until he submitted his annual report but could make a special report to parliament. We thought that if the matter was so urgent that it required a special report to parliament, nothing would be wrong with requiring that the report be debated immediately.

We do not want to do anything that would lessen the power and discretion exercised by the Speaker and, I must say, exercised very wisely in most cases. In the light of that, and upon reflection, we decided that it would perhaps be more acceptable if subclause 4 were struck from our amendment and it were confined to subclause 5, which reads:

> The annual statement to parliament made by the commissioner under this section, when tabled respectively in the Senate and House of Commons, shall thereupon be referred in each house to a committee designated by the Speaker.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) will introduce an amendment which will have the effect of striking out subclause 4 of our amendment, but providing that the annual statement of the commissioner, and any other report the commissioner sees fit to make to parliament, shall be referred to a committee designated by the Speaker. What can possibly be wrong with an amendment of that kind? All we ask is that the report of the commissioner, rather than lying on the table where it will probably die, be referred to a committee of this house.

Many reports are referred to committees of the house. It is absolutely useless to ask

the commissioner to make a report to parliament if parliament is not given an opportunity to discuss and examine it. Where could this better be done than before a committee of the house? I appeal through you, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members on the other side of the house to accept my amendment. What can possibly be wrong with a request of that kind? What possible objection can the government have to it? Is there anything wrong in asking that a committee of the house consider the report of the commissioner? Why would the government be afraid of that? Why should they say this is not a reasonable request?

As I have already said, practically all reports are referred to committees which examine them and report back to parliament. All we ask is that the annual report of the commissioner, as well as any special report he may see fit to make under the powers which will be given to him by the act, be referred to a committee of the house designated by the Speaker. We are not asking anything more than that. We are not asking that the house adjourn to debate the question as a matter of public importance. All we are asking is that we be given the right to examine the report in committee. We suggest there is nothing wrong with that. It is a safeguard. Just as sure as we are sitting in the house today, some people in Canada will feel that if there is no provision for the report to be referred to a committee, if there is no provision in the bill for taking the report off the table, there is something wrong; people will be suspicious about the procedure we are adopting, and they will have every reason to be suspicious.

This is not an unreasonable request, and we therefore very seriously recommend it to the government. The government will not be backing down at all if it accepts the amendment. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has indicated that he does not see why the house should change any decision arrived at in the special committee set up to study the bill. Let us not forget that the special committee comprised only 12 members of the house, and there are in the house 264 members. Therefore, 252 members did not have a chance to consider this matter in committee.

Surely, the minister was not serious when he suggested the rest of the membership of the house should be denied the privilege of discussing and perhaps adopting some of the things the committee in its wisdom saw fit not to adopt. We recommend to the government, and all members of the house, the amendment as it will be amended by the hon. member for Peace River. I can assure the house that if the amendment is passed there will be throughout Canada a much better feeling so far as the official languages bill is concerned.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I would point out that at this stage the hon. member will require the unanimous consent of the house to move that a portion of the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. Baldwin: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, we are following the practice that was followed on two previous occasions, the last time by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). Rather than the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) asking that the amendment he has moved be withdrawn—he would need unanimous consent to substitute another amendment—I am going to move, seconded by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Cardigan. I submit this procedure will be within the four corners of the previous decision of Mr. Speaker.

• (5:00 p.m.)

May I be permitted to read my amendment, following which Your Honour can consider it? I move:

That the motion be amended by:

(1) deleting the proposed subclause (4); and

(2) inserting in the proposed subclause (5), next after the word "section", the words "and any report that may be made by him under section 33"; and by renumbering the subclause as subclause (4).

I have a number of quite unofficial copies in English and in French for hon. members who, I know, will be clamouring for them.

May I say before I sit down that the effect of the amendment will be precisely as set out by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), to nullify the effect of the proposed subclause (4) which permits a member of the house, under certain conditions set out more particularly in subclause (4), to let a report be brought before the house. My amendment would leave the remedy exclusively in subclause (5), namely an automatic direction to the commissioner that the report be referred to parliament and dealt with there. That is the effect of the amendment which I moved.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) was kind enough to inform me earlier of his intention, and the intention of his colleague to

move an amendment to the motion which is now on the order paper. I informed him that so far as I was concerned, and I am sure that my colleagues take the same position, I would support the motion as now amended, subject to a small subamendment which I shall move in a moment and which I hope will be acceptable to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and his associates.

Let me say that toward the conclusion of the sittings of the special committee on this bill I moved a motion that the special committee recommend that all reports tabled before parliament be referred to an appropriate committee. That motion, which is on record in the committee's proceedings, was ruled out of order by the chairman of the special committee. I think, if I may say so, that this was done quite properly because of the very specific terms of reference of the committee. I refer to it merely to say that from the time when this idea was brought to the committee, I personally took the position that I could not accept the proposal that there be a provision in this bill that any motion moved under Standing Order 26 must be accepted by the Speaker. The reason for this is, first, the reason which the member himself gave, that we should not reduce the Speaker's powers in these matters and, second, that in most instances I cannot see the value of a debate on the floor of the house where the commissioner is not present. I said at the special committee that it is much more sensible to refer the commission's report to a committee of parliament where we can call the commissioner before us, interrogate him on his report and find out from him what criteria and principles he applied in carrying out his duties. It seems to me that that is much more desirable than a general debate on the floor of the house before that kind of scrutiny has taken place.

Therefore, I am totally in harmony with the hon. member for Cardigan and the hon. member for Peace River with regard to the principle of their amendments. It seemed to me, in the special committee, and it still seems to me, a little strange to embody that kind of proposal in the act instead of making it a rule of the house that the matter be referred to committee. But I am persuaded—and I do not mind saying it—by the hon. member for Cardigan that ther there may be value in having this in the bill. Therefore, I will move a subamendment, explain it and add my appeal to the hon. member for Cardigan that the two ministers responsible for piloting this bill, and who are now in the house, accept his amendment and my subamendment.

I will move in a moment that the words "to a committee designated by the Speaker" be replaced by the words "to an appropriate committee". My reasons are very simple. First, I do not think it is fair to the Speaker to place on him the burden of having to decide to which committee the report is to go at that stage. It seems to me that it is the job of parliament to decide which committee will deal with a particular function under an act of parliament. It is unfair, and, if I may say so without offence, it is not very sensible to lay on the Speaker the duty of deciding to which committee the matter should go. I think that it should be a committee of parliament. Second, I think that the way it is worded "a committee designated by the Speaker", conveys the possibility that there may be a different committee for each report. I hope that there will be either a standing committee or a special committee dealing with this matter only, that is with the reports of the commissioner, or, alternatively, one of the present standing committees, such as, for example, the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, to which these reports would be sent.

I therefore hope that my very simple subamendment is acceptable to the hon. member for Peace River. It seems to me to improve the amendment which he moved. I should like to add my words to those of the hon. member for Cardigan in making a plea to the ministers who are here to accept the amendment and subamendment.

I see a case for saying that a bill should not normally contain such an instruction, but I think the ministers will agree that this is not an ordinary bill and that it is a bill dealing with a very delicate matter. It is a bill which has aroused certain fears, although I have said many times that I am confident that these fears are not justified. It is a bill which requires as careful a scrutiny by parliament as the situation makes necessary. The amendment and the subamendment do not in any way affect the principle of the bill. They do not affect in any way the powers of the commissioner. They do not in any way affect the operation of the bill. They do give a guarantee that the reports of the commissioner will not merely lie on the table of parliament but will be scrutinized by a committee of parliament and, more than that, that the work of the commissioner will be scrutinized through questioning by an appropriate committee of parliament.

I agree entirely with the hon. member for Cardigan that the acceptance of these amendments does no violence to the principle of the bill. I join him in making a plea to the ministers concerned to accept the amendment and the subamendment so that there may be one occasion on which this house is unanimous with respect to an improvement which is suggested by members of the opposition.

Therefore, I move:

That the motion be further amended by deleting the words "to a committee designated by the Speaker" at the end of subclause (5) and that the following words be substituted therefor: "to an appropriate committee".

• (5:10 p.m.)

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Before getting down to the new situation created by the subamendment, I wish to address myself to the argument, again introduced by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), that the commissioner is a powerful individual. I have expressed myself already on the subject of his powers, and what I believe to be his limitations and I do not intend to repeat what I said in this regard on Wednesday evening.

As to there being no appeal, in the sense of a judicial appeal, from the commissioner's recommendations, let me repeat that the commissioner is not a judicial officer; he is not conducting judicial proceedings; he is not deciding questions involving personal rights; nothing he does attaches obligations or penalties. He will be a creature of parliament, responsible to parliament, and he will report to parliament.

Mr. Horner: To which minister?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member has, as usual, with his sense of intuition anticipated just what I was about to say. The reason no minister has been delegated as being responsible is that the commissioner, having the duty to review the performance of the spirit and letter of this bill as it affects every department, should be impartial with respect to every department. In other words, it would not be appropriate that he should be responsible to a particular minister, a position which might give rise to a conflict of interest in relation to the performance of that particular department. Consequently, the commissioner will report to parliament through the Clerk of the Privy Council. The appeal, in terms of the report, is, of course, to parliament.

The purpose of the amendment by the hon. member for Cardigan, as I understand it, is to ensure that the reports of the commissioner are considered by the house or by one of its committees, whether they arise from special investigations under clause 31, or whether they be the annual reports under clause 34.

The hon. member will recognize that this matter did receive consideration in the special committee and that it was decided by the members of the committee not to attempt to tie down the House of Commons in advance to any procedure for the consideration of these reports. Members of the committee felt it was not advisable to attempt by statute to prescribe parliamentary procedure and to intervene in the internal proceedings of the house. Therefore, when we deal with the new subclause four suggested by the hon. member under which leave could be asked to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing the report as a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, we feel that the special order No. 26 now in the standing orders is sufficient. Upon the tabling of a report, this latter procedure could be brought into play as a parliamentary procedure, not as one provided by statute. This part of the amendment was rejected by the committee for the reason that it is open to the house already under standing Order 26 to discuss a matter of urgent public importance at any time depending on the circumstances.

In view of the new subamendment and the subsubamendment—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The motion, the amendment and the subamendment.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):—the motion, the amendment and the subamendment, and the striking of the addition of subclause four, presumably, by the hon. member for Cardigan, which would impose on parliament in a statutory way the necessity for debate, and in view of the fact that there is now a simple procedure, if one reads both amendments together, for referring the report to an appropriate committee within the discretion of the house, not imposing any obligation in advance, I should like to suggest that we stand this particular clause so that I can reflect on it over the weekend and discuss its effect with the leader of the house.

Mr. Lewis: We should like you to reflect favourably.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Certainly, the elimination of proposed subclause four puts a different complexion on the matter. We would like to let this stand and have the house proceed to something else.

Mr. Lewis: Could the hon. member for Cardigan not buy the Minister of Justice a meal over the weekend and persuade him before he sees the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald)?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He was not in a very good mood today.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We would like to look at this from the point of view of the house rules.

Mr. Hales: Would the minister accept a question? Supposing an hon. member of the opposition wished to direct a question in the house with regard to the activities of the commissioner. To whom would this question be directed if the commissioner does not report to any particular minister?

Mr. Baldwin: That is academic. We do not get any answers, anyway.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Presumably the proper time for a question to be asked with respect to the conduct of the commissioner would be when the report was tabled in the house. Then, the house would be left to its own procedure.

Mr. Horner: Oh, come on. You can answer better than that.

Mr. Hales: Perhaps the minister did not follow my question. It may be hypothetical but this situation could arise. Suppose I or anyone else, as a Member of Parliament, wished to direct a question in the house during the question period in connection with what was being done under the official languages legislation, to which minister would that question be directed?

An hon. Member: The Prime Minister.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I would think so, yes. The Prime Minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed that this clause stand as suggested by the minister?

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the next amendment stands in the name of my hon. friend from Calgary North. Unfortunately, he is not here at this particular time. He is away on a very important mission. I ask that the same courtesy be extended to us as we extended to the Minister of Justice, that we stand the next one, No. 5, and proceed with motion No. 6.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting clause 38 thereof and substituting the following:

"38. (1) The right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages shall not be restrained or restricted in its natural development in any way.

(2) The Governor in Council may by order in council enter into an agreement with the government of any province which has been authorized by legislation so to do, for the purpose of encouraging natural development of any such minority language especially as regards the use of such language in matters of education."

He said: Mr. Speaker, let me briefly recapitulate the circumstances leading up to the motion that is now before this house. When the B and B commission made its report one of the commissioners, Professor Rudnicki, made what might be called a dissenting report which is attached to the main B and B commission report. In it Professor Rudnicki made certain claims and suggestions with regard to the languages of other minority groups. He went a very great distance beyond what was expressed in the B and B report.

When the bill was drafted and brought down, the government saw fit to introduce clause 38, which deals with this particular issue. So that this clause might appear for the benefit of those who might read these remarks, clause 38 provides:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this act with respect to any language that is not an official language.

Despite opinions that may have been expressed to the contrary, this is simply a question of saying that anybody who wants to speak another language may do so without penalty. No less is contained in the principle implied and expressly indicated in clause 38.

Quite frankly, there are a number of us who think that this clause does not go far enough. Without taking the position that Professor Rudnicki took in his dissenting report, some of us feel there is room for an intermediate position, and this is expressed in the amendment that I have proposed and placed before the house.

Let me deal with the reasons for moving this particular amendment. First of all, while we are all Canadians, and Canadians first and always, there are different problems in different regions. As a matter of fact, there is no question that the reason for this legislation is precisely because of that fact. Western Canada does have a somewhat different history with regard to its exploration, development and economic progress. All throughout the latter part of the last century and into this century, immigrant boats from Europe came to this country and discharged their passengers in eastern Canada. These people travelled across northern Ontario and into the prairies. The people of the Ukraine, Poland and other parts of central Europe settled on the raw lands of the prairies, following a particular pattern from Manitoba into northern and some parts of central Saskatchewan, and northern and some parts of central Alberta. Thus a perceptible pattern of settlement and colonization was established. These people, settling on this raw land without the benefit of civilization, literally created by their bare hands a fine and viable community in parts of western Canada.

In saying that, I am in no sense diminishing the great contribution made by other people as well, but this is a situation that has developed and which appears obvious in western Canada. It is a fact of life which cannot be ignored in our contemplation of this question of language, racial groups and minority rights.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I wonder who has the floor?

Mr. Baldwin: Thank you, sir. I await the response that I am sure will be generated by those who are waiting to hear the rest of my remarks.

Today those people have woven a pattern in the economic, social and agricultural life of western Canada. In saying that, I am by no means derogating from what has happened, particularly since the second world war, in the great cities of Montreal and Toronto and other metropolitan areas in eastern Canada. Nevertheless, this particular situation to which I have referred in western Canada has developed, and we cannot, indeed we must not be allowed, to ignore it.

Let me direct my attention for a moment to one of the linguistic groups, the people from the Ukraine. I have lived amongst these people. I was brought up, went to school and first practiced law in such a community. These people are a fiercely proud and independent people who have managed for a thousand years or more to maintain a viable identity, language and culture. Surely, anyone who saw the representatives of this particular ethnic group perform on Parliament Hill during the course of centennial celebrations will agree with me.

Scattered throughout western Canada are hundreds of halls dedicated to the preservation of the Ukrainian language, though not as an official language or to any extent suggesting that this language should be the language of commerce. These people have accepted English in western Canada as their working language. However, through struggle and perseverance, with this fierce national pride that they have, as I say, they have been able to maintain in a viable way their language, their art and their culture.

It has often been said—and this is something that is said every time representatives from the United States and Canada get together—that while people from the same nations in Europe have poured into Canada and the United States, we are unique, we are different. We, in Canada, have been determined to maintain our certain distinctive and diversified ethnic and cultural rights. This privilege was granted us under the British North America Act in a way known to all members of the house. Each time people from Canada and the United States meet we say: "We are the same as you in many respects, but we are different; we are unique. We think we have something to offer because we have the two great language groups in our country". We have a contribution to make in that regard. If that is the case then, surely, would our contribution not be enhanced if we were able to say to the world, "We have other minority groups in our country. Although they do not seek for their languages the status of official languages, nevertheless these groups have been able to maintain their languages and in that way make a constructive contribution to our society."

Official Languages

• (5:30 p.m.)

I was delighted to learn when I was in Europe that the 18 nations making up the council of Europe had specified that English and French were to be the official languages of the council. As a result, our delegation was able to make a very great contribution on their first appearance. If those in our country of Slavic origin who speak the Slavic languages are able to maintain a viable Slavic identity, could not Canada, considering that there are in the world millions of people who speak the Slavic languages, make an even greater contribution internationally? With those considerations in mind I have proposed the amendment. It does not intend to suggest that languages other than the two mentioned in this bill shall be considered official languages. We feel that if the amendment is accepted it will make the bill more readily acceptable to people belonging to the many different groups we have in our society.

May I now permitted to read some remarks that were made on a previous occasion. I am couching my remarks this way in an attempt to get around the rule which prevents the reading of certain speeches. I hope I will not be ruled out of order. Actually, I am reading from a speech I made myself. I quote:

> All over the world we see the lights of freedom and liberty flickering fitfully against the hot winds generated by those who would take away the rights of the people. In many cases, alas, and in many countries, the light has been snuffed out. We read our papers, we listen to the radio, we watch television, we see these things happening, but we say this will never happen to us.
>
> Hopefully not, and yet, the saddest stories of history find form in the sorrow of peoples who, having experienced freedom, having come to take it for granted, have failed to exert that constant vigilance so essential for its preservation and have looked the other way or been indifferent while it was being filched away from them.

That will be the position this party will take, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the iniquitous rules contained in the proposal of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I continue:

> The history of the Ukrainian people, the exploits of Khmelnitsky, the greatest of the Hetmans, and the words of Shevchenko make it plain that the Ukrainian spirit has proved itself imperishable in the past and I am convinced it will continue to remain so in the future. It has been well put by the author, C. A. Manning, who says, 'This has made Ukraine through the ages a land of wealth and of sadness, a land thirsty for liberty but again and again debarred from obtaining it.'
>
> But in Canada these characteristics of individual initiative and the love of political liberty have found a climate favourable to the preservation of the national spirit which did not die.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

> As I am a Canadian, so are you all Canadians, so are the people in the province of Quebec, and the people of the province of Newfoundland, and the people of all the other provinces.

In the same way, all hon. members here are Canadians. I continue:

> We are Canadians for many reasons. Surely, one of them must be the desire to carry through to completion the most unique experiment in human society—to bring together and welcome within the boundaries of this country people from all parts of the world who accept the common characteristics of Canadian nationality, are proud of it, fiercely proud of it, and yet provide for those who so wish to do the opportunity not only to preserve but to advance different cultures.
>
> What else but good can come out of such an arrangement which permits this to be done? What great blessing must flow from an association on a free and tolerant basis of peoples who establish a national spirit and then inject into that spirit the best characteristics of the respective groups who have made up the nation.
>
> When, if ever, this experiment will end I cannot say. How it will end I do not know, but I do know that I find it exciting to be a part of it. I rest content that my children after me and their children after them will continue to be involved in it and I pay the most unequivocal tribute to those who, like the people of Ukrainian descent in this country, are convinced of the values and virtues of Canadianism but are equally satisfied that they have something in particular to offer, their history and their literature,—

It is in that sense, Mr. Speaker, that I offer the amendment to this house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of rising today to speak on this matter but after hearing the previous speaker relate the background of the ethnic groups which have settled the west, I feel that it is my duty to add a few words because I realize that the hon. member spoke of all the ethnic groups from Europe, China and Japan, but that he did not say a word about the ethnic group from Quebec, namely the French Canadians.

On three occasions I visited the western provinces. I poked around almost everywhere in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Manitoba and Alberta and I realized—and I feel sorry for the minister—that it will be very difficult to explain the official languages bill to westerners.

I heard the previous speaker talk of "Canadian languages" but I was often told in western Canada that English was the Canadian language.

English-speaking people in western Canada should get it into their head, like us in Quebec, that when we speak of Canadians, we

always think of the citizens of both languages. I hoped in vain that the hon. member would speak about the French group, at least the one in his constituency, for there are French Canadians there, but if there are so many French groups nowadays in the western provinces, it could be, if one studies Canadian history, on account of the federal government, of the English-speaking people who thwarted them. I was told so by the French Canadians who live at present in the west. I spent evenings with them, I talked with them.

At that time, subsidies were granted to all ethnic groups from the Ukraine, Hungary, Russia, China, so that they could take over pieces of land in the west, while the French Canadians represented more than 30 or 32 per cent of the population. A certain group of English-speaking people probably got scared and that is why all assistance was refused to people from Quebec who wanted to settle in the West. Those who went there, I am not afraid to say it, paid their own way. The French Canadians who were helped, whom I have met and who come from the United States, received help precisely because they came from the United States. I met three French Canadian families who went to the United States before they came to settle in the West in order to get help.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Facts must be acknowledged, Mr. Speaker. I think that it will help the young English-speaking Canadians to understand the situation in the West. Why have approximately three million French Canadians settled in the United States? Because obstacles were put in their way and they were prevented from going out west to clear the land. These three million French Canadians should be living in the West. They are not because, I repeat, of the federal government, because of an English-speaking majority that did not want French to be spoken too much in the West. And they got their way most of the time.

I assure you that when you get the reception I got in French-speaking localities out west and when those people have an opportunity to meet sincere French Canadian members of parliament, then they open their heart. I heard old people tell old stories with tears in their eyes because that land belonged to us as much as to others and French Canadians would have been the first to clear it. If opposition had not been raised at one time efforts would certainly not be made today to have Ukrainian, Russian or some other language recognized in the same capacity as French, in the West. That bothers me. When I hear an hon. member—who does not admit it so in public—say that he would like to see French treated the same way as Russian, Ukrainian, Chinese and Japanese in British Columbia, Saskatchewan or Alberta, I cannot agree.

In speaking in this debate I want to awaken the young English-speaking Canadians who are willing to discuss the matter. I have met young English-speaking Canadians who are open for discussion, who want to learn history. They are wondering why so many Canadians—because young people consider French Canadians as fellow Canadians—have gone across the border to settle in the United States when the farms are so beautiful out west?

They gave me the answer. The oldtimers told me what had happened, how the French Canadian groups in the Peace River district had begged for their transportation costs in our Canadian parishes. They went there at their own expense, helped by the parishioners, to take over their share of an area which was being given to Rusians or to Ukrainians whose transportation and settling costs were being paid.

One has to know those historical facts to understand the bill under study, and to resolve to correct any injustice inflicted at that time. Many English-speaking people—and I congratulate them for it—through this bill, want to do justice to those who are still clamoring for their rights and begging their provincial governments, most of whom turn a deaf ear, to grant them those rights.

In fact, we consider ourselves to be every bit as Canadian as the English-speaking people in Canada. We consider our linguistic rights as important as theirs, and that is why this bill on the official languages is before us today, for which I congratulate the government.

Finally, if a government at one time denied our French-Canadians out west the right to speak French, this government is allowing them to speak French once again, to enjoy their linguistic rights, to use French at work, in court and in the federal administration offices.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want, through my intervention, to make a few things clear, because I believe that all hon. members will be interested in this question.

I had the opportunity—for which I thank parliament—of gathering information on the

spot. In fact, I hate talking through my hat. I went without sleep nights to meet English and French-speaking groups in order to get an understanding of the situation and to make allowance for it. I am sure the struggle goes back to the earlier days of colonization. Those who have read the history of Canada are aware of the hypocritical injustice done the settlers.

That is why many people, including our own children, wonder why there are still so many French Canadians in Maine and in the rest of the United States. It is because it was feared that the west might become as bilingual as Ontario, Quebec or New Brunswick. That is why almost 3 millions French-Canadian workers were prevented from owning land and that preference was given to Russians, to Poles and to Ukrainians. Not that I dislike them, of course, but in all fairness, our people should have been given at least equal advantages at the time.

Today, when we are asked to give almost the same linguistic rights to the Ukrainians and other ethnic groups, it is generally overlooked that when they came to Canada, they were requested to make the solemn promise they would speak the language of the country. And so, on arriving in Canada, they abandoned their own language, because those are the conditions imposed upon immigrants.

Today, they are happy. They all adopted the English language. We must bear the blow, but let no one tell me that the Ukrainian or the Russian will be treated in the same way as the French Canadians because an ethnic group has committed an injustice in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this intervention without malice summarizes certain remarks I heard and which surprised me, because they were made even by English-speaking people who do not admit this situation exists. If we want a united Canada, a strong Canada, let us start by working together, within the ethnic groups who settled Canada.

As for those who came to join us, they agreed to speak either English or French. They were entirely free. For heaven's sake, we do not want to be told today that Russian comes before French, for example, or that Polish comes before French, because we are in the West. I heard the same thing with regard to Chinese.

If we were to continue the discussion frankly, we would hear something else. Those who speak in that manner do not dare to speak too clearly. They speak about the rights of certain people, certain ethnic groups that are more numerous than others. I recognize that culturally they are right, but linguistically, let them admit that they are in Canada and that they must accept the decisions of the Canadian government.

Today, if parliament tries to ensure more justice, to pour balm upon the discrimination that prevailed forty years ago, it will have done something, and it can be assured that it will have my support as long as it applies that policy.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on a question of order, I rise to correct a statement made by the hon. member, I hope quite unconsciously. He indicated that I had or had not said certain things, or made certain representations. On the two previous occasions when I spoke on this bill in the house I made it quite plain that I supported the bill, and I dealt with the problems faced by the French speaking people in northern Alberta. I indicated that while I supported the bill generally as a Canadian, I had a particular reason to support it because of the difficulties of these people, many of them friends I have known for 40 years. When the hon. member indicates that I failed to make any reference to the people of French speaking ancestry in my country he is ignoring the facts, probably quite unconsciously.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: I would like to answer the hon. member, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

[*English*]

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I rise to speak for the first time in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to thank the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for a preamble to my speech. It is not my purpose at this moment to embark on a detailed dissertation or dissection of the constitutional question. I leave that to others. Besides, I feel that the constitutional issues have been underscored over and over again and are fairly well understood by Canadians from coast to coast.

I would emphasize that there is more to the question than simply the historical, traditional or constitutional aspects. It is basically and above all a question of people, a question of

Canadians. It is a question of the kind of Canada we want to have, a Canada for Canadians, regardless of colour, race, origin, religion or social position.

[*Editor's note: And Mr. Paproski having spoken in Ukrainian and Polish:*]

I have enjoyed using these few expressions in Ukrainian and Polish, Mr. Speaker, but realize I must abide by the rules of this house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to say a few words, in the house, about the Canadian identity.

The Canadian problem is not restricted to the constitution or to the history of our country.

There is also the problem of Canadians, that of the people itself, of all those who live across the country. First of all, the first inhabitants, the Indians and the Eskimos, and then, those who came to our beautiful country, the French, the English, the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Germans, the Italians, the Scotch, the Chinese and all the representatives of the various races who live in this country.

However, by creating a free society, a multiracial and a multicultural society, officially bilingual, will we be able to build a prosperous, peaceful, harmonious, mature Canada we all want to be heirs to?

[*English*]

I think we must adopt the principle that every Canadian and every group has the same rights under the law as every other. There were certain specific guarantees set out in the constitution of 1867. If the Fathers of Confederation in 1867 granted to the French and English certain rights, we are not at this stage going to attempt to rewrite history. But it would be fatal to accept as a principle that there is some kind of chronological priority of rights which applies to those who came earlier. If this were the case then the Indians and the Eskimos would have more rights than anyone, but as a matter of fact they have fewer.

No one should have any special rights in this or any country except those set out in the constitution, and constitutions can be rewritten. Every person in this country today, whether newly arrived or in the second, third, or fourth generation is an immigrant or descendant of immigrants. This applies to native Canadians who migrated in successive waves across the Bering Strait. There should not, therefore, be any recognition of rights based on earlier arrival. Every Canadian, whether he arrived in 1600 or in 1969, should have the same status, with the possible exception as I have said of the guarantees laid down in the constitution. They are there not as divine rights but as matters of national convenience.

If we are talking about chronological priority, the first arrivals were the Indians and Eskimos. The Scandinavians have a claim. They arrived soon after—"Sail now and pay later." Then came Christopher Columbus. He was an Italian. That gives the Italians a claim. John Cabot showed up in 1497. Jacques Cartier appeared in 1534. There was Carte-Real in 1501. He was Portuguese. In 1524 Verrazano came along. Henry Hudson came along in 1607. We must not forget that Cortez got to Mexico in 1519, too early for the Winter Games. Then, of course General de Gaulle did not make his discovery until 1967.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. It being six o'clock p.m. this house stands adjourned until Monday at two o'clock p.m.

At 6 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 23, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MAHONEY—COMPLAINT RESPECTING PRESS REPORT ON INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of newspaper reports on a question I directed to the Prime Minister during oral question period last Friday. In my question I indicated that Metropolitan Toronto plumbers working a 37½ hour week would, as a result of recently concluded collective bargaining, be paid more than Members of Parliament. A number of newspaper reports—and the particular one I shall quote is the Canadian Press report contained in Saturday's Ottawa *Journal*—stated:

> Members of parliament are paid $18,000. Of this amount, $6,000 is tax free."

Little wonder that the headline "Plumber's Pay to Top M.Ps?" ended with a question mark.

The newspaper report would indicate, since $260 times 52 does not exceed $18,000, that the factual foundation of my question was not valid. This is an implication which I emphatically deny. I have no information on how plumbers are reimbursed the expenses they incur in the exercise of their trade. I was not comparing the expense allowances of M.Ps and plumbers. I was comparing salaries or wages, and the plumbers' 52 times $260, or $13,520, certainly exceeds the M.Ps' $12,000 annual indemnity.

Mr. Speaker: In spite of the obvious support received by the hon. member for his alleged question of privilege I suggest that the matter should not be pursued further. It is not, actually, a question of privilege, and we ought now to go on to another matter.

I might inform hon. members that this seems to be an allotted day for questions of privilege, having in mind that the Chair has been formally advised of three such questions, the second of which is in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West. Shortly thereafter, notice of a question of privilege was sent to me by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in connection with approximately the same subject as the one raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I do not think it will be necessary for each question to be presented to the house separately; for the time being I will invite the hon. member for Edmonton West to indicate what his question involves.

MR. LAMBERT (EDMONTON WEST); MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—IMPARTIALITY OF CHAIRMEN—PRESS RELEASE BY CHAIRMAN OF PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question of privilege is briefly as follows: One of the matters to be considered by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization was the degree of impartiality and conduct of the chairmen of the house standing and special committees and whether they should assume a position comparable to that of the chairman and deputy chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Notwithstanding this referral, which has not been adjudicated upon by the standing committee, the chairman, without authorization of the committee, or even discussion at the last meeting, has seen fit to issue a press release, in his own name, on Friday, June 20, —I have attached a copy to my notice to Your Honour—wherein he pleads the case for the adoption of the proposed rule 75C as referred to in the standing committee's third report. This report was adopted by the government majority on the committee, with all opposition members present at the meeting voting against it.

It is contrary to all the principles of our committee system and the role of committee chairmen to so act unilaterally and in a partisan manner. As such, this action by the chairman constitutes a breach of the privileges of the members of the house and of the committee.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Your Honour is correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying that my question of privilege is the same as that which has just been raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. Since he has stated it clearly, there is little I should add. I might just say, however, in

support of my contention that the chairman of our committee—who has otherwise been an excellent chairman—exceeded his authority, that he issued his release on a letterhead which has the following printed at the top: "Chairman of the Standing Committee, Procedure and Organization." In other words, the release appeared to have been given in the name of the committee, whereas the committee itself gave the chairman no such authorization.

I protest this action because it seems to me it is not in line with the tradition of impartiality which chairmen should follow and which our committee, in particular, has been enjoining on the chairmen of all the standing committees.

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank both hon. members who have spoken for having given me notice of their intention to raise this question of privilege. I think everyone in the house will appreciate that they, like myself, are concerned about the proper operation of the committee system, and certainly that there should be no partisan abuse of the position of chairman.

I have had a certain amount of experience with this complicated question of presenting rule changes, not only to hon. members but to the public and to the press. I think hon. members will be aware that the proposal contained in the committee's formal report consisted of three proposed orders of the house, and without reflecting upon the excellent draftsmen responsible for such orders, I think it is clear that the wording of the orders is in technical language not readily understandable to either the public or to the gentlemen of the press, who have to meet a deadline of some kind when announcements of this sort are made. Therefore, I undertook on my own initiative to prepare what I thought was a fair and proper summary of the three standing orders which were recommended by the committee, and I stand by that summary. I think that anybody who reads it would in general agree that it is not a partisan statement but an attempt to explain the text of the standing orders.

The position of a committee that sits in camera is rather difficult. I must say that in the interest only of avoiding undue discussion I refrained on Friday from raising a question of privilege of my own. As recorded at page 10453 of *Hansard*, after my report had been tabled the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rose in his place and stated:

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that this is a report of the Liberal members of the committee only. It does not have the support of any members of the opposition.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is true.

Mr. Blair: I suggest there is some infringement on the privileges of those hon. members who are members of my committee in that this statement is not accurate. As everybody knows, this report carried with it in its majority recommendations the substantial concurrence of all members of the committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is not true.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear.

Mr. Blair: In connection with this question of press releases I should also like to point out that before the house opened on Friday morning the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre distributed a long, three page press release—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Blair: —setting forth his opinions and views on the recommendations of the committee. I am not suggesting for a moment that he is not entitled to express his opinion, but what I do say is that perhaps this might indicate that there is a reason why the chairman should have undertaken to prepare an explanatory press release.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. According to the standing orders the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) gave the Chair some hours ago notice of their intention to raise this matter. Anticipating that there might be a motion and lengthy debate, the Chair spent most of the luncheon hour considering the alternatives open to the Chair, to hon. members and to the committee. I am sorry that I cannot use all of the knowledge that I gained during these two hours of study; perhaps I will have an opportunity to do so on another occasion.

For the time being, in view of the fact that there is no motion presented to the house by either the hon. member for Edmonton West or the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and also in view of the fact that, if I may say so, the very question raised by the hon. members is now before the Committee on Procedure and Organization, I suggest that it is not for the Chair to decide in what way the responsibility of the chairman of the committee should be considered, but rather for the committee itself to make a recommendation to the house.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

TABLING OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WORKING PAPERS

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies in both languages of the two reports submitted by the government of Canada at the last meeting of the constitutional conference, held on June 11 and 12 last.

I promised to the house, on the morrow of this conference, to table those reports in the house. They are entitled: "The Taxing Powers and the Constitution of Canada", and "Federal-Provincial Grants and the Spending Powers of Parliament".

[*English*]

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we also presented to the conference a third paper which dealt with certain constitutional aspects of regional disparity. This paper is not being tabled now as it was principally a review of the positions that we had stated before in publications of the federal government such as "Federalism for the Future" and "The Constitution and the People of Canada" and in the papers that were tabled today. Whether any further paper on the subject of regional disparities will be published subsequently will depend on the future. It will depend on the nature of our future discussions on this subject.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT OF MINISTER UPON RETURNING FROM SCANDINAVIA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to give hon. members a brief account of my recent tour of Scandinavia. This is the first statement I have given and I think it appropriate that it should be made here in parliament and not in the press.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: My tour began on June 8 in Oslo and ended on June 19 in Reykjavik, after visiting Helsinki, Copenhagen and Stockholm. This was the first time a Canadian foreign minister had made a tour of all five Nordic countries. It was the first time that a Canadian foreign minister had visited some of these countries.

Report of Minister on Scandinavia

My purpose in undertaking this tour was to reaffirm on a personal basis the long standing good relations between the Canadian and Nordic governments, to provide a new impetus for increased co-operation between Canadians and the Nordic peoples, and to make Canada better known in those countries.

In all the capitals visited, I emphasized that the enlargement of Canada's international horizons taking place as a result of our foreign policy review does not imply any lessening of Canada's interest in Europe and that we recognize the importance of Europe not only for our security but also for many other dimensions of our national life. It is from Europe that most of our population, our culture and our tradition comes. The bulk of our immigration and a significant proportion of our exchanges of persons, ideas and goods are still with Europe. These relations are of great importance not only in themselves but also as a means of diversifying our external relations and developing an identifiably Canadian way of life in North America. For all these reasons we wish to seek new forms of co-operation with the Europeans, including the Scandinavians.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Everywhere we went our reception was friendly and generous, and I wish to say here, as I said there, how much we appreciated the care with which our programs were prepared and the many kindnesses we were shown. It was evidence, I think, of the high regard in which Canada is held in those countries and of their desire to get to know us better.

Great interest was shown in our review of foreign and defence policies. In outlining its nature and the results so far, I stressed the great changes that have taken place both in Canada and the world in the last few years. I pointed out that Canada is now aware, as it has never been before, that it is not only an Atlantic nation but also an American nation with growing interests in Latin America, a Pacific nation with growing ties with Japan and other Asian countries, and an Arctic nation with increasing responsibilities for the development, surveillance and defence of our vast northern territories. Above all, I emphasized that in deciding to stay in NATO and to stay in Europe, we have rejected a non-aligned or inward-looking orientation.

This explanation received a sympathetic reception everywhere. Those Nordic countries that are partners of ours in NATO pointed out

that our action would necessitate readjustments within NATO and they stressed the importance of both the timing and the possible psychological repercussions as factors to be carefully weighed. However, I am confident that they have a better understanding now of our objectives and that they are reassured of our intention to maintain an effective Canadian military presence in Europe.

Another aspect of our foreign policy review which attracted considerable interest was our decision to open negotiations on diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. All the Nordic countries except Iceland have embassies in Peking and I formed the impression that they welcomed the Canadian initiative. I also took advantage of my presence in Stockholm to get a personal report on this subject from our Ambassador there.

We had some very useful exchanges of views in the Nordic capitals about the general question of east-west relations and European security. I explained Canada's vital interest in the search for détente between east and west and for a lasting solution to Europe's security problems. This was why we had welcomed the various initiatives, including the Budapest Declaration, that had been taken concerning the possibility of holding a conference on European security.

I expressed support in particular for the positive but realistic approach of the Finnish government and for their view that any conference that might eventually meet should be without pre-conditions, should be fully prepared, should involve all countries concerned and, above all, should be assured of reasonable prospects for success.

The west at least had no interest in a conference that failed and it would therefore be wise to proceed step by step, sounding out the possibilities of agreement beginning with the easier problems and moving on gradually to the more difficult ones. I explained that we envisaged this in terms of a steady on-going process, in which NATO consultations had an important role to play, rather than in terms of some great occasion on which there was likely to be an abrupt clash of views on stubborn points of contention. I also made it clear that Canada intended to be involved in this process from the beginning and throughout. I found that there was a near identity of view on these points between all the Nordic governments and ourselves, and it was agreed that we should keep in close touch as bilateral consultations proceeded.

[Mr. Sharp.]

We also had an opportunity to discuss developments in western Europe, including future prospects for the European Common Market and its relationship to proposals for a Nordic economic union. We found it useful to compare notes on the situation in the Middle East, in Nigeria and in Viet Nam. We exchanged views on the disarmament negotiations and on United Nations matters, including peace keeping operations and the provision of aid in disaster situations. On all these questions we found that more often than not our appreciation and approach were very close to those of the various Nordic governments.

In each capital we discussed a number of bilateral questions concerned with trade and other forms of exchange. It should be borne in mind that Canada is the second best customer for Denmark and Sweden. We found everywhere a desire to increase co-operation on a functional basis and some specific suggestions were discussed, particularly in the economic, scientific and technological fields. Interest was expressed in reciprocal visits by parliamentarians and I hope, Mr. Speaker, to have a chance to discuss this with you at an early date.

In meetings with the public media as well as with governmental authorities, I made a special point of explaining Canadian policies and objectives in terms designed to make clear that we had our own view of the world, our own aspirations and our own way of doing things that were not quite like anybody else's. As a result I think there is a better knowledge of Canada in the Nordic countries and a better appreciation of the possibilities for our working together. I, in turn, have a much clearer picture of these countries and their peoples and of the prospects for joint action.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, ordinarily it might be difficult to know whether I should commence my remarks with a quotation from Confucius or from Hans Christian Andersen, but in the circumstances I must begin by protesting the failure of the minister to make this statement in the house on Friday.

Mr. Sharp: It wasn't ready then.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, it must have taken a long time to prepare this statement—

Mr. Harkness: It always takes a long time to try to make something out of nothing.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister had plenty of time to prepare to meet the press, but not time enough to perform his first obligation upon his return, namely to meet the House of Commons. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to admit that the statement he made today lost nothing by being delayed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: I think it would be safe to say that no Canadian minister has been the object of such derision internationally since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came back from London.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is more to be pitied than laughed at or more to be laughed at than pitied. But still the comment made by Winston Churchill comes to mind, made after Wendell Wilkie returned from a world tour. Wilkie said, "Mr. Churchill'—as he then was—"I could write a book," and Churchill replied, "And the title could be Gullible's Travels."

• (2:30 p.m.)

The purpose of the minister's trip is incomprehensible. He gave no explanation before he left Canada concerning why he was going. Now that he has returned he has given a rather convoluted explanation to the house and the country. I must say I congratulate him on being able to keep a straight face during his presentation, while all those about him were having great difficulty doing so. According to the minister's statement and the news reports, the minister made a number of speeches in Copenhagen, Helsinki, Oslo, Stockholm and the Lord knows where else, on the genesis of the Prime Minister's NATO policy. It was much the same sort of doubletalk we have been hearing for several months, of keeping one foot in Europe and maintaining an effective military presence. This kind of talk has been a farce here. It is bad enough that this should take place before a Canadian audience but it is worse that the minister should make a road show of it.

Already it seems clear that the real reason the minister went to Scandinavia was to get in on what he thought was the successful conclusion of the talks between Canadian diplomats and representatives of the Peking government. The minister was going to jump on the bandwagon just as it came into public view. Before he left Canada, when he landed in Europe, and on every occasion that presented itself he dropped hints that he would be glad to see the representative of the People's Republic of China. The minister's eagerness was equalled only by the Ambassador's indifference. If the minister met anyone at all, it was strictly Occidental.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I apologize to the house for using that play on words; but his apparent pursuit of the Chinese Ambassador has made this country look foolish. What it has done to the minister's reputation I am too charitable to say. He described this as the first official visit of a Canadian foreign minister to the countries of Scandinavia, yet his main reason for going seemed to concern not only different countries but a different continent.

The minister claims to have encouraged—and by one reading he claims to have conceived—a meeting between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, and yet he urged them to discuss only the matters on which they can agree. I presume he would not want there to appear to be a difference of opinion. Despite the best efforts of the government to make Canada seem like a country of fools, we are not; we cannot accept fairy tales as an excuse for policy. The most revealing statement on the minister's visit slipped from his own tongue in an interview with Mr. Arthur Blakely, contained in Friday's Montreal *Gazette*. I quote Mr. Blakely's story:

> Even so, Mr. Sharp felt that the exercise had been worth while. He had had some interesting chats with the Canadian Ambassador to Sweden, Arthur Andrew in which the latter had been in a position "to tell me face to face things he would not dare put in a cable".

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I trust the Ambassador spoke for all of us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Poor Sharp, poor Sharp!

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we in this party share the view expressed with such wit by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), that it would have been much more courteous and proper for the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) to have first made this statement in the house, before he made it in a press interview last Friday. We sympathize with the minister's difficulty in presenting Canada's NATO policy to our Scandinavian allies and friends, because he has never practised telling this house what Canada's phase by phase

foreign and defence policy is. Certainly if he told the Scandinavian ministers something in this regard, he said something that has never been said in this house.

We in this party are glad that the minister has visited the Scandinavian countries. In our view the smaller countries of Europe represent an enlightened and constructive outlook on world affairs based largely on support of the United Nations. We think Canada should co-operate as closely as possible with them in strengthening international organizations.

We would have liked to hear something more definite in the minister's statement on the progress of the negotiations in respect of the diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China. We know there are differences of opinion in this house, but as far as this party is concerned we welcome vigorous action on the part of the government to assist in bringing nearly a quarter of the human race within the community of nations.

On the question of east-west relations and European security, we in this party strongly support the proposed conference and urge upon the minister that some risk must be taken. What he has said about success being assured before a conference is held seems to be carrying this rather far. We think that even at the risk of having an unsuccessful conference, without an immediate and positive result, a conference should be held as a means to ending the massive military confrontation in Europe which is costing so much money and which is a risk in that vital part of the world.

In his statement the Secretary of State for External Affairs has told us he compared notes with his Nordic colleagues on the situation in the Middle East, Nigeria and Viet Nam. We would very much have liked to hear what the basis for this exchange of notes was. We believe that both Canada and the Scandinavian countries have an important role to play in providing the peace keeping forces that may well be needed to bring about a lasting peace in the war torn areas. We would have liked to hear what Canada's policy is, because in each one of these areas it becomes apparent there is a need for the contribution of Canada and the Scandinavian countries to the international forces.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to express our thanks to the minister for his note informing us that he had not had time to get the text of his statement translated in time for today's sitting.

Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the national day of French Canadians, it is most significant to note that when some statement is to be made it does not seem so important to wait until the French text is ready.

At any rate, we support the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the spokesman for the New Democratic party. We feel that these meetings the minister attended have merely served the cause of understanding between good neighbours, but do not seem to have led to anything very concrete. In fact, we must admit that the results are rather vague and have little new to offer.

If we must take such a roundabout way simply to arrive at the recognition of Communist China, I think that is taking too many precautions to establish clearly Canada's policy.

• (2:40 p.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER RESPECTING MATERIAL AND HUMAN REQUIREMENTS TO FILL DEFENCE NEEDS

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that when I reported on June 2 regarding the NATO ministerial meeting, I undertook to report progress as decisions are reached on changes necessary to give substance to the government policy on defence as announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 3.

This report I make today will not be a lengthy one, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons. There are many variables which must be taken into account before final decisions can be made. For example, our role and force structure in NATO are still being discussed with our allies. We will honour our obligation to be governed by the established NATO consultative procedures, and hence our plans must remain tentative for the time being. For similar reasons we do not wish to anticipate changes which might be made in air defence roles and organization. In this regard, we are looking forward to receiving and studying the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. These are but two examples, Mr. Speaker, and when account is taken of all the

factors that must be studied before firm decisions are made, hon. members can understand the difficulty I have in making this first report as full and specific as I would have wished. There are, of course, some broad aspects which I can announce at this time and as I have stated earlier, I will continue to make public, from time to time, further details as they become firm.

[*English*]

During the whole course of the defence review, and particularly following the government's decision to base defence forces on the four point program in the April 3 statement, we have conducted a careful analysis to determine the resources required, both material and human, to fill our defence needs and at the same time be consistent with national priorities and capabilities.

Although there are some detailed alternatives still to be decided, we have concluded that a regular force of 80,000 to 85,000 will be needed to meet Canada's defence requirements.

We propose to make the transition over a period of three years, and to reach the new manpower levels without instituting a plan of forced attrition for this purpose. We fully recognize that this will result in some temporary personnel imbalances within certain trades and specialties, but we are confident these can be overcome by making available opportunities for retraining.

Basic to our planning was a firm decision to concentrate, wherever possible, on reducing administrative and support activities, to provide us with a higher ratio of operational to non-operational forces than in the past. This includes a re-examination of our command and control activities with a view to reducing headquarters staff, including those here in Ottawa.

I would now like to describe in general terms the force structure we plan to establish by early 1973. Maritime Command will continue in the anti-submarine role, using most of the existing equipment. However, we are continuing plans for employing the new ships under construction and are considering a replacement aircraft for the Argus. At the same time, we are exploring the possibility of widening the roles open to maritime forces in response to the government's broad policy directive. In particular, we expect more emphasis will be placed on activities relating to Canadian sovereign interests in our adjacent waters, and the seabed. In this context our Arctic territories take on particular significance.

Mobile Command will undergo some changes but will continue to maintain in Canada forces for a variety of roles related to the defence of Canada, aid to the civil power, co-operation with United States forces for the defence of North America, and collective security and peacekeeping abroad. This will mean more emphasis on light, quick-reaction, airportable land force units designed to meet these roles. Mobile Command will continue to be organized in combat groups and the Canadian Airborne Regiment is being retained.

Air Defence Command will remain very much as it is for the immediate future. However, we are engaged in intensive study of Canada's roles in continental air defence, and related discussions are proceeding between Canadian and United States military and civilian officials. As for the longer term, it will be some time before decisions can be made on the post 1975 bomber defence system, including AWACS, over-the-horizon radars and new interceptors.

Air Transport Command's strategic airlift capability will depend primarily on our present fleet of Hercules transports. They will be augmented for shorter hauls by Buffalo aircraft, now in the inventory. Although our detailed analysis of strategic deployment requirements is not yet complete, we expect that some contraction in the size of our air transport force will be made through retirement of part of the Yukon fleet and of other older aircraft. On the other hand, we are continuing with our studies of the requirements for a long range pure-jet military transport aircraft.

Along with the reductions in the regular force, we are planning to reduce the reserve force. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, we will be consulting next month with the Conference of Defence Associations and will be exchanging with them ideas on how we might make the most effective use of our reserve force, as a back-up to the regular force in their new roles and missions.

Our cadet program has been most successful. Its benefits in character building and the promotion of good citizenship will, in the future, as in the past, make an important contribution to national development. We intend to continue to support a program involving about 100,000 cadets.

It will be obvious, Mr. Speaker, that reductions in over-all strength of the forces, and

particularly reductions in administrative overhead, will result in the closure of certain bases. Decisions have not yet been made on this complicated matter and I believe it will be another month or two before our studies will be completed. We will give ample advance notice before closing any base. In each case a comprehensive plan will be developed, in consultation with all the interested parties, with a view to minimizing the disruptive effects on the communities, on the personnel directly involved, and on their families.

There will be a reduction in the number of civilians employed in the department. This reduction, for the most part, will be achieved by normal turnover and by transfers to suitable vacancies elsewhere in the government service. The facilities of the Department of National Defence, the Union of National Defence Employees, the Public Service Commission, the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will be used to the utmost in these endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, in my statement on June 2, I said that we believed we can achieve the transition to the new defence posture, barring unexpected international developments, within a defence budget which will be maintained for the next three years at its current dollar level. Our studies since then have served to substantiate this estimate. I am confident that these resources will be sufficient to equip and maintain the force organization I have just outlined.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I should like to mention a fact that may be overlooked. Although we will be reducing our over-all regular force strength, we will continue to recruit qualified young Canadians for whom we can promise an attractive and challenging career.

For the reasons I mentioned earlier, that is all the information I can give at this time. I appreciate hon. members' desire to receive more complete details and I regret that these are not yet available. You will recall that when I spoke on this subject on June 2, I pointed out that this concern was shared by members of the forces, and I will have to ask them too to be patient a little longer. I am personally confident that both during and after the period of change we are about to embark upon, the Canadian Armed Forces will continue to exhibit the same high standards of professionalism they have displayed in the past, and will continue to be a source of pride to all Canadians.

[Mr. Cadieux (Labelle).]

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I should like to thank the minister for giving us an advance copy of the statement he has just read. However, I regret that the notice of it was so short that there was no time for a considered analysis of its full implications. Therefore, the remarks that I will make at this time will be of a preliminary nature.

• (2:50 p.m.)

It is obvious that the problem of most Canadians as well as of the minister in the matter of defence policy is that Canadians are ruled, and presumably the minister is overruled, by a government dominated by men whose understanding of their heavy responsibility in this matter is as shallow as the cliché "make love, not war".

The lesson of history is that every leader who has taken the course of least resistance, of which Ethelred the Unready and Neville Chamberlain are examples, and in whose hands the fate of the nation was unhappily placed has sooner or later dragged his people into disaster and war. I deplore the actual and concrete reduction in our armed forces because I believe that although our forces may seem costly, the resulting saving is minimal. I think that their reduction is not only unfortunate in itself, but also because of the impression it may create, not only among our friends and allies but also among our enemies. I deplore whatever aid and comfort our present defence policy may give to those who would destroy our way of life. We have to remember that the world has become a global village and that we can no longer retreat into national isolationism and expect that course to succeed.

The minister's statement—and I appreciate the difficult position in which he finds himself—perhaps raises as many questions as it answers. It is difficult for me to understand how, with a reduced and limited capacity, for example, we can hope to expand our commitments with regard either to continental defence or the very valid and necessary activities of our maritime command to establish our sovereignty over our coastal waters.

I think the fact that the minister was able to announce in fairly definite terms that the ceiling of manpower in the forces would be between 80,000 and 85,000 men indicates a tendency of the government to put the cart before the horse in this business, and it looks as if the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) has been given an ultimatum to

operate within a certain ceiling in dollar value, regardless of the outcome of any studies which may be undertaken in the fields of external affairs and defence. I should like to point out that this ceiling will lower as long as the value of the purchasing power of our dollar continues to decline.

With regard to some specific statements which the minister made, I am pleased that he has established that it is his intention to honour our obligation to be governed by the established NATO consultative procedures. I was also pleased to hear him indicate that the government will give some attention to the reports of the Committee on National Defence and External Affairs. I hope that it will give more attention to future reports of that committee than it did to its report on NATO.

I wish to congratulate the minister on his intention to try to reduce further the administrative costs of the armed forces and to increase the ratio of the combat units to total personnel and total costs, but I am afraid that he will meet with disappointment unless he has more success in grappling with Parkinson's law than did most of his colleagues up to now.

With regard to the minister's remarks concerning the maritime command, I am pleased that the government recognizes the vital importance of the role which that command carries out. If I may digress for a moment, may I say that I know the personnel stationed in my constituency will be pleased to know that the government is contemplating a study of a replacement aircraft for the Argus.

I think it is very unwise to reduce the strength of the reserve forces. Our professionals say that at the time when our permanent force is to be reduced, our reserve strength should be increased so that we might have something to fall back on in certain situations.

I hope that the minister will take into very careful consideration, as he promised, the economic side effects of the closing of bases, especially those located in more or less isolated areas the economy of which is dependent on the bases. I also hope that the government, in concert with other levels of government, will find some compensating stimulation for the economy in any area where a base must be closed before that action is taken.

The minister has deplored the apparent necessity for keeping the forces in a state of some uncertainty for some time longer. I hope that he can correct the situation at the earliest time, but I agree with him that our armed forces are made up of professionals and they will carry out whatever duty is allotted to them in a fashion of which all Canadians can be proud; because I believe that the Canadians who represent us in the armed forces, especially those who are stationed in Europe, are of the very highest professional quality and are a credit to all Canadians.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I have to make will not take too long because I, like others, find myself in a difficult position as a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on External Affairs and National Defence. The committee spent all of last week drafting a report. I know what is in it but, because of the time it takes to translate it into French, it cannot be tabled until Wednesday or Thursday.

However, may I say that speaking individually I have a great fondness for the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Lewis: Watch out.

Mr. Winch: But when he speaks, as he did today, on the so-called government policy on national defence, I am not only amazed but I think that the minister has increased the confusion in the defence policy and, worst of all, has demonstrated that so far as the government is concerned our defence policy is a *fait accompli* and the opinions expressed in the committee or in the House of Commons mean nothing at all.

I do not know why we have spent so many months in the committee, studying defence matters, when all we can do now is to come here to listen to an announcement of a *fait accompli* by the government.

Mr. McGrath: The house leader is not even listening. Shame on him.

Mr. Winch: The minister said a few minutes ago: "We will honour our obligation to be governed by the established NATO consultative procedures, and hence our plans must remain tentative for the time being... In this regard we are looking forward to receiving and studying the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence."

• (3:00 p.m.)

As to NATO, I thought we made an arduous trip and worked our heads off to file

a report on this subject prior to the negotiations in Washington and Brussels. The government had the report for weeks, both the majority report and a minority report signed by three representatives of this party. So that first statement about waiting for a report on NATO is sheer, unmitigated nonsense.

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Winch: He did not say it? "In this regard we are looking forward to receiving and studying the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence." This is the same paragraph on NATO—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winch: Perhaps the secretary sent me the wrong copy. I completely agree with the minister—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winch: —when he talks about a reduction in the number of Armed Forces personnel. I had the privilege of attending the Mobile Command exercises at Camp Petawawa last Saturday and the success of the demonstration there, showing what can be done through co-ordination and co-operation, indicates to me that we can vastly reduce our force under NATO in Europe with the efficient integration of army and air force units. And, as the previous speaker suggested, if we did a job at N.D.H.Q. to ensure there were more Indians and less chiefs it would undoubtedly be possible to achieve the objective of 85,000.

However, there is one thing which really bothers us, especially in the Defence Committee, and that is the practice of the government in presenting defence policy as a *fait accompli.* Under its terms of reference the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence was asked to go into all aspects of defence policy, including the subject of Maritime Command. Only last week a subcommittee of nine was established to consider policy governing Maritime Command. It held its organization meeting on Thursday intending to get its work under way, yet today the minister tells us that Maritime Command will continue its anti-submarine role. This is another example of a *fait accompli.*

We are told that consideration is being given to replacing the Argus. What about the Tracker which is to be phased out in 1972 or 1973? The statement talks about Canada's sovereign interest in the Arctic. It is really not fair to give us these generalities. The information we have is that our entire navy, including our new ships, has not been constructed with prows suitable for sailing in Arctic waters, and that we do not possess planes capable of operating in that region either. We are entitled to more than generalities of this sort, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to comment on the important aspect of policy which involves A.B.M.s and AWACS. I hope Canada will not enter into any negotiations leading to the establishment here of either the A.B.M. or AWAC systems, but I shall refrain from further comment bearing in mind that there is considerable comment on this matter in the report which is coming from the defence committee.

Nevertheless, I should like to add a further word about the aspect which really stumps members of the House of Commons and its committees. I refer to the government's propensity for the *fait accompli.* Why does the government not take its own committees into consideration before these decisions are made? Why does it not take into consideration the recommendations of other organizations before announcements are made? I have referred particularly to Maritime Command. Now there is the question of a reserve force. I am glad we were given a copy of the minister's statement. Let us see what it says on this aspect: "Along with reductions in the regular force, we are planning to reduce the reserve force. In this regard we will be consulting next month with the Conference of Defence Associations."

One month after we have been told by the minister that it has been decided to reduce the reserve force, consultations are to take place with the organizations which are interested. Mr. Speaker, representatives of these associations appeared before the defence committee last week and urged that there should be an increase in the reserve force.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are getting restless. I have only a few words to say to end what could have been a lengthy speech—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winch: We do most heartfeltly wish that there were more facts presented, less

wishful thinking, more consultation and more co-operation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, as I have congratulations for the most part to offer the minister, you will believe me if I say that I will be brief, because it is much more difficult to congratulate than to criticize.

For several years, Canada was considered by many countries as a small country covering a few acres of snow. It needed the last wars and the good services of our armed forces for them to have some idea of what Canada really was. Today, anyone of us, anyone of our friends who goes to Europe realizes that our soldiers have been our best ambassadors, even if many of them are buried there. At all events, even if we must now reduce our forces, I think that is perfectly normal, since Canadians have played their role wonderfully well. Considering the length of our coast-line, I am happy that the Maritime command will continue in its anti-submarine role. We all know that Canada has the longest coast-line in the world.

On sea, in the air and on the ground, the department is considering modernizing sensibly everything that is mechanized, and it is quite normal if we want to maintain an adequate defence.

Modernizing the equipment will mean reducing the strength of our forces. We will then know the same effects that were felt in industry and in other fields.

For a long time, the army could afford to keep idle people. But today, in his statement, the minister is advising us that from now on, his role as father of a family is ended and that he intends to administer the department as a business. Therefore, I wish to congratulate him on behalf of our party and assure him of our support.

Mr. Speaker, my only criticism concerns the question of elections. The armed forces being the only group that does not publish electoral lists, it was fraudulently that I, as a candidate, obtained one at the last election. I discovered there the names of two families that left the Portneuf riding twenty-five years ago and are now living in Montreal. Two members of those families who were in the armed forces were approached in Ontario at the camp where they were stationed, and they still had the right to vote in the Portneuf riding. That is my only criticism, and should the minister reduce the strength of our forces, I trust he will make the necessary recommendations so that the names of military personnel no longer living in their home riding will also be deleted from the electoral lists.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the moment is not opportune for the Chair to remind hon. members of the terms of Standing Order 15(3) which reads:

> On motions . . . a minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy. Any such announcement or statement should be limited to facts which it is deemed necessary to make known to the house and should not be designed to provoke debate at this stage. A spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government may comment briefly, subject to the name limitation.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I suggest to hon. members that when we have spent nearly one hour on two statements we have perhaps not observed either the spirit or the letter of this Standing Order. I appreciate that we are dealing with very important matters, but at the same time I have the impression that over the weeks there has been a tendency for ministerial statements to become longer and for the comments thereon by opposition members to become proportionately longer as well. Perhaps this might be borne in mind by members of the government and by representatives of the opposition when we reach this item of business from day to day.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make which meets the spirit and the letter of your remarks. I should like to inform the house of the names of the remaining appointees to the Prices and Incomes Commission.

Hon. members will recall that I recently announced the appointment of Dr. John H. Young who had agreed to serve as chairman of the commission. I am now pleased to announce that Mr. Paul Gérin-Lajoie, a cabinet minister in a former Quebec government, has been named vice-chairman of the commission. Dr. George V. Haythorne, former

deputy minister of labour of the government of Canada, and Mr. George E. Freeman, director of research for the Bank of Canada, have been appointed commissioners.

I should like to ask leave of the house to table their biographies covering the training and experience of these four members, all of which makes them, I think, eminently qualified to begin this new and important assignment. On behalf of myself and also on behalf of the Canadian government I should like to say how pleased and grateful I am to them for accepting these appointments and for choosing this way to serve their country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Basford: Recruiting of the counsel and staff, the clerks and technical advisers of the commission, is now under way, and the chairman has informed me that the commission will be able to begin its work on July 2.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, in the same spirit I will try to be circumscribed by the comments of Your Honour. I noted that the minister said that his statement would be short. It may have been short, but it took a long time for us to reach this point in time. It is almost six months now since the white paper on price stability was presented and the announcement of this commission was made in this house; it is only now that the personnel of this very important commission have been appointed.

Mr. Basford: We wanted to get the right people.

Mr. McGrath: It took the minister almost five months to appoint the chairman of the commission, and it is incredible that he had to look no further than his own backyard to find a suitable person. It also seems to me incredible that it took another month for the minister to bring the house up to date on the other appointments to the commission. It would not be difficult to anticipate that the government would look for a banker, and where else to look than the Bank of Canada? It would not be difficult to anticipate that the government would appoint somebody who was familiar with the labour laws and labour scene in this country, and where else to look than the Department of Labour? Any Liberal in the province of Quebec would anticipate the appointment of Paul Gérin-Lajoie.

Why did it take six months to fill these appointments, Mr. Speaker? During all that time inflation was taking its toll in this country. Prices were going up—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McGrath: We can only conclude that the government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must seek the hon. member's co-operation. I would not think that he was now abiding by either the spirit or the letter of the law. I take the liberty of reminding the hon. member of the terms of the Standing Order, which requires ministers to make statements that ought not to provoke debate. In speaking on behalf of his party the hon. member is under the same limitation. It would seem to me that if he is to go on and debate the question of inflation and other very general problems he is definitely going beyond the terms of the statement made by the minister. I seek his co-operation so that we may go on with the business of the house.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, would you allow me to conclude by saying that the government has its priorities all mixed up. The government has failed to recognize the urgency of the most serious problem facing the country today, namely, rising prices, the continuous rise in the cost of living index and the effect that this has on the average man and woman in this country. I suggest to the minister and the government that, if they want to know what is the most urgent problem facing the country, all they have to do is to talk to the man on the street. He will readily tell them that the most serious problem facing this country today is rising prices, the increase in the cost of living index, and poverty. It is about time that this government got the message.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the statement of the minister let me say first of all that no one questions the training and experience of the people appointed by the minister. What is being questioned is the intention and the credibility of the minister and the government. This is what is at issue.

There is no question in my mind that the government has had the power to do something about prices for a long time now but has failed to take any action in this area. Many of us have reason to suspect that with this commission the government is simply throwing another camouflage over its failure to act. The government's delay in appointing

the commission represents its unwillingness to come to grips with the serious problem of inflation and rising prices in this country, and has very little to do with the quality and calibre of the men being appointed to the commission itself.

A number of years ago the Macquarrie commission reported to the government on combines legislation. That commission pointed out ways which were open to the government to take effective action against rising prices. From that time the government has done very little to accept any of the recommendations of the Macquarrie commission. It has failed to use the powers it already possesses to investigate rising prices.

The disturbing feature about this commission is that it will be completely isolated from the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons that the minister has talked about appointing. Since the committee cannot make recommendations to the commission, the members of this house will not have the opportunity to express their concerns in any effective way. The commission will operate in its own way, and if its work is not successful there is very little that the House of Commons can do about it. It seems to me that this is an important failing and one that should be corrected immediately. As co-chairman of the previous committee the minister knows that a committee of the House of Commons can do an effective job in holding down prices and focusing attention on those sectors of the economy that are being abused.

In closing I merely say, therefore, that the best men in the world will not do the job for us if the intentions of the minister and the government are other than the taking of urgent action to counter rising prices.

• (3:20 p.m.)

VETERANS AFFAIRS

STUDY BY STANDING COMMITTEE OF WORK OF CANADIAN PENSION COMMISSION

On the order: Government notices of motions:

That the report of the committee appointed September 8, 1965, to survey the organization and work of the Canadian Pension Commission, tabled on March 26, 1968, be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REVISION OF ORDERS, REGULATIONS AND STATUTORY RULES

Question No. 1,666—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. When will the government undertake a revision of the orders, regulations and statutory rules?

2. What is the staff of the O.R.S.R. division?

3. Is it the government's intention to amend the Regulations Act (R.S.C. 1952 c. 235) principally with respect to the legal status of the regulations and to possible discrepancies with the Canada Evidence Act?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. It is anticipated that a consolidation and revision of subsidiary legislation (regulations, etc., of a legislative nature) will be undertaken after the revision of the Statutes of Canada is completed.

2. There is no such division as the O.R.S.R. division; however, the duties in relation to orders, regulations and statutory rules are performed by the Orders in Council section of the Privy Council office together with the legal adviser to the Privy Council office. The Orders in Council section is composed of three officers and five clerical staff. The legal adviser has one secretary.

3. The government intends to examine the Regulations Act after the Special House Committee on Statutory Instruments submits its report.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Question No. 1,848—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Does the CNR operate an exclusive communication service and, if not, under what arrangement is this service offered the public in the name of the CNR?

2. Did the CNR's telegraph service operate at a profit in 1968 and, if so, what was the amount of profit to the company?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Pursuant to Section 26 of the Canadian National Railways Act being Chapter 29 of the Statutes of Canada 1955, the C.N.R. is empowered to establish, construct or acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise and to maintain and operate telecommunication facilities systems and services in Canada and elsewhere. In addition, it may carry on a public

telecommunications business and may enter into arrangements with other telecommunication companies or Her Majesty for the exchange and transmission of messages or for the maintenance or working, in whole or in part, of the telecommunication systems of the respective companies or Her Majesty. However, it does not possess an exclusive franchise anywhere in Canada for the provision or operation of such services.

Certain telecommunications properties or works in the Yukon Territory, in parts of Northern British Columbia and in Newfoundland which are vested in or owned, controlled or occupied by Her Majesty, pursuant to various Orders in Council have been entrusted to the Railway for management and operation. In addition, Canadian National provides the only public telecommunication services in the Northwest Territories.

2. In addition to a telegraph message service provided to the public the Company engages in a diversity of telecommunications activities including the operation of local and long distance commercial telephone services, the provision of private wire circuits, a Telex Network, and facilities for radio and TV network transmissions. The telegram constitutes less than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the commercial communications business handled by the Company and is not compensatory. However, as shown on Page 37 of the Company's Annual Report for the year 1968 which was tabled in the House of Commons on April 24th, 1969, the net income realized from the overall operations of the Telecommunications Department during the year 1968 was $8,654,140.

CABINET MINISTERS ON SOUTH AMERICAN TRIP

Question No. 1,938—**Mr. Gauthier:**

1. Were any provincial Cabinet Ministers or senior provincial officials invited to accompany the federal Cabinet Ministers and senior officials of their department on the mission to South America in October and November last (a) if provincial Ministers and officials were invited, who were they and in what capacity were they invited to attend (b) if not, for what reason were provincial Ministers and officials not invited?

2. Were the provincial Ministers and officials made aware of the mission by federal Ministers and officials prior to its departure and were they informed of the results of the mission on their return and, if so, will the government table this correspondence?

3. Were representatives of the news media invited to accompany the mission and, if so, which representatives of the (a) English language media, and (b) French language media, were invited, and (c) who accepted and attended?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No provincial ministers or officials were invited to participate in the ministerial mission which visited nine Latin American countries in October and November of 1968.

Except for the renewal of a trade agreement and the signature of a minor agreement in another field wholly within federal jurisdiction the objective of the mission was to explore the possibilities of developing closer relations between Canada and Latin America in all important fields.

2. The government's decision to send the mission was announced several months in advance, and a few days before its departure the Prime Minister made a full statement in the house regarding its composition, itinerary and objectives. Following its return the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a brief statement in the House of Commons and subsequently tabled the preliminary report of the mission, copies of which have been sent to the provinces.

3. All media represented in the Parliamentary Press Gallery were given an opportunity to participate in the ministerial mission. In addition, special steps were taken to inform the Canadian Press and certain weekly publications issued in the English and French languages.

The mission was accompanied for all or part of its duration by the following representatives of the press: Mr. Paul Kidd, Washington Correspondent, Southam News Service; Mr. Guy Anger, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, French Radio News; Mr. Louis Rollet, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, French Radio News; Mr. Pedro Marcos Bilbao, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, International Service; Mr. William Dampier, Toronto Telegram; Mr. Don Newlands, Mrs. Newlands and Mr. David Lee, freelance, for Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Television Network, programme "The Way It Is".

[*English*]

*WHITE PAPER ON EXTERNAL POLICY

Question No. 1,971—**Mr. Lewis:**

Will the proposed White Paper on External Policy be prepared and presented to the House for debate prior to the summer recess?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no".

[*English*]

POST OFFICE CLOSURES

Question No. 2,024—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How many post offices have been closed in each province in Canada since June 25, 1968 and how many post offices is it proposed to close during the year 1969?

2. How many families are affected by the changes in their addresses?

3. How much does the government expect to save in each province by the closing of these post offices?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:
1. (a) British Columbia, 13; Alberta, 42; Saskatchewan, 40; Manitoba, 37; Ontario, 92; Quebec, 51; New Brunswick, 32; Nova Scotia, 45; Prince Edward Island, 16; Newfoundland, 11; Northwest Territories, 1; Yukon, 0. (b) 235 for the period of June 1969 to December 1969 inclusive.

2. Departmental records are not maintained in such a way that would make it possible to compile these statistics.

3. Departmental records are not maintained in such a way as to permit compilation of savings broken down by provinces. However, since the inception of the Department's program in February 1967, to close small unproductive Post Offices, an approximate saving of $513,865 has been realized throughout the country.

THE FLORENCE AGREEMENT

Question No. 2,047—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Is there an international agreement entitled "The Florence Agreement" which the Government of Canada has not yet signed and, if so, for what reason?

2. How many countries have signed this agreement?

3. Did Canada participate in the drafting of this agreement?

4. What countries have not yet signed this agreement?

5. When is it expected that Canada may sign this agreement?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes, there is an international agreement called the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, which was adopted in Florence in July 1950 and opened for signature at Lake Success, New York on November 22, 1950. Canada has not signed the agreement because it has not been considered to be in Canada's interest to abandon the limited protection afforded domestic producers against imports of certain educational, scientific and cultural materials as long as important trading partners maintained barriers against Canadian exports of these materials. Canada does impose a small duty on such imports but other countries, even where no tariffs are maintained, continue to limit imports from Canada of these materials by the use of stringent non-tariff barriers. In any event the question of Canada's accession is under continuous review in the light of changing conditions in trade and the intensive study into aspects of intellectual property currently being prepared by the Economic Council.

2. As of May 22, 1969, the agreement had entered into force for 62 countries. A further eight countries had signed but not ratified the agreement and the agreement is not in force for these countries.

3. No.

4. Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian S. S. R., Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Maldive Islands, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen and Zambia (63).

5. See answer 1.

USE OF CHEMICAL "MACE"

Question No. 2,101—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Has a decision been made by the RCMP on the use of the chemical "mace"?

2. Is there a Department of National Health and Welfare report on this chemical?

3. Is there a report in the Solicitor General's Department on the use of this chemical?

4. Is there a report by the RCMP on the use of this chemical?

Questions

5. Is it the intention of the government to have one or all of these reports tabled?

6. Have there been any requests from police jurisdictions in Canada outside the federal government for information on this chemical?

7. If so, what has been the nature of the government's replies to these requests?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Solicitor General and the Department of National Health and Welfare as follows: 1. Yes; a decision has been made by the R.C.M. Police that chemical "Mace" will not be used.

2. No.

3. No; however, the Department of National Health and Welfare replied to specific questions by the R.C.M. Police in respect to the chemical "Mace".

4. No.

5. Not applicable.

6. Yes.

7. The R.C.M. Police have supplied copies of the material they obtained from the Department of National Health and Welfare, on the chemical "Mace", to those police departments requesting them and to other major police departments.

GRAIN SHIPMENT COSTS TO CHURCHILL AND MONTREAL

Question No. 2,142—**Mr. Noble:**

What is the difference in cost to the Canadian Wheat Board of shipping a bushel of grain from the Prairies into the elevator at the Port of Churchill, Manitoba, compared to shipping a bushel of grain from the Prairies into a grain elevator at the Port of Montreal, Quebec?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Average cost of moving wheat from country points to Churchill, 10.71 cents. Average cost of moving wheat from country points to Lakehead, 12.00 cents. Average cost of moving wheat from Lakehead to Montreal, 13.50 cents. It should be noted that the differential between the Lakehead and Montreal is recovered in the Canadian Wheat Board sales prices and is therefore not a cost to the Board.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,174—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Fisheries and Forestry provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. (a) Subsidies are provided by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry in the fishing industry for fishermen and fishing firms towards the construction of wooden fishing vessels to the extent of either 30 per cent, 40 per cent, or 50 per cent of the cost of construction. Payments to the fishermen and firms in this respect for 1969-70 are estimated at $565,000; (b) In the fishing segment support is given to fishermen and fish processors, (i) through purchase and disposal of groundfish products, canned mackerel, salt cod, and Lake Erie yellow perch; (ii) through the provision of loans to companies engaged in processing groundfish products. Probable loans in 1969-70 are estimated at $4,200,000; (iii) through re-settlement of families in Newfoundland. Payments in this respect are estimated at $1,400,000 for 1969-70; (c) In the forestry segment, support of research in universities and other forestry activities is provided through a number of grants to forestry schools and to forestry organizations. Support is also given to the Province of Newfoundland under a 1965 agreement to assist with an inventory and land capability study. For 1969-70 the grants to Universities will amount to $283,000, and assistance to the Province of Newfoundland is estimated at $800,000. Grants to forestry organizations will be as follows: Canadian Forestry Association, $50,000; Commonwealth Forestry Institute (3,000 pounds Sterling), $8,000; British Columbia, Festival of Forestry Organization, $10,000.

2. The following amounts were paid for subsidies and support programs during the years 1960-68: 1960-61, $4,605,511; 1961-62, $7,699,-537; 1962-63, $9,043,003; 1963-64, $9,326,596; 1964-65, $10,034,543; 1965-66, $12,193,065; 1966-67, $11,731,104; 1967-68, $8,817,611; 1968-69, $9,429,551.

INDIANS ON DEPARTMENTAL STAFF

Question No. 2,226—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. What is the total staff of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and how many of these are Indian?

2. What percentage of the total staff are "decision making" Indian employees?

3. Do there exist any programs specifically training Indians to qualify for "decision making" positions within the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

4. What percentage of the total salaries paid by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is paid to Indian employees?

5. How many agents on Indian reserves are Indians, how many non-Indians and does the government or Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have any explicit policy regarding the ratio?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. For the year 1969-70 the total authorized strength of the Department is 9,121 of which 692 of these are Indians.

2. .7 per cent of the staff are "decision making" Indian employees.

3. In November of 1968 there was introduced in the department an Indian and Eskimo Recruitment and Development Program. The specific objective of this program was to increase the number of Indian people in the Department who occupy "decision making" positions. This objective was to be achieved in three ways: 1. By launching a summer recruitment program among university students of recognized Indian ancestry with a view to encouraging them to join the department upon completion of their education. 2. Through a recruiting program on Indian reserves, high schools and in all areas where Indians live to encourage qualified Indian people to seek employment with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 3. To develop an in-service training program which will train Indian people who are now employed in the department to assume more responsible roles. For the first phase of the program, namely the university student summer program, 60 Indian and Eskimo university students have been placed in all areas of the Department including social programs, the economic development program and the conservation program and the administrative program. The development part of the program is in the planning stage and the Department is being assisted by a Consultative Committee composed of Indians. Further recruitment will take place in the fall.

4. 9.1 per cent of the departmental budget for payroll costs is paid to Indian employees.

5. There are five superintendents (formerly known as Indian Agents) who have Indian status; there are 60 superintendents of non-Indian status.

There is no statutory preference for Indian people. Position of superintendent is subject to the Public Service Employment Act, and appointments are made in order of merit from eligibility lists established as the result of competitions. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is promoting a recruitment program designed to increase the number of Indian employees both in this Department and in the Public Service of Canada.

PAN ARCTIC OIL LTD.

Question No. 2,243—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has Pan Arctic Oil Ltd. submitted to the government its Annual Report and, if not, when will that report be filed?

2. If such report has been received by the government, will it be tabled in Parliament?

3. What amount was invested in that company by the government, under (a) shares (b) bonds and loans (c) grants?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. No. An Annual Report is being prepared and will be filed shortly.

2. Yes.

3. For a grant of nine million dollars made by the Government to Panarctic Oils Ltd., the Government has received 900,000 preferred shares with a par value of 10 dollars. On the basis of one common share for each four preferred shares, the Government has received 225,000 common shares, of no par value, but a cost of 10 cents per share or a total of 22,500 dollars. The number of shares issued to the Government in each class represents 45 per cent of the total shares issued being in the proportion which the amount of the Government grant bears to the total funding of 20 million dollars in Panartic Oils Ltd.

VETERANS AFFAIRS SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,279—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

Questions

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. The Department of Veterans Affairs provides subsidies and/or support programs for veterans who reside in Canada.

2. The amounts paid for such programs during each of the years 1960-68 were as follows:

Fiscal year	Disability pensions	War veterans allowances, civilian war allowances and assistance fund	Other benefits and allowances	Treatment services	Veterans' Land Act loans	Total
	$000	$000	$000	$000	$000	$000
1959-60	130,949	59,938	8,661	48,652	24,600	272,800
1960-61	131,858	61,382	8,436	49,796	36,972	288,444
1961-62	155,992	77,876	8,295	47,625	32,804	322,592
1962-63	154,090	84,611	7,431	44,003	39,040	329,175
1963-64	152,281	86,262	6,901	46,115	42.131	333,690
1964-65	165,353	96,222	8,674	47,402	37,257	354,908
1965-66	170,485	104,863	8,813	49,582	47,423	381,166
1966-67	180,252	108,699	8,168	54,251	79,900	431,270
1967-68	189,249	104,046	7,725	58,434	98,471	457,925

INDIAN REPRESENTATION ON SCHOOL BOARDS

Question No. 2,284—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. What is the policy of the federal government respecting Indian representation on local school boards in districts where Indian children are educated?

2. To what extent is this being enforced?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. The policy of the federal government is to encourage provincial governments to enact legislation which will permit Indian representation on local school boards. This has been done over the past few years through an exchange of letters between the Minister of this Department and the ministers of education in the provinces, and through discussions between officials of this Department and those of the departments of education. In pursuing this policy, the Department was acting on behalf of, and in the interest of, the Indian people. Today the Indian people are able to exert political pressure through their representatives in the provincial governments. The results of this intergovernment activity are: 1. In Ontario, new legislation permits the minister of education to appoint Indian representatives to school boards. 2. In New Brunswick, new legislation permits the minister of education to appoint Indian representatives to school boards. 3. In Saskatchewan, new legislation gives the Indian people the status of electors who may stand for election as school trustees or who may vote for a representative on the school board. 4. In British Columbia, new legislation gives the Indian people the status of ratepayers who may now apply to have their names placed on the voter's list.

A bill is now before the Legislature in Manitoba which, when passed, will give the Indian people the status of electors.

The Alberta Legislature was prepared to present a bill to provide Indian representation on school boards at the current session but the Indian Association in Alberta asked the Alberta Government to postpone the bill until they had had more time to examine it.

2. The role of the federal government has been strictly advisory since education is the exclusive responsibility of the provinces who enact their own school legislation and enforce it. This Department will continue to encourage provincial governments to enact the legislation necessary to provide Indians with the opportunity of being elected to school boards. There has been a very active interest on the part of the Indian people in this matter and, in all provinces where legislation permits, there are Indian representatives on various school boards.

ACQUISITION OF MOBILE HOMES

Question No. 2,306—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Will the federal government consider the application of N.H.A. funds to acquire mobile homes and, if so, when, and if, not, for what reason?

2. Does the federal government have statistics on the number of mobile homes utilized in Canada and the number of people accommodated by them and, if so, what are the numbers?

3. Will the federal government recommend that other levels of government provide mobile home park facilities to accommodate mobile homes and will the federal government provide funds to assist in this regard?

4. Will the federal government consider providing facilities for mobile homes in National Parks?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as follows: 1. Under the National Housing Act home ownership loans must be secured by a first mortgage on real estate and the housing to be financed must meet certain minimum standards as to size, safety and so forth. If such security can be provided and such requirements can be met mobile homes will be eligible for financing under the N.H.A.

2. According to the 1966 Census of Canada, there were 28,177 mobile homes in Canada occupied by persons who had no other permanent home. The number of persons accommodated therein is not available. DBS does not compile statistics on the number of mobile homes used for vacation purposes.

3. When further amendments to the National Housing Act are under review consideration will be given to provisions relating to the financing of mobile homes and the sites on which they may be placed. At that time, provinces and municipalities will have to be consulted regarding provincial laws and municipal codes.

4. No consideration is being given to providing facilities for mobile homes in National Parks. Facilities are provided in public campgrounds for vacation-type trailers. In this case, the duration of stay in any one location is normally restricted to two weeks.

LONG HARBOUR, NFLD.—ELECTRIC REDUCTION COMPANY GRANT

Question No. 2,319—**Mr. Moores:**

1. Did ERCO receive any grant through ADA during the construction of the facilities at Long Harbour, Newfoundland?

2. With whom were negotiations carried out?

3. How much money was made available and on what terms?

4. Were federal government experts consulted regarding possible pollution during the construction period?

5. Was effective pollution control a condition of the ADA grant?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Department of Fisheries and Forestry as follows: 1. Yes.

2. A group of company officials including the President, Vice-President and Secretary.

3. A payment of $3 million under the Area Development Incentives Act was made after the facility reached commercial production in December 1968. Payments of $1 million each would be made in December 1969 and December 1970 provided the conditions of the Act and Regulations continue to be met.

4. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry experts were consulted in association with an oceanographer from the Bedford Institute.

5. No.

COLOURED SPREAD SALES

Question No. 2,326—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. Does the government know how many pounds of "coloured spread" were sold in Canada from April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968 and from April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969?

2. Of that amount, what proportion was sold illegally?

3. What were for the same periods the amounts of other imitation milk product sold in Canada?

4. What were the amounts of milk products of all kinds which were imported from other countries during the above-mentioned years?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. If by "coloured spread" is meant margarine, the Manufacturers Sales of Margarine for periods specified were: April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968, 188,-151,000 lbs; April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969, 195,142,000 lbs.

2. No information available.

3. There are no statistics available on imitation fluid milk sales in Canada.

4. The amounts of milk products of all kinds imported from other countries were as follows: April 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968, 488,189 cwt.; April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1969, 478,504 cwt.

Questions

*HOMES BUILT UNDER VETERANS LAND ACT

Question No. 2,357—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. How many homes were built in Ontario under the Veterans' Land Act during the past five years?

2. How many loans under the Veterans' Land Act were granted where both the husband and the wife qualified?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part is, 2,002. The answer to the second part is as follows: The Veterans' Land Act regulations provide that where a man and wife are both veterans only one of them may receive the benefits of Part I of the act. Information is not readily available from VLA records as to whether established veterans' wives are also veterans.

VETERANS AFFAIRS PUBLIC RELATIONS

Question No. 2,358—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Is there a branch or division within the Department of Veterans Affairs dealing with Public Relations matters and, if so, how many people are so employed there, what is the official name of the branch or division, what amount of money was expended during the fiscal year 1968-69, what positions are held by each person working therein and what is the salary paid to each and their qualifications?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): There is a division in the Department of Veterans Affairs dealing with public relations matters. There are 11 employees and the official name is the Public Relations Division. The total amount expended by the Division during the fiscal year 1968-69 was $117,427. The positions, salaries and qualifications of the staff of the Division are set out hereunder: Chief, Public Relations Division, Information Officer 4, salary $14,490 per annum. Since joining the Department in 1944, has been involved in information and public relations work; has been chief of the division since 1954; Canadian Public Relations Society Accreditation; overseas veteran World War II. Information Officer 3, salary $10,960 per annum. Graduate in law from Laval University; nine years in newspaper and journalism work; has been with Public Relations Division for two years. Information Officer 2, salary $9,660 per annum. Graduate in arts from Toronto University; over 20 years experience in Department of Veterans Affairs the last eight years in the Public Relations Division as editor of departmental publications; member Canadian Industrial Editors Association. Information Officer 2, salary $9,800 per annum. Employed with commercial radio stations and for 11 years with C.B.C. as a publicist; joined Public Relations Division, DVA in October 1968; overseas veteran World War II. Information Officer 1, salary $8,412 per annum. Reporter with daily commercial news; eight years as publicity assistant, Department of Trade and Commerce; seven years with Public Relations Division, DVA; overseas veteran World War II. Administrative Officer 1, salary $7,812 per annum. Over 25 years experience in DVA in clerical and administrative work; in Public Relations Division, DVA since May 1968. Support Staff: 1—CR 4, salary $5,211 per annum; 2—CR 3, salary $5,124 per annum; 1—CR 3, salary $4,656 per annum; 1—ST 2, salary $3,852 per annum.

[Mr. Pepin.]

PUBLIC WORKS—PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,401—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works have a relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

FARM MACHINERY PRICES

Question No. 2,402—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

Has it been determined by the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery that prices for various types of tractors are much lower in England than in Canada and, if so, what steps will the government take to reduce prices in Canada?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): The Royal Commission on Farm Machinery prepared a paper for the Canadian Agriculture Congress in March, 1969, entitled "Farm Tractor Prices in Canada Compared with Those in England and Other Countries". This paper shows that prices in the 1967 selling season were significantly higher in Canada than in the United Kingdom for tractors up to 55 to 60 hp. but somewhat lower for tractors with greater horsepower.

Announcement of any policy which may be established in this regard will be made to the House in the usual manner.

INCORPORATION OF UNIONS

Question No. 2,420—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the government's intention to require the Canadian incorporation of all unions operating in Canada and, if so, will they be subject to the same rules and regulations as laid down in the Canada Companies Act?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Matters related to this question are involved in the report of the Task Force on Labour Relations and are being studied in the course of considering amendments to the IRDI Act. Until this study is completed, it is not possible to predict government action.

VETERAN DISABILITY PENSIONS

Question No. 2,433—**Mr. Robinson:**

1 How many veterans receive a disability pension of (a) 100% (b) 90-99% (c) 80-89% (d) 70-79% (e) 60-69% (f) 50-59% (g) 40-49% (h) 30-39% (i) 20-29% (j) 10-19% (k) less than 10%, in each of the years 1960-69 respectively?

2. How many veterans are there of (a) the Boer War (b) the First World War (c) the Second World War (d) the Korean war?

3. How many veterans served in more than one war?

4. How many veterans are entitled to and/or are receiving more than one veteran's pension?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. The required information is contained in the following table.

2. Estimated number of living veterans at June 1969: (a) statistics for this group are not available; (b) 113,000; (c) and (d) 833,000. (Korean group cannot be isolated).

3. Statistics relative to veterans who served in more than one war are not available.

4. This information is not readily available.

Department of Veterans Affairs

Table

1. Number of Pensioners by Percentage of Disability

At March 31	Percent of Disability											
	98–100	88–97	78–87	68–77	58–67	48–57	38–47	28–37	18–27	8–17	5–7	Total
1960.....	6,941	1,105	6,251	3,126	4,571	10,021	7,015	12,409	25,916	52,371	22,098	151,824
1961.....	6,794	1,113	6,059	3,113	4,529	9,979	6,959	12,253	25,684	51,719	21,875	150,177
1962.....	6,604	1,092	5,865	3,077	4,537	9,961	6,920	12,282	25,434	50,917	21,799	148,488
1963.....	6,354	1,074	5,704	3,030	4,479	9,841	6,853	12,155	25,306	50,218	21,836	146,850
1964.....	6,257	1,070	5,664	3,064	4,546	10,085	6,965	12,448	25,765	50,602	22,239	148,705
1965.....	6,000	1,046	5,429	3,017	4,454	10,049	6,830	12,306	25,501	49,860	22,103	146,595
1966.....	5,734	1,032	5,222	2,948	4,358	9,957	6,672	12,244	25,003	48,937	21,748	143,855
1967.....	5,553	1,020	5,069	2,952	4,388	10,090	6,388	12,141	24,629	47,785	21,552	141,567
1968.....	5,322	993	4,842	2,915	4,247	10,018	6,350	11,890	24,233	46,881	21,336	139,027
1969.....	5,070	958	4,611	2,851	4,158	9,820	6,388	11,746	23,590	45,683	20,989	135,864

QUOTAS TO CREAM PRODUCERS

Question No. 2,459—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many cream producers were awarded quotas for the 1969-70 dairy year, which entitles them to the dairy subsidy in the Provinces of (a) Alberta (b) Saskatchewan (c) Manitoba (d) Ontario and (e) Quebec?

2. How many producers received a phasing-out payment this year in (a) Alberta (b) Saskatchewan (c) Manitoba (d) Ontario and (e) Quebec?

3. Were any additional quotas allotted to producers in any of these provinces and, if so, what provinces were involved and what was the allotment to each province?

4. How much subsidy was paid in the Provinces of (a) Quebec (b) Ontario (c) Manitoba (d) Saskatchewan and (e) Alberta in the dairy year 1967-68 and 1968-69?

5. What is the Dairy Commission's philosophy behind disallowing transfer of quotas to producers purchasing herds from registered quota holders with quotas under 3,500 pounds?

6. Were any adjustments made to increase quotas to any producers for the current dairy year 1969-70?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The quotas for 1969-70 will not be completed until the end of June.

2. None.

3. No additional quotas will be allotted to producers in any province.

4.

Province	1967-68	1968-69
Alberta	$ 9,623,852.68	$10,146,510.24
Saskatchewan	4,407,285.16	4,481,753.10
Manitoba	4,820,335.29	5,203,951.55
Ontario	37,440,587.78	40,056,084.01
Quebec	45,725,390.28	52,540,738.14

5. There is no such disallowance when the producer purchasing the herd already has a quota. In the case of producers who do not already have a quota and who intend to ship cream the minimum quota which will be reallocated is now 1,750 pounds.

6. No adjustments will be made to increase quotas to any producers for 1969-70 other than through reallocation on the purchase of the herd of another person holding a quota.

ST. EPHREM, QUE., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,461—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works have a programme for the construction of a post office in St. Ephrem, in the constituency of Beauce?

2. If so (a) has the Department of Public Works called or will it call for tenders (b) when will the work begin?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes.

2. Tenders are expected to be called later this summer and work should commence as soon as possible after award of contract.

BEAUCEVILLE-WEST, QUE., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,468—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works have a programme for the construction of a post office in Beauceville-West, in the constituency of Beauce?

2. If so (a) has the Department of Public Works called, or will it call for tenders (b) when will the work begin?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes for a build to lease building.

2. (a) Tenders will be called in the near future; (b) As soon as possible after award of contract.

[*English*]

VETERANS PENSIONS EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,473—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total amount paid for veterans pensions during each of the years 1945 to 1968 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): The required information is contained in the following table.

Table

The total number of disability and dependent pensions in force, and the annual liability as at the end of fiscal years 1945–1968.

Year	Disability	Dependent	Total annual liability
1945	89,369	28,639	50,856,917
1946	108,850	33,821	60,515,629
1947	141,436	34,399	69,308,993
1948	155,699	34,164	72,980,929
1949	158,659	33,965	91,629,690
1950	161,504	34,403	93,965,639
1951	161,651	34,069	94,581,389
1952	160,869	33,701	124,108,713
1953	160,622	33,722	125,502,878
1954	160,377	33,888	126,249,141
1955	160,436	34,012	127,486,097
1956	160,228	33,990	128,713,722
1957	159,155	33,780	128,592,825
1958	158,049	33,576	148,812,435
1959	156,893	33,419	148,457,627
1960	155,612	33,014	147,435,370
1961	153,966	32,699	172,089,044
1962	152,315	32,351	174,939,688
1963	150,624	31,989	172,995,436
1964	148,705	31,649	170,383,276
1965	146,595	31,231	184,991,304
1966	143,855	30,712	181,888,184
1967	141,567	30,531	199,891,602
1968	139,027	30,102	219,936,660

NOTE: (a) The above figures represent pensions in respect of World War I, World War II, Special Force and Regular Force service.

Questions

RESEARCH GRANT TO MR. CHANDLER DAVIES

Question No. 2,481—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. For the past two years, what was the amount of the research grant which the Canadian Government paid to Mr. Chandler Davies?

2. What was the subject of the research?

3. What was its purpose?

4. Where was it carried out?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. 1968-69, $6,350, Senior Research Fellowship; 1969-70, $15,130, Operating Grant.

2. Mathematics in both cases.

3. The purpose of a Senior Research Fellowship is to give an experienced research investigator who has been granted sabbatical leave by his university an opportunity to pursue his research interests and increase his knowledge and awareness of new advances in his special field. The purpose of an Operating Grant is to provide support for scientific research conceived and carried out by competent investigators and is judged primarily on the basis of an assessment of the scientific competence of the applicant and the quality of his work. Dr. Davis' request was for support of research in "Inequalities for Matrices".

4. Senior Research Fellowship: Canada, United States, Hungary, Rumania, Russia and France. Operating Grant: University of Toronto.

PAYMENTS UNDER GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Question No. 2,486—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How much money has been paid under the Guaranteed Income Supplement in each year since its inception?

2. How many people in each province receive benefits under the Guaranteed Income Supplement?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. January to March 1967, $39,680,997; April 1967 to March 1968, $234,414,934; April 1968 to March 1969, $244,490,849.

2. As of April 30, 1969: Newfoundland, 23,052; Prince Edward Island, 8,294; Nova Scotia, 39,903; New Brunswick, 30,490; Quebec, 209,749; Ontario, 241,808; Manitoba, 46,479; Saskatchewan, 42,138; Alberta, 54,257; British Columbia, 80,157; Northwest Territories, 610; Yukon, 237; Total, 777,174.

CUSTOMS AND TARIFFS REVENUE

Question No. 2,492—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the total revenue obtained from customs and tariffs for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):

Customs and Excise

The following shows the amounts of revenue collected by Customs and Excise during the fiscal years 1960-61 to 1968-69:

Fiscal Year	Customs Import Duties	* Sales Taxes	Sales Taxes Transferred To Old Age Security Fund	Other Excise Taxes	Excise Duties	Sundry Collections	** Net Revenue
	($ 000's)	($ 000's)	($ 000's)	($ 000's)	($ 000's)	($ 000's)	($ 000's)
1960-61.....	498,698	990,849	(270,231)	290,658	344,945	1,627	2,126,777
1961-62.....	534,516	1,044,557	(284,879)	262,526	362,799	1,279	3,105,677
1962-63.....	644,992	1,108,210	(302,239)	260,378	381,866	1,460	2,396,906
1963-64.....	581,441	1,277,815	(331,760)	273,415	393,326	1,596	2,527,593
1964-65.....	622,102	1,587,771	(383,151)	269,082	411,402	2,160	2,892,517
1965-66.....	685,519	1,917,215	(522,086)	296,178	445,885	2,228	3,347,025
1966-67.....	777,586	2,073,081	(559,515)	315,580	460,980	2,081	3,629,308
1967-68.....	746,437	2,145,609	(544,516)	337,048	488,554	2,015	3,719,663
Mar. 31/69 (Not final).	750,331	2,052,415	(516,633)	366,784	502,244	1,908	3,673,682

*Totals include amount of sales taxes transferred to Old Age Security Fund.

**Refunds and Drawbacks Deducted.

Questions

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY PUBLIC RELATIONS

Question No. 2,502—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Fisheries and Forestry have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

WORLD BANK LOANS

Question No. 2,516—**Mr. Dumont:**

To the knowledge of the government, has the World Bank recently made loans totalling $78,000,000 to (a) The Republic of China (b) The Republic of Korea (c) Trinidad and Tobago (d) Yugoslavia and, if so, in what amounts, at what interest rates and for what period for each country?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The World Bank has recently* made loans totalling U.S. $108.2 million to:

	Amount $	Term	Interest
a) Republic of China	31.2 Million	15½ years (3½ years grace)	6½ per cent
b) Republic of Korea	45 Million	30 years (7 years grace)	6½ per cent
c) Trinidad and Tobago	2 Million	15 years (2 years grace)	6½ per cent
d) Yugoslavia	30 Million	25 years (5 years grace)	6½ per cent

*The loan to the Republic of Korea was announced on May 16, 1969; the loans to the Republic of China, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yugoslavia were announced on May 28, 1969.

MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION AT FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Question No. 2,520—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to invite representatives of any municipal governments to the next Federal-Provincial conference?

2 If so, does this indicate a new policy of the federal government?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. No. It would be for provincial governments to decide whether to include such representatives in their delegations.

2. Not applicable.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

BILINGUALISM ADVISERS

Question No. 1,712—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Which of the following have advisers on bilingualism on their staffs: the Bank of Canada, the Industrial Development Bank, the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, the National Arts Centre Corporation and the Northern Ontario Pipeline Crown Corporation?

[Mr. Côté (Longueuil).]

2. Which of the above have advisers on bilingualism who (a) have French as their mother tongue (b) have English as their mother tongue (c) have another language as their mother tongue (d) are bilingual?

3. What are the ages and educational levels of the advisers on bilingualism of each of these?

4. What is the administrative level of the position of adviser on bilingualism in each of these bodies, and in each case, at what level have such appointments been made?

Return tabled.

EXPROPRIATIONS BY NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Question No. 1,945—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. Of the expropriations by the NCC settled in the year 1968, what were (a) the dates of these expropriations (b) the amount of compensation in each case (c) the amount of interest paid because the Commission delayed settlement (d) the number and cost of real estate appraisals (e) the values estimated by each appraiser, including alternative estimates based on different approaches to value?

2. Were any of the former owners represented by a member of the National Capital Commission or any of its advisory bodies?

3. Were any of the properties purchased or expropriated in 1968 owned or partly owned by any members of the National Capital Commission or any of its advisory boards?

Return tabled.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSION BETWEEN NATO AND WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES—MEETING WITH MAINLAND CHINA REPRESENTATIVE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see the Secretary of State for External Affairs back in the House of Commons. May I ask him whether Canada as a member of NATO is pressing NATO countries to enter into discussions with the Warsaw pact countries in an attempt to bring about meetings which will be fruitful and result possibly in a détente?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I said in my report on my Scandinavian tour, we have been supporting in particular the Finnish initiative which embodies the conditions and qualifications we think necessary for a successful conference. We believe that the Budapest Declaration, or the language of that declaration, is not of a nature best calculated to make friends and influence people. The Finnish initiative seems to have that character and has, therefore, more hope of success.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I asked, Mr. Speaker, whether Canada is pressing her NATO allies or associates to proceed along those lines?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is our policy. It is the position we are pursuing within NATO.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has Canada actually made representations to this effect to the NATO council or to any appropriate NATO organization? Has it done so beyond speaking to individual Scandinavian countries, for example? Has Canada made specific recommendations to the appropriate NATO organization which would take the step that has been alluded to? Also, what does the minister consider is the appropriate first step for anyone to take having regard to his indication that we ought to proceed step by step?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, Canada has been foremost among NATO countries over a long period of months in advocating a détente between east and west. This has perhaps been our most important contribution to the NATO discussions in recent months. Our view about the course of the discussions, as I indicated, is that we should proceed to discuss those questions upon which greatest progress is likely to be made immediately. We should begin with disarmament.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, whether in his discussions with the Finnish government he indicated that Canada would be prepared to attend such a conference? Also, did he find that other countries had indicated to the Finnish government that they would be willing to attend such a conference?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we not only indicated our willingness to attend but also our wish to be invited. This is the first hurdle in these discussions which must be surmounted. The plans which have been put forward do not indicate with sufficient certainty as yet that Canada and the United States will be invited. But it is our wish to be invited and we are certainly willing to go if we are invited.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister speaks of certain steps which ought to be taken preliminary to such a conference. Has the minister outlined these proposed steps in any document and has this document been circulated among our NATO allies? If so, what has been the response?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for us in the NATO council to distribute documents of this kind. We have been discussing in the NATO council for some months the prospects for détente. Indeed, this discussion, as the hon. gentlemen will recall, was quite well advanced before the Czechoslovakian invasion. We now hope to get the discussions under way again, and that is why we have been giving such strong support to the initiative of the Finnish government which is an entirely neutral government. That initiative seems to offer the best hope. It would enable the two sides to come together and discuss the issues upon which Europe is divided. As I understand it, the discussions that are going on are very informal because in many cases certain countries have not replied yet to the proposals put forward by the Finnish government. Perhaps the conference might consider a series of questions, beginning with those upon which greatest progress is likely to be made and ending with those that are most difficult.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the statement the minister made earlier today. Since it is highly unlikely that the minister visited the Scandinavian countries purely on a good will mission while the house was in session, may I ask whether he knew, prior to leaving Ottawa, that a high ranking diplomatic official of the People's Republic of China was to be in Stockholm in the latter part of June? Was it the minister's intention to meet that diplomatic representative? If it was, may I ask what caused the mix-up?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I have had the greatest difficulty in persuading the press that I did not go to Scandinavia in order to meet the Chinese in Stockholm. I have made these denials time after time and always they have been received with apparent disbelief. In fact, I did not go for the purpose the hon. gentleman alluded to. I did not know when the Chinese ambassador was to arrive in Stockholm.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is our cable code communication from Stockholm so insecure that our Canadian ambassador is afraid to send vital messages to the minister in Ottawa, thus making it necessary for the minister to go to Stockholm and talk face to face with the ambassador?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the question as asked is in order.

RECOGNITION OF MAINLAND CHINA IN ONE-CHINA POLICY

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government either made an offer or agreed to the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition of the Chinese government located in Taipei in exchange for diplomatic exchanges with Peking? Perhaps I could rephrase the question. I was trying to be very precise. In short terms, has the government agreed or offered to withdraw recognition of the People's Republic of China located in Taipei in exchange for diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China located in Peking?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As I have stated on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, we have had a one-China policy, intend to have a one-China policy and we will recognize only one government. If we can reach agreement with Peking, it will be the People's Republic of China government.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. So there is no misunderstanding, if agreement is reached to have diplomatic recognition with Peking, I take it we will then be withdrawing our present recognition of Taipei?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE—TRANSFER OF MATERIALS ACROSS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Canada is a signatory to the Geneva protocol of 1925 against the use of chemical and biological warfare, will the Prime Minister inform the house whether Canada's part in the diabolical research and development of chemical and biological weaponry is being reviewed in the present review of our defence policy with, I hope, a view to terminating it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already asked that this type of question be made part of our review: the degree to which we are bound by the Geneva protocols and the arrangements thereunder. I have no report as yet to enable me to answer that question.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Prime Minister whether there is any possibility of the house being informed of the results of that review within a reasonable time, either before we rise or very shortly after we come back in the fall?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is linked to the over-all review of policy which will be presented to the House of Commons. I have no timetable to propose to the house at this point on that question.

Mr. Lewis: I wish to direct a further supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Wednesday last I asked the then acting minister some questions about the possibility of the transportation of germs and other elements of chemical and biological warfare over Canadian air space. May I ask the minister to inform the house whether any shipments of such materials take place from the United States into or over Canada by planes, trucks or trains?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity of asking my officials to confirm the accuracy of the report that was made by the acting minister to see whether there were any aspects of it which required further elucidation. I am informed there is no record of any transport of any of these kinds of materials to Greenland or Alaska. Permission would be required whether they were transported across Canada in military or civilian vehicles.

INTIMIDATION OF MEMBERS OF GREEK COMMUNITY OPPOSING MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Last Tuesday the acting minister was asked whether he would investigate the reports of alleged harassment of members of the Greek community by supporters of the military régime in Greece. Is the minister able to report to the house now with respect to that inquiry?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, just before I came into the house I inquired whether the investigation was complete. I was informed it is not yet complete.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—NET INCOME OF INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Last Thursday, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Côté) quoted some figures according to which the income of Quebec farmers had increased by $16 million in 1968, compared with 1967. I would like to ask the minister whether he feels that the lower price obtained by the farmer for his manufactured milk and the export tax, will contribute to increase the income in 1969, compared with 1968?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the hon. member's question is argumentative and I think it could easily be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

GRAIN

ALLEGED INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF BOX CARS—EXTENSION OF DELIVERY TIME

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, possibly I could direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. In my mail today I received four or five letters from various parts of Saskatchewan in which farmers complain of injustice or inequity in connection with the distribution of box cars. This condition has become worse and more intensified in the last couple of weeks. Will the minister look into this matter and possibly on Wednesday make a statement to the house because this problem is causing serious difficulty, particularly in those areas where there are minimum quotas and cars are not available for the purpose of transportation?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman would send us the particulars so that we may know which shipping points he is referring to, we could get a report through the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce from the Wheat Board respecting the situation. If there is a disparity or a disproportionate number of cars being allocated to those points, we could try to persuade the railways to correct the situation. I caution the right hon. member that it is not wise to load more cars than can be unloaded.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I need no caution in that direction, Mr. Speaker. When there are no cars, the caution is worthless. Two areas come to mind at once, namely, Kinistino and Glenavon, on which the minister can start.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact the last statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce indicated that there were still some delivery points on a unit basis and about 38 per cent still on three bushels or less, may I ask the minister if the government is considering the possibility of easing the concern on the part of the farmers by assuring them that the delivery season will be kept open until at least a five bushel delivery has been made effective at every delivery point on the prairies?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce

commented on this the other day. It has to be borne in mind, however, that keeping the delivery points open on the past crop year does not add greatly to the marketing prospects for the ensuing year. This has to be taken into account, the amount of space available and the kind of grain our customers wish us to have in export position.

NATIONAL REVENUE

PORT DOVER, ONT.—FAILURE OF U.S. PLEASURE CRAFT TO REPORT TO CUSTOMS OFFICER

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. I apologize that time did not give me the opportunity of giving the minister notice beforehand. In view of the fact that on Saturday last at Port Dover, Ontario, out of seven United States pleasure boats from Erie, Pennsylvania, bringing United States dollars and good will to Canada two were fined $10 and all were ordered to get out of Canada because they had not reported to the customs officer who was not available, will the minister devise some means of clearing our United States visitors through customs on weekends through the three summer months, which is the only time that most of the United States boats can visit Canada?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation which he has to assume will be noted by the minister. If the hon. member wants to pursue the matter further this will be a question that will have to be set down at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Time of adjournment, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EXTENSION OF TRADE THROUGH MAINLAND CHINA RECOGNITION

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs supplementary to questions directed to him a few minutes ago with regard to recognition of the People's Republic of China. Aside from the world peace issue involved, having in mind the importance to the prairie provinces of our grain trade with the Orient and also the importance of that trade to the ports of British Columbia, would the minister undertake to press on with his efforts to reach an acceptable basis for recognition of the People's Republic of China?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government has taken the initiative and I hope both sides will reach an amicable agreement.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the government be taking advantage of the presence in Peking of Premier Smallwood to facilitate the negotiations?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

OCCASION OF LAST MEETING BETWEEN MAINLAND CHINESE AND CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in view of his apparent chasing of a will-o'-the-wisp while he was on his trip to the Scandinavian countries, would the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house when was the last occasion that there was a meeting between the elusive Chinese communists and representatives of the government of Canada in regard to the solicitation of the part of the government of Canada, on bended knee, for recognition?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some serious doubt as to the terminology of the question asked by the right hon. member. I doubt that the question can be asked in those terms.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would help the minister. I now ask him, when was the last occasion that this convivial group got together, the communist Chinese and the Canadians?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am very puzzled by the attitude of the right hon. gentleman. The only elusive will-o'-the-wisp has been these reports that I was going to Stockholm to meet the Chinese, which I tried to deny from the beginning. But in reply to the right hon. gentleman, whose motivations I do not quite understand, whether he wants to interrupt these discussions—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I just want to get an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We cannot debate the question at the moment.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

DEVCO—USE OF FUND IN RETIREMENT PLAN

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Will he tell the house under what arrangements Devco is using the Unemployment Insurance Commission fund in its early retirement plan?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): As has been mentioned in the house before, Mr. Speaker, the assistance to people retired at age 60 is a two-stage step. The first step is supplementary unemployment benefits administered by the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The second step is direct assistance or pensions paid for by Devco when unemployment insurance benefits run out.

Mr. MacInnis: It is apparent the minister completely misunderstands the representations I am making. Under what special arrangements has Devco brought about the use of the U.I.C. fund in its early retirement plan?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps of historical interest to the hon. member to know that this arrangement was made some time ago, as the former minister of manpower has pointed out on several occasions in the house. It is not the first time such arrangements have been made, and it probably will not be the last. The important thing is that it is of great benefit to the men concerned.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to ask the minister to take into account that this is the first time that any such plan has been in operation. It has nothing to do with former arrangements. I ask the minister once more: Under what special arrangements can Devco use the U.I.C. fund, a fund which has been denied to individual Canadians?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked the question three times. He may not be satisfied with the reply given to him by the minister, but I suggest to him that the rules allow him to ask the question just once. He asked it the third time as a point of order, and I suggest it was not a legitimate point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: As a supplementary question I would ask the minister why individual Canadians are being denied that right that is being used by Devco, a Crown company?

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question is argumentative.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—RED CROSS ROLE IN PROVIDING RELIEF

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question that was directed to the acting minister a few days ago and which he was unable to answer. Now that the Biafran authorities are indicating that they are prepared to allow daylight flights, what representations has the government of Canada made to encourage Nigeria to extend safe passage for daylight flights by the Red Cross?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Recently on a number of occasions we have had discussions with the Nigerian authorities urging them to agree to continue their offer for daylight flights. I am very happy that there seems to be some progress and I hope the Leader of the Opposition is correct in saying agreement has been reached on these matters. We have also been discussing with the Nigerian government the safety of flyers who may be involved. We share with the Leader of the Opposition the desire to make our aid available on the most effective basis.

Mr. Stanfield: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the report that the Red Cross has withdrawn from operations in Nigeria because of planes being shot down, is the government of Canada prepared to make arrangements to bring assistance to the starving people in Nigeria through any other agencies? Is this matter being given active consideration?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Leader of the Opposition's statement is not correct. The International Red Cross, I understand, will be continuing to operate in both Biafra and other parts of Nigeria. Discussions are now going on with respect to daylight flights and other methods of delivery over land and over water. We are doing everything possible to assist with these discussions.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether in his discussions with the federal government of Nigeria he made any protest about the shooting down of a clearly marked Red Cross relief plane on June 11, I believe, with consequent loss of life of the crew, in complete disregard of international conventions?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Nigerian government had given notice quite a long time ago that night flights were contrary to the wishes of the Nigerian authorities and that anyone who flew contrary to the wishes of the Nigerian government would do so at his own peril. The Nigerian authorities suggested at that time, and reiterated it on a number of occasions, that flights should be made in daylight.

AGRICULTURE

ASSISTANCE TO ONTARIO AND QUEBEC FARMERS IN REPAYMENT OF LOANS

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since it now appears certain that the long season of excessive rainfall in Ontario will result in very serious crop losses, will the minister say whether farmers in Ontario will be accorded the same sympathetic consideration regarding repayment of government loans, both principal and interest, as has been indicated for western farmers?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has pointed out, the lack of income or lack of cash flow will not be apparent until later this season when the harvest is in and is being marketed. Certainly if there is a problem with respect to this matter at that time it can be considered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

If the same cause exists in Quebec, will the farmers of that province get the same treatment as those in the West and in Ontario?

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, this has been applied universally across the country so far as the Farm Credit Corporation is concerned.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the policies the minister has brought into being apparently are not working in western Canada, could he come up with some new ones?

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—CONTINUATION OF MARITIME COMMAND IN ANTI-SUBMARINE ROLE—CLOSING OF BASES

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Does the sentence in the statement he made on motions today to the effect that Maritime Command will continue in an anti-submarine warfare role mean that it will continue in that role in the full sense in which it is now engaged in this operation?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think I qualified that statement by saying that so far we are negotiating with SACLANT as well as with SACEUR the question of our NATO participation and the A.S.W. role which, as my hon. friend knows, is within the purview of that particular responsibility within NATO.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether part of these discussions with SACLANT and SACEUR includes a possible specialized role or specialized activities within the broader A.S.W. role in NATO itself.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Yes, they do, as a possibility. They, of course, study options and maybe we can come out of these discussions with practically the same kind of operation we are doing now. This I cannot prejudge until we have terminated the discussions.

[*Later:*]

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to the questions already asked of the Minister of National Defence. Although the minister stated that decisions with regard to closure of bases generally had not been taken, does it flow from the statement he made with regard to Maritime Command that it is unlikely that Maritime Command bases will be closed?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): I think I would have to ask the hon. member for his definition of bases within Maritime Command. I do not think any maritime bases are being considered for closing at least for the time being, but I cannot be that sure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the discussion between the minister and the hon. member could be continued outside the house.

Mr. Forrestall: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It pertains to Shearwater.

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for

the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that the people have been waiting several years for information, can the minister relieve their anxiety and quell some of the rumours by giving the house a date, before the house recesses in July or August or before we come back in October, when there will be a definitive statement on base closure?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): I believe I am right in saying that probably before August 1 we will be in a position to announce what bases are to be closed.

Mr. Barney Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of National Defence. I wonder whether he could possibly explain a little more clearly to the opposition our phased policy as opposed to their "two-phased" policy?

An hon. Member: Funny guy over there.

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

CONSIDERATION OF INTEREST RATES BY COMMITTEE DURING SUMMER RECESS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the hon. member for Gatineau in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. Since we have indicated to him our willingness to sit through the summer to hold hearings in respect of the outrageous rise in interest rates, can he indicate whether he has received information from the other parties as to their willingness to do the same?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, my thanks to the hon. member for Waterloo for giving me notice of his question. The hon. member wants to know if the members of other parties have told me that they would be prepared to sit this summer.

I think this is a hypothetical question since the matter has not yet been referred to the committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and I am planning this week, namely on Wednesday, to convene the members of the sub-committee on Program and Procedure in order to discuss the general policy of that committee.

[*English*]

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member whether I heard him correctly when he said next Wednesday rather than this Wednesday and whether it is his intention to have the committee meet while parliament is still in session to consider this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Speaker, if I gave the impession that it was next Wednesday, I want to say that it is this Wednesday. Like all hon. members, I hope that on the 27—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

LABOUR RELATIONS

DISPUTE IN QUEBEC-LABRADOR IRON ORE INDUSTRY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour regarding the six-weeks old strike in the iron ore industry in Quebec and Labrador. I know the minister has endeavoured to get some co-operation from the governments of Newfoundland and Quebec and I believe he has received the cold shoulder from the latter province. In view of the fact that dock and railway workers are involved who come under federal jurisdiction, is the minister doing anything at all to try to effect a settlement?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member so properly pointed out, the lengthy strike in the northern part of Quebec, Labrador and Newfoundland is very complicated because of the fact that there are 16 unions involved which come under federal jurisdiction and provincial jurisdiction. We did endeavour to approach the matter on a joint basis but the province of Newfoundland has expressed a desire that its conciliation board receive a little more time in an effort to bring their particular problems to a successful end.

In so far as federal jurisdiction is concerned, I would remind the house that two conciliation boards are still meeting and that employees under federal jurisdiction are not on strike.

AGRICULTURE

MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER WITH WESTERN FARMERS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he can now acquaint the

house with the approximate time and location of his intended tour of the prairie provinces this summer and also whether or not he will be meeting with individual farmers and farm organizations at that time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, of course I will be meeting with individual farmers. I understand there are quite a few western farmers who would like to talk with me. I am not in a position yet to give the exact itinerary, however.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has not accepted any invitations to go east tomorrow and in view of the fact that the people of the west are almost frantic to have him come, may I ask whether he could make a trip west tomorrow?

IMMIGRATION

AMENDMENT PERMITTING HEARING IN TORONTO OF DEPORTATION APPEALS

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration when he will introduce amendments to the Immigration Appeal Board Act with a view to making provision for appeals from deportation to be heard in Toronto, where most requests originate?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give my hon. friend a definite date, but this matter is under consideration at the present time in the hope that the board will be able in the future to operate a panel in that area.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CHANGE IN REGULATIONS—RECEIPT OF BENEFITS UPON ADMISSION OF VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I should like to know whether there has been a recent change in the regulations controlling the Unemployment Insurance Commission fund, and also whether it is not a contravention of those regulations to receive benefits when voluntary severance is admitted by applicants?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the second question he asked is clearly argumentative.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

Mr. McIntosh: Then, Mr. Speaker, would the minister answer the first question?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): I am afraid I have lost track of what the original question was.

[*Later:*]

Mr. McIntosh: The minister has apparently forgotten the first part of my question. Perhaps I could repeat it or rephrase it. Will he advise the house whether there have been recent changes in the regulations controlling the Unemployment Insurance Commission fund which would allow a person who has apparently severed himself from his position to make an application and receive benefits under the act?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): That is not the situation under normal circumstances. If the hon. member has a more specific incident in mind, perhaps I will be able to deal with it tomorrow.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CLEMENCY PLEA FOR POLITICAL PRISONER ALEXANDOROS PANAGOULIS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On June 12 I put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs relating to one Alexandoros Panagoulis who was sentenced to death for political activities in Greece. The acting minister said he would have the matter looked into. Will the minister, now that he is back, look into the matter himself and perhaps give me an answer some time?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would be happy to do so, Mr. Speaker.

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE—TRANSFER OF MATERIALS ACROSS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I intended earlier to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he could inform the house how the materials used at Shirley's Bay, and particularly the material used at Suffield, Alberta, in connection with chemical and biological warfare research gets to either or both of these laboratory grounds?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice. As I said in

reply to the earlier question, the inquiries we made indicate there has been no request to transport any materials to Alaska and Greenland. Before making a further inquiry I would want to know if in fact U.S. materials are used in Canada.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ORDER OF PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called perhaps I might ask the President of the Privy Council when it is intended to proceed with government order 91 in respect of the setting up of a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Price Stability, Incomes and Employment, especially in view of the limited timetable of the House, and whether it is the intention that this committee will sit during the recess?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we would hope to deal with government order No. 4 in respect of the official languages bill, the government order dealing with the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Assistance bill and then the completion of order No. 84 with regard to Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities. We would also expect to deal before rising with the motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. On that basis and subject to consultation, I am not certain we will be able to get to the order in question before the house recesses.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED LACK OF ACTION TO COMBAT POLLUTION

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka) moved:

That in order particularly to discuss the department's neglect to assert federal leadership and take effective action to attack the worsening contamination of the Canadian environment by pollution, consideration be given to Vote 1 of the 1969-70 estimates of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources contained in the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Public Works presented to the house on May 30th, 1969 and to other estimates relating to this department.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

He said: Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity afforded by the rules to bring before the house the estimates of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the report of the standing committee in order to underline the urgency of federal government action to control pollution in our Canadian environment and to deplore in the strongest terms the basic failure of the government to take leadership or any effective action. It should not be necessary to remind ourselves and the government of the priority this problem should demand. Obviously the government has overlooked it and has not given priority to this very important, very serious and most urgent matter.

We are trying to make Canada a better place, where we can feel at home anywhere. This is the intent of the the official languages bill which we have been considering. What kind of a home will it be if our water, soil and air are polluted, and of what use will it be to make a home which is unsatisfactory to all our citizens? We are trying to make working conditions better so that our people will have more time for leisure activities. But where will they go for holidays in a polluted country, and what tourists will come here if we allow this to happen?

We are trying to legislate regional equality of opportunity. This should not mean equal opportunity to suffer from pollution, but that is what the result will be if pollution control does not accompany regional development. In other words, we must move hand in hand in our efforts to improve the economy and the country from a pollution standpoint. Surely we can say very clearly that pollution in relation to our environment is the greatest threat, except for war, to our continued existence.

The population explosion, urbanization, the increased use of technology to create new products and the great variety of new wastes being released from industrial plants make it increasingly difficult to keep pollution under control. Pollution comes from such diverse sources as household detergents, human wastes, industrial by-products, which cannot be otherwise used or consumed, from mines, pulp mills and food processing plants, from agricultural wastes and automobile exhausts, as well as from many other sources.

We cannot just run from one emergency to another dealing with the pollution of our environment. There has to be some management on a national basis of our environment and resources, and this has to be done on a planned and co-ordinated basis across the

whole country. If one province has tight pollution control methods, if it has good legislation and enforces it, it should not be penalized by the movement of industry to another province or area where the regulations are not so stringent. This is one of the basic reasons national controls and national minimum standards ought to be enforced.

For a moment I should like to mention some of our urgent problems today and give some examples of what we see in the newspapers that causes the people concern. I have quite a number of examples but I shall mention only a few in passing. On April 24 the *Globe and Mail* carried an article entitled "Oil And Chemical Slick Threatens West Lake Erie Ducks, Beaches." This is an additional source of pollution to the already existing threat from the serious dumping from industrial plants.

On May 28 an article appeared in the *Globe and Mail* entitled "May Charge Inco For Spill Of Acid." This took place in the Sudbury area and created a great deal of concern to the people there. The matter is being investigated by the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

This month another article appeared in the *Globe and Mail* under the heading "Lake Pollution To Be Probed At Kingston". It had to do with the problem of oil pollution from ships in eastern Ontario and the St. Lawrence River and suggested that the problem would be tackled by a conservation group.

Let me refer to another field of pollution, namely, air pollution by jets. It appears quite clear that jet aircraft are now beginning to loom large as a potential contributor to the air pollution of our big cities. These huge jet engines are major contributors to the tremendous build-up of poisonous hydrocarbons in the atmosphere over the Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver airports in particular. Jet take-offs and landings at these airports are increasing very rapidly. Last year they totalled more than 65,000 at Toronto, 58,000 at Montreal and 23,500 at Vancouver.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Coming a little closer to where we are, the Rideau River beaches are threatened by pollution again this year. Last year sewage backed up in the Nepean system and overflowed into the Rideau, sending up the bacteria count high enough to force the closing of the beaches. Temporary emergency pumping helped ease the situation. More pumps were supposed to come from the Ontario Water Resources Commission but they have not arrived yet. Now sewage is again starting to spill into the river, and tests conducted early this year indicated that effluent is getting into the river from Nepean Creek.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Another dangerous situation exists at Lake Memphremagog. Pollution of that lake in the eastern townships of Quebec is far more serious than it was first thought to be. New reports of pollution measurements indicate that the infection level of the lake is growing more rapidly than was feared. Bacterial contamination at the end of last summer was found to be 58 times higher than when first measured in the spring. In two bays near Georgeville 46 per cent of the samples were in the poorest category, over 1,000 bacteria per 100 millilitres of water; yet Georgeville is not the worst area of Lake Memphremagog.

Coming right down to today, there is a report of a mysterious fish kill in British Columbia. One of the most important sports in British Columbia is fishing in rivers, and this sport is threatened. The Nicomekl River in the lower mainland, greater Vancouver area is a favourite river for thousands of British Columbians. Today we learn that hundreds of trout, chub and cohoe salmon fry are being killed by some pollution agent that has found its way into this river. What is the government doing about this situation? Are they waiting for the situation to go away? Are they waiting for the provincial authorities to do something, or are they going to take some action on a joint basis?

These are just a few of the problems of the pollution of our environment which have not been dealt with. The government is dragging its feet with the apparent excuse of a division of jurisdiction with the provinces, but that excuse is wearing very thin because the way has been shown for a joint federal-provincial effort and for sole federal action many times. In 1966 the resource ministers conference on pollution in Montreal gave a very clear direction. This was a federal-provincial effort which should have been followed up, but in fact that very excellent pollution conference has not been followed by action from the federal government.

Second, dozens of publications and articles have been written by knowledgeable writers. The most recent that I have seen is an excellent series in the May/June issue of the A.I.C. Review published by the Agricultural Institute of Canada. This was a comprehensive look at the problems of pollution and some of the solutions.

Third, solutions have been reached in the United States and are contained in the clean water act, and in Germany some solutions have been found by associations for waste water purification. These are countries with divided jurisdiction; yet they have managed to meet the problem.

Fourth, a complete policy paper by the Progressive Conservative party of Canada was issued last year. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) acknowledged the study and commented on it, just in case you may think it went unnoticed.

Finally, the standing committee of this house issued its report on May 30, 1969, which stated fairly clearly what had to be done.

The federal role is not really in any doubt. The most essential need is for the federal government to demonstrate that it will take the lead in an all-out fight against pollution right across the country. This it has not done. Other areas have been spelled out so often that I will not enlarge upon them now. They are not just areas of opportunity; they are areas that no other level of government can undertake.

We must have a national pollution abatement policy with related federal, provincial and municipal legislation. We must have provision of research facilities, collection of water, air and soil data, establishment of national minimum standards and design facilities for the removal of pollutants. We need a co-ordination of effort among the many federal departments, and I will deal with that in just a moment. We need the establishment of a national pollution abatement commission. We need the provision of financial incentives to assist in areas where ordinary commercial effort would not be sufficient, particularly in assisting provincial efforts and efforts by such bodies as water control commissions and water basin conservation areas. The groundwork has all been done many times. It has been spelled out over and over again.

Where is the concentrated, vigorous attack we need? I think it has all gone down the drain with the rest of the Canadian dream of federal leadership which was so hopefully looked for a year ago. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who sold himself to Canadians a year ago as a centralist, as a person who would take vigorous action in fields of joint federal-provincial jurisdiction, has proved, in this particular field and in many others, to be exactly the opposite of what the people believed. He has walked away from co-operative programs such as this one, especially when money is involved. In his approach to this problem he has been very casual.

Question after question has been asked in the house by members of all opposition parties, but there have been no answers. We have heard only one thing, that a water act will be introduced later this year. This water act has been under consideration for four or five years now. It was promised by the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) when he was minister of resources. It was promised by two previous ministers of energy, mines and resources. The water act is coming, everything will be settled, we hear over and over again. In the first place, we have not seen it so we have no idea what will be contained in it. It still has not come, and if the plans for adjournment materialize there are only a few days left. I wonder whether the minister is going to tell us today that the water act will be introduced this week. After I had put my motion on the order paper I really expected that he would bring it in this morning to beat me to the gun, but not even that did any good. Therefore we have to assume that it just is not ready or that the government is not ready to proceed with it.

Mr. Baldwin: If the minister resigns tomorrow we will have it a day later.

Mr. Aiken: We have not seen the water act, but it will not provide a solution unless it is in much broader terms than its title indicates. We cannot meet the problem by just dealing with water resources. There are many other aspects of pollution which must be dealt with in some co-ordinated way. I do not know how it is going to be done. We made a suggestion as a party that there should be a pollution abatement commission. I think that was a good idea. But if the government finds something better we will go along with it. However, let us have something, and let us get away from all this division.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Aiken: It has been very common knowledge that the main problem with pollution in the federal area is the division of jurisdictions, the divisions between the federal and provincial governments and between numerous agencies, including the International Joint Commission which involves another country. So we have been hoping to see some concentration of effort.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

• (4:20 p.m.)

When the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources was set up I thought: this is the department which will deal with it; this is the department which will co-ordinate the whole effort. But instead of concentrating these powers the Prime Minister has allowed them to become further fragmented. Responsibility for resources has been given to a Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang). Without reflecting in any way on the abilities of the minister concerned, I must say this does not indicate that a high priority has been given to the control of pollution, especially as it affects our water resources. If this were the only responsibility assigned to the Minister without Portfolio the conclusion reached might be different. But it is not.

Then there is the menace of air pollution, to be dealt with by the Department of National Health and Welfare. The minister in this case seems to be interested in internal smoke rather than external smoke. We have not seen much evidence of an attack on air pollution through the Department of National Health and Welfare.

The Department of Agriculture has come to the fore recently in connection with soil pollution and particularly in connection with pesticides, which are presently a serious hazard. Its efforts have been receiving a good deal of publicity across the country. Who is next? The Department of External Affairs is responsible for taking measures against pollution when it occurs in international waters. This responsibility is by no means regarded as having first priority. In fact, as has been pointed out in the discussion already today, the minister has been away engaged in other tasks.

The Department of Fisheries is also concerned with the matter. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) has suddenly taken a leading role in this area. In the last few weeks he has been making speech after speech on this subject and is apparently seeking to fill the void in which none of the other departments has been active. Only today he made an announcement concerning the establishment of a fresh water agency in Manitoba, part of whose duties will be to inquire into pollution and deal with it in waters all across Canada. To me, this move looks like a power play. I do not believe that the job of pollution control is one that any minister really wants. I do not think it would be a happy job for any minister to undertake. I get the feeling that the Minister of Fisheries is trying to take control of the efforts against water pollution. If he is, and if he intends to go ahead vigorously, good luck to him. I hope somebody does.

The situation has been further fragmented within the last few weeks by the active entry of the Departments of Fisheries and Agriculture into this arena. The result is that we do not know where to turn. We do not know to whom to direct questions on this subject. One can direct them to half a dozen different ministers and they are all ready to answer, or at least to stand up and try to give an answer, but we do not get very much by way of solid information.

Pollution affects the interests of many departments; it is rarely the concern of one department alone. Take the simple case of a farmer using d.d.t. under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture which has the duty of licensing pesticides. He may seriously pollute waters under the control of the resources department, creating a hazard which the Department of National Health and Welfare is called on to deal with, killing fish in which the Department of Fisheries is interested and, finally, affecting boundary waters under the control of the Department of External Affairs.

It is no use saying we must allow each department to operate on its own. In any case, they are not doing so. We do not know who is in charge. If the Prime Minister were more honest he might say: Well, I am leaving it to the provinces. I hope he does not take that course, because there is a definite, serious and urgent federal responsibility involved. The Prime Minister's approach has been extremely casual and he has allowed jurisdiction to become fragmented. The progress made during the last year has been nil. There has been no follow-up to the promising start made by the resource ministers' convention. It is true the inland water centre at Burlington is getting under way, and for this we are thankful, but I would remind hon. members that this project was instituted by a former prime minister. The reports of the International Joint Commission received concerned acknowledgement from the government, but no action was taken. The much heralded water legislation has not yet appeared, though a year has now gone by and three previous ministers have trumpeted its arrival.

The report of the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources has been received and filed—and I mean "filed"; I

have seen no evidence of action. It was a good report, particularly with regard to the desirability of setting up centres such as that in Burlington in other places across Canada. But nothing additional has been promised or promoted. We wait for a glimmer of hope for better surroundings while the gloom deepens across the country.

I conclude by pointing out that pollution is a national danger, a current one and an urgent one. Right now in the coastal waters of the Pacific Ocean near Vancouver, as well as in Placentia Bay in the Atlantic, pollution is actually occurring. Pollution of areas of the Great Lakes is already a fact. The situation could be contained if action were taken promptly. Provincial governments are acting individually here and there to meet the challenge. In some provinces pollution control commissions of one sort or another have been established.

I intend to leave it to others in this debate to draw attention to some of the specific and detailed areas to which immediate attention should be given. I know there are many. I hope the debate today may lead to concentrated and concerned action to deal with water, soil and air pollution. I hope, too, it will help the government to realize this is essentially a single problem, one to which a response must be developed on a national scale.

There is one way in which man may perhaps escape from the consequences of his polluting habits. In this morning's *Globe and Mail* there is an article about a marine scientist who is developing an underwater habitat in which people can live for extended periods. It is being tried out in Georgian Bay in the neighbourhood of Bruce Peninsula. Man who came from the sea, can, it seems, now return to the sea, provided, of course, that he can find a clean place in the ocean.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) in relation to the pollution problem facing the Canadian nation. I must say I endorse practically all of the comments he made in regard to the need for taking immediate action.

Frankly, I must admit that I too am rather confused by the lack of apparent interest on the part of the various federal departments in solving the pollution problem in Canada today. Along with other members of the house I had hoped that we would see the Canada water act come down at a very early date; in fact, it was promised for the beginning of the year. Then we hoped to see it on the Order Paper before the end of this session. However, we are still waiting and hoping that it will give us a lead as to what the government is going to do in this regard.

I should like to make some rather general comments first of all and deal very briefly, if I may, with the committee's report which was presented to the house at the end of May. I think the committee's recommendations are good. They are very general and certainly do not cover the entire problem, but I feel that the members of the committee are to be congratulated on putting into print and laying before the government the report that they presented. I certainly endorse it.

The committee pointed out—I might say that the report was unanimous—that everyone is concerned about the increasing magnitude of air, water and soil pollution and the jurisdictional conflict which hampers the finding and implementing of proper solutions. I do not think any member of this house with any knowledge of the pollution problem would fail to admit readily that the greatest drawback to finding a solution to pollution is that we are in a jurisdictional muddle in regard to what the provinces, the municipalities and the federal government each can or cannot do.

In 1969, a time when perhaps the very existence of mankind depends upon finding solutions to pollution, the problem would be funny were it not so serious. It is tragic that federal and provincial politicians have not the desire—and I think part of the trouble stems from their lack of desire—to sit down and lay out some program that could and should solve many of the major pollution problems facing Canada today.

In this regard the committee recommended:

> —that the government draft a code of standards for the cleaning up of and the future protection of all Canadian waters; that provincial approval of such a code be sought; and that the federal government provide an enforcement procedure—if necessary by means of an amendment to the Criminal Code.

This is something that we should have had years and years ago. Instead we find that in 1969 major pollution problems are confronting us everywhere we turn. We should not have had to wait till now for a committee to suggest to the government the procedures that should be taken.

The committee further recommended:

—that a centre or centres similar to the Canada Centre for Inland Waters be set up to centralize all existing and future federal research in air and soil pollution and to extend and speed up such research so that codes of standards may be drafted to protect the air and soil from pollution.

Again I have no hesitation in saying that I endorse the general objectives of the committee. Having made this report the committee and its members are going to go on—at least I hope we are—and see that some legislative action is taken. I commend to the minister that he take this report seriously and that legislation be brought in to implement the ideas the committee has placed before the government. I have no hesitation in stating that time is short, that we must move and move quickly if we are to prevent some of the major disasters that are now becoming apparent in the field of pollution control.

I should like to point out too that pollution has become international in scope. It is not merely a provincial problem or a municipal problem or a federal problem; it has become an international problem. Our scientists have warned all the nations of the world that we are swiftly and completely damaging our environment to the extent that we are threatening man's existence on earth. It is as simple as that. We may try to laugh this off because we think that since we are living in a country that is sparsely populated this problem might not affect us too much. Nevertheless, the problem is there and the nations of the world have been given this warning.

Despite the mounting pollution problem we find governments and politicians are reluctant to make those moves that are required to put our house in order as far as pollution control is concerned. Why, Mr. Speaker, are we reluctant to move? This is not a civil service problem; it is a problem for governments and for politicians.

The reason for the reluctance is the enormous cost of pollution control and the many strict and possibly unpopular moves that will have to be made. Everybody knows that governments and politicians do not like making unpopular moves, and basically this is the problem that is facing us in the field of pollution control. All sectors of our economy, be they private or public, will have to make major and costly adjustments if any plan is to succeed. Again I point out that one of the drawbacks has been that we have been afraid to go to industry and to the private sector and to tell companies causing pollution that they have to eliminate pollution that is affecting our rivers, streams, air, soil and everything else. I think we must be in a position to demand that controls be implemented.

Since this is going to cost money, we may ask who is going to provide it? The average citizen, of course. He has to pay for everything anyway. Whether through increased prices or taxation, eventually the cost will be met by the wage earners of this nation.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I should like to outline this afternoon a few general problems. There is a host of material available, in fact so much that it would be difficult to condense to the point where it could be put before the house in a short 20-minute speech. However, one of the major weaknesses as far as the federal government is concerned in its approach to pollution is that there is absolutely no co-ordination on the subject between the various departments. This is supposed to come within the Canada water act. At the moment one arm does not know what the other is doing. There are about 14 independent departments of government that somewhere along the line are involved with the pollution problem. Some departments have standards to enforce; others have none. In this day and age that is a ridiculous state of affairs. The legislation on the statute books is inadequate and we cannot control pollution by using existing legislation. In fact, no single department of government has sufficient authority to deal adequately with pollution problems. It is time the people of Canada were made aware of the facts.

Departments have inadequate facilities to enforce existing laws. They are loath to use existing powers to enforce existing laws for fear of upsetting those in the private sector of our economy. That attitude is all wrong. It is sheer nonsense. The various departments of government find it convenient to ignore many of the major causes of pollution. They get around the problem by saying, "We can do nothing, because if we act we shall upset the provincial governments". Their attitude is that many pollution problems fall under provincial jurisdiction and have nothing to do with the federal government. I say that it is the duty of this government, which has hidden behind the gimmick of constitutional issues in order not to accept responsibility for pollution control, to iron out constitutional problems in this field. The government ought to be meeting with representatives of the

provinces and municipalities and trying to iron out these so-called constitutional problems. This government has been in power since 1963. Except for the odd new face, it is the same old gang that has been in power all along. The pollution problems of 1963 are still with us today in 1969.

An hon. Member: The same old gang sits in the opposition.

Mr. Harding: Yes, that may be so. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has the responsibility for dealing with pollution of rivers and lakes. How is it, then, that this department has no pollution standards? I asked for a return to be tabled in the house indicating the standards the department has adopted in order to fight pollution, and I have learned that the department has no standards at all. Here is one government department that has the responsibility of dealing with water resources; yet it has no standards to enforce in the fight against pollution. That state of affairs must be remedied.

Recently amendments to the Navigable Waters Protection Act were introduced into the house and, lo and behold, on examining them, I found that federal and provincial Crown corporations did not come under the act. It does not apply to them. We tried to introduce an amendment to bring the Navigable Waters Protection Act up to date but that amendment was defeated. One could ask, "What has the Navigable Waters Protection Act to do with pollution?" It has plenty to do with it, I say. If a dam is to be built or a reservoir constructed—the reservoir might be 100 miles long—and the government does not insist that the reservoir basin shall be cleared of standing timber before construction begins, the water of the reservoir could remain polluted for as long as any of us in this house stay alive. The government is aware of weaknesses in the act; yet it always tells us, "We must have constitutional discussions before we dare to move in this area."

I have raised these points because one of our provincial governments ignored the damage that could be done when it failed to insist that timber in reservoir basins be cleared. We need only look at the example in British Columbia of Duncan Lake to see what a mess can be created. Another disgrace is shaping up in the reservoir behind Mica Dam which, when completed, will form a lake 125 miles long. The timber has not been properly cleared. This is a national scandal. It is true that the two projects I have mentioned are under the control of the provincial government, but I submit that the provisions of the Navigable Waters Protection Act could be brought to bear. The federal government must put teeth into its laws if it is to control pollution. If necessary amendments to the Criminal Code should be brought in, there should be appropriate fines and penalties for individuals, companies or Crown corporations that contravene the provisions of laws affecting pollution control.

In legislating we are not keeping our eyes fixed on today or tomorrow only; we are legislating for the benefit of our coming generations. We want our youngsters to enjoy recreational areas which we have been wise enough to create during our stay here.

I now wish to speak about the Fisheries Act in relation to pollution. Hon. members have spoked about that act this afternoon. It requires major amendments. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has made good speeches, the spirit of which I endorse. In his attempts to have regulations under the Fisheries Act enforced he will have my backing and the backing of many others in the house.

Let us examine some of the effects of our fisheries legislation. First of all, there must be a large fish kill before we prosecute anybody. That is not good enough. It is too late to prosecute after all the fish have been killed. That is like locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen. I say the act should be amended and we should tighten regulations governing pollution. We must put teeth into the Fisheries Act if it is to do any good in this area.

For instance, in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, there has been large-scale pollution of which the department was warned by its own research station in Nova Scotia. The department's experts said that there might be possible trouble from the phosphorus plant. The federal government gave a $5 million grant to the company under the area incentives plan and the company built the plant. The government did not insist that the company behave as a good industrial citizen. Later there was a tremendous fish kill in the area which affected many fishermen. A tremendous amount of damage was done and only after that did the federal government offer to pay the fishermen compensation.

The government hopes the fishermen will prosecute the company and get back some of the money which was paid out in compensation. I say that the fishermen should not be prosecuting the company. That is the job of

the Department of Fisheries. It should collect every penny owing from the company. The taxpayers of Canada should not be out of pocket on account of the phosphorus spill from this industrial plant. I say to the government that it is setting a precedent in this area that can be followed in other parts of Canada. It is reasonably certain now that the spill from the plant killed the fish. Therefore the plant ought to be liable for the compensation that was paid to fishermen.

While I am on the subject of fisheries regulations may I mention the Fraser River. The lower reaches of the Fraser River are a running sewer. That is all they are. That stretch of water is one of the filthiest waterways in this nation. The Department of Fisheries is unable to force municipalities and others up the river to clean up raw sewage being dumped into the water. Great damage is being done; there is no doubt about that. Great harm is being done to the fish in that part of the river. Do we need to have vast numbers of fish killed before the government acts? I could cite many other examples. Pulp mills in the area have broken pollution control regulations time and again. They are breaking them today. Action is not being taken against them. Many threats are being made and letters are being written. Then the government gets real tough and sends them a registered letter to really scare them.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Saltsman: It doesn't get there. The Post Office is not working.

Mr. Harding: These problems worry us. Pollution control is a matter of establishing on a co-operation basis a working agreement between the federal and provincial governments and the municipalities. I agree with the hon. member who spoke earlier that a national abatement pollution policy should be established to set national goals as to the standards for a national policy. We have to do this. Industries must be told that they cannot move out of Kootenay West to Alberta or Saskatchewan because if they do they will be up against the same national standards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Harding.]

Mr. Harding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not abuse the time because I know quite a few members wish to speak. I will clear up two or three points and then take my seat.

My second point is that we must have complete understanding of jurisdiction. This can be ironed out through frequent meetings of the federal-provincial ministers' group which has already been set up. Once the jurisdictional problem is ironed out, if governments are not afraid to move we will be well on the way to solving many of our major pollution problems.

In the field of enforcement, amendments must be made to the Criminal Code, including adequate penalties. We need priorities in attacking the major problems facing us. These cannot all be tackled at once. Priorities must be set up and we must move very quickly and adequately on them.

There must be one department and one minister responsible for pollution. This minister must have the power to co-ordinate the activities of all other departments. He must be in charge of pollution problems for the whole nation. In addition there must be a vast research program for water, air and soil pollution. Federal, provincial and municipal legislation must be passed to cover every aspect of the pollution problems facing us today. There must be co-ordination of the legislation passed by the various provinces. There should be some type of loan system set up for municipalities and, in some cases, industry to obtain loans to carry out the improvements needed to prevent pollution.

While I have dealt mainly with water pollution, air and soil pollution are equally serious. I wish to make one comment regarding the pollution of soil. It concerns the use of d.d.t. which is very widespread. Not much research is being carried out in Canada with regard to the effects of d.d.t. on fish and game, human beings, cattle, grain, and so on.

Recently a survey was conducted in the United States which covered the whole of the river basins and lakes in that country. Although it did not touch every lake, it was a very broad survey. Out of 590 samples of fish taken from 45 rivers and lakes throughout the nation, 584 had d.d.t. in their tissues. In some cases it was exceptionally high. Some concentrations were as high as nine times the food and drug administration's tolerance level. This is very serious. This report confirms that there is an accelerating pollution of the environment by hard pesticides. It confirms the findings of some experts that there should be thorough research into d.d.t. by the govern-

ment and its various departments. It is not the most toxic pesticide; there are others that are much worse.

We must face this problem now. It is not only a problem in Canada and the United States. Every nation is faced with the problem of finding the residues of these pesticides in fish and game and foods which are grown. We are not carrying out the research in Canada that is necessary. I hope other hon. members will also deal with this later this afternoon. I thank Your Honour and hon. members for the few extra minutes given to me this afternoon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, today we have before us a non-confidence motion introduced by the Progressive Conservative party which reads as follows:

That in order particularly to discuss the department's neglect to assert federal leadership and take effective action to attack the worsening contamination of the Canadian environment by pollution, consideration be given to—

I inform at once the Conservatives that we will support this motion because we are also of the opinion that the government is too slow in meeting the problems of pollution which at this time seriously endanger human life.

However, instead of criticizing the vote I would have liked the motion to read as follows: "That the Bank of Canada will grant free interest loans to municipalities, to provinces, so that all the bills to be studied and put forward in the future are passed as soon as possible."

When dealing with the water pollution problem, and in order to enlighten the house and the committee that will study the problem, I should like to confine my remarks mainly to suggestions because it is a serious problem and we seem to forget that actions is urgently needed, since the survival of the human race twenty years from now is at stake.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The cost of air pollution varies in Canada, according to estimates, from $20 to $65 per capita, depending on the areas. These figures include the washing, painting, cleaning of buildings, air filtration and the cost of medical care. But there is more to it than expenditures and losses. Air pollution is a serious threat to health. It has been established that it weakens the resistance of the body, decreases vitality, and increases the incidence of illness.

In addition, it is possible that air pollution, even relatively low, contributes to the increase of degenerative illnesses including cancer of the skin and the lungs, heart and vascular diseases, and chronic bronchitis. Fortunately, scientific progress in other fields allows us to hope that air pollution also can be checked. Here again, above all, new plants should be required not to pollute the air.

Would it not be advisable to grant loans, without interest, to our municipalities that they might solve once and for all those air pollution problems? But no! Collective suicide is being witnessed complacently, and we are told there is no money. What must we do?

Personal conscience is the prerequisite for any effort towards efficient conservation. A ruling of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington reads as follows:

A non-written pact between the dead, the living and future generations prescribes that we should leave to those who will succeed us something more than debts and exhausted natural resources.

Nature kept its balance for millions of years, but it has now run into a new obstacle. All other creatures follow habits and instincts, while man seeks to dominate things and give them new orientations.

The undiscerning killing of noxious plants and insects by means of chemicals is not only a serious menace to the preservation of wild life but also the source of potential contamination for human beings. In Mexico, 17 children actually died, apparently because of a pesticide that had been used to kill rats in a corn field.

Sewage pollutes the water of our lakes and rivers, thus infiltrating our bodies. Water, which is the most important of our natural resources, can carry germs and toxic elements. According to the World Health Organization, about five million children die every year because of intestinal diseases carried by water.

At a certain point, rivers themselves rebel against the saturation of various poisons from urban sewage, factories, slaughter-houses, or tilled soil. These toxic matters kill the plants, exhaust the oxygen supply in the water and impair the filtering action of the gravel. Once a certain level of pollution is attained, animal and plant life disappears and the river ultimately dies.

In order to clear up our lakes and our rivers, we have to fight different sorts of man-made pollutants: detergents, fertilizers, insecticides, weed-killers, sewage, industrial waste. It is more a matter of prevention than

of treatment and it seems that municipalities and industries are now moving in this direction at the moment, however, the rates of interest are a burden far too heavy for them to bear.

Today, Mr. Speaker, air pollution and fog are just mere incidents of our everyday urban life, or so it seems, until a catastrophe in the field of public health occurs, such as the death of 4,000 people in London, in 1952, as a result of the smog, makes us realize that our carelessness can be lethal. About a hundred air pollutants have been so far identified plus those resulting from their integration.

We need people endowed with sufficient sense, imagination, firmness and boldness to demand that sufficient wooded and open areas be reserved for recreational instead of practical purposes. If wilderness disappears, young people will be deprived from satisfying their instinctive taste for dreams and outings. Confined in the canyons of the cities, imprisoned in octopus-like suburbs, their hearts, minds and hands empty, debarred from experiences that their nature requires, they will devote their energies to protest and wrong-doing.

Man has spread pesticides all over without wondering whether they would not be fatal to birds and useful insects, and even to human beings. Man had poured millions of pounds of detergents in the rivers before he found out that he was polluting the water. He let the lakes die through lack of oxygen. He helped increase the fatal effects of smog in allowing harmful substances in the atmosphere.

It is now essential to evaluate the comparative importance of know risks and possible advantages. That is where conscience and intelligence have a role to play. As Harry Commoner said in a striking article on pollution, and I quote:

> No scientific procedure can tell us how many abnormal births caused by radioactive fallout we must tolerate before having a new nuclear weapon . . . No scientific principle can indicate how to make a choice, which the problem of insecticides could force us to make, between the shadow of the elm and the song of the robin . . . the duty of making the necessary judgments does not lie exclusively with scientists and technicians but also with all citizens.

However, the pressure of public opinion remains an essential factor for the success of these efforts. The cahllenge can be met if we muster every skill, every economic force and every human resource in order that what can be achieved physically in this field may become financially feasible. I mentioned

before that the Bank of Canada could supply municipalities or provinces, as the case may be, with the funds required for an effective anti-pollution campaign. Man's presumptuous, arrogant meddling has now brought about the deterioration of living conditions we are now concerned with, the extinction of many animal and plant species and the pollution of air and water.

Now that his very survival appears to be at stake, man must revise his thinking, relearn long-forgotten lore and continue his advance along the appropriate ways.

Our research and the conclusions and lessons resulting from it offer hope to a world which ignores largely how serious the situation is. Scholars and researchers do not make the laws, they discover them. Nature's laws exist, and scientists formulate them so that we can observe them.

Mr. Speaker, a duty awaits us. Our governments have this possibility of helping fight pollution. The realities of nature's balance and man's role in this respect have to be presented to the populations of all countries in a way they can understand. Only in this way can scientists give to these responsible the opportunity of taking the necessary decisions on those serious questions.

No municipal, provincial or national effort to maintain nature's balance can be efficient if it is not earnestly demanded and supported by a well informed public opinion. There is no need for people to be specialists in some branch of learning, but everyone should be able to understand what scientists are saying, what technicians are doing and what elected governments who are now increasing debts instead of taking the necessary measures I suggested at the beginning should do, namely that the Bank of Canada should grant interest free loans to our municipalities, as was done recently for western farmers, as was done for Expo, in Montreal, to enable that municipality to develop instead of going bankrupt.

If such loans can help our municipalities and our provinces to fight, with every possible means, pollution which leads to our suicide, we will have really played our role as legislators.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this afternoon hon. members opposite have indicated their appreciation of the serious nature of the pollution problem which faces

civilized man in his many activities. In that they have joined the members of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works who showed that they had an understanding of the important nature of this problem and the challenge it presents to governments in Canada today.

There is no doubt about the serious nature of the problem with the increased amount of waste which is being produced by man in his industrial and domestic activities. The disposition of these wastes is a serious matter and a challenge in respect of having available for other use by man our natural and renewable resources. It is, of course, a key to intelligent management of water resources to develop first an understanding of their availability in terms of quantity, quality and location. It is this, of course, which has preoccupied the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in recent years in coming to grips with the problem.

I was interested to note that while indicating some understanding of the problem hon. members opposite said very little which really supported the motion that is before us today. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is in fact doing many things in many ways to examine the question of quantity, quality and location of these water resources. Under the Canada water survey there has been established a network of monitoring stations. There are 2,300 of them across the country. There are some 2,000 under the direct responsibility of this department and 300 which are operated by the mines and resources branch of the province of Quebec.

In addition to these monitoring stations which check stream flow and therefore quantities and locations of water, there is being established in co-operation with the provinces a network of stations to assess the chemical qualities of our water resources including such things as hardness, physical characteristics, colour, potability and methods of water treatment for domestic and industrial uses. At the same time we are expanding the network to determine the nature and extent of pollution in major Canadian surface waters and to determine seasonal variations in water quality. Specific attention is being paid to the total nitrogen and phosphorus content of Canadian waters. Special monitoring is being established to detect pesticides, herbicides and algicides that many be present in trace quantities. More intensive research is being carried out to determine water quality problems on the lower Fraser River, the northern Ontario rivers and the Exploits River system of Newfoundland. These studies have been initiated at the request of other agencies as part of over-all water development programs. Intensive water quality studies are being undertaken on ten small watersheds as part of the International Hydrologic Decade. Special studies are in hand on waste disposal problems of specific industries. For example, the effects in local ground water regimes of brine disposal ponds near potash mines is under intensive study.

Studies of groundwater resources are being expanded through establishing a national observation well network in co-operation with the provinces. Assessment of the reserve in aquifers, the replenishment of groundwater, the quality of groundwater, and the potential yield rates are all included in this program.

The department has also undertaken studies of the glacialogical area to examine the relationship between climatic variations and increases and decreases in these important sources of western water.

In addition to these more general programs the department has undertaken specific and intensive programs in co-operation with the provinces on particular river basins. For example, we are working with the province of Ontario in examining the quantity and quality of water in the Hudson Bay drainage of Ontario. The program also includes estimation of the anticipated water needs of the region.

Similarly, a $5 million water resources study of the Saskatchewan-Nelson system is under way in co-operation with the three prairie provinces. The federal government will pay half the total cost of this program. About two-thirds of the cost will go toward water storage studies while the remainder will be spent on examination of water diversion potentials within this huge drainage basin of some 350,000 square miles. These studies are essential before forecasts of water quality levels can be made. I may say that this also demonstrates the effective manner in which federal-provincial co-operation can produce the necessary knowledge about our water resources and how they may be made more useful to the people of this country.

Perhaps the most critical water quality issues facing Canada today concern the Great Lakes. Pollution abatement programs in the Great Lakes basin, on both sides of the international boundary, present a special problem unique in the world and of vital concern to present and future generations. Technically

we are faced with the cumulative effects on lake waters of waste products that escape, even with the best of abatement procedures, and cause progressive deterioration of the Great Lakes. Massive studies of the physical, chemical and geological characteristics of the lakes are essential to understand their capabilities of assimilating and disposing of wastes on the one hand or of concentrating and accumulating them to their detriment on the other. From these studies, together with engineering, economic, social and legal studies, intelligent programs will emerge to improve and maintain the quality of the lakes.

Economically, socially and aesthetically no other water pollution problem in the industrial heartland of North America can compare in magnitude and importance with the critical situation developing in the Great Lakes. In recognition of this problem we have undertaken major positive steps in the Great Lakes area. In 1967, recognizing the need for this knowledge, the government decided to build a major interdisciplinary research establishment. A site at Burlington, Ontario was selected and then without waiting the two years which might have been required for site preparation a laboratory complex was immediately housed in trailers. The laboratories were in operation before the end of 1967 and are now operating with a staff of more than 150 scientists, technicians and administrative personnel. Within 10 years it is anticipated that a staff of 1,000 will be undertaking integrated interdisciplinary research and planning related to the physical, biological and chemical nature of the lakes, pollution, water levels, shore erosion and sedimentation.

The Canada Centre for Inland Waters is expected to cost a total of $23.5 million. In addition, a major research vessel, the *Limnos*, has been commissioned. This is a floating $2 million laboratory containing the most sophisticated scientific equipment available. A second ship is under lease to allow a full scale offshore research program.

As members of this house will realize, water is perhaps the most versatile of all resources in its uses and as a result a number of federal departments and agencies are involved in various aspects of the government's over-all program. A fine example of co-ordinated programs is taking shape at the Canada Centre for Inland Waters. Not only is this department employing a team of scientists of different disciplines but it is also making facilities available to the Department of National Health and Welfare as well as the Department of Fisheries and Forestry. University scientists will also use our laboratories. No effort will be spared to bring the best minds to bear in an efficient, effective, co-ordinated search for knowledge.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Within the government there has been established an interdepartmental committee on water programs to review and recommend on all water resource programs of government agencies. This interdepartmental committee has been established to assure that public programs will be co-ordinated and developed in a sensible and consistent manner. It is expected that under the Canada water act this committee will be given some permanent status in respect of the fight against water pollution.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he is able today to indicate when the water act will be introduced.

Mr. Lang: I expect to comment on that a little later, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to the question of co-operation between government departments there is the extremely important question of co-ordination and co-operation between federal and provincial governments. I am not going to go into the problems of federal and provincial jurisdiction at this time. It may suffice for me to say that the question of jurisdiction is complex and involves both levels of government. Therefore it requires the best kind of co-operation in the true spirit of federalism for us to make the best and most successful use of our water and provide the best kind of water management.

I should like to mention a couple of initiatives in the area of federal-provincial co-operation. Two years ago the then Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, now Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), proposed to the provinces that the senior governments endorse the establishment of a national advisory committee on water pollution, with representation from the federal government, the provinces and the universities. This committee would have included in its functions studies on various aspects of water pollution, such as regional and national water quality objectives, the costs of pollution, and the benefits to be reaped through pollution control. The terms of reference of this committee have recently been expanded

to include air and soil pollution as well as water.

Our proposal included an offer to finance the committee and provide it with a secretariat. Although most provinces seemed to favour the proposal, others did not. This stalemate is much regretted by us since it has blocked one avenue of joint action.

We have been successful in developing a broad program of research outside of government. In 1967 the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources launched a grants-in-aid program to support water resources research at Canadian universities. The objectives of the program included provision of funds for a required expansion of water research, development of knowledge and expertise on water problems on the part of university staff and faculties, and the provision of greater opportunities for graduate students to undertake work in this field as a stimulus for increasing the pool of trained personnel available for employment.

To assist in the administration of this program, we established a national advisory committee on water resources research by Order in Council in the fall of 1967. This committee is charged with three important functions: provision of continuing advice to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on the needs and priorities for water resources research; assistance in the co-ordination of water resources research, and review and recommendations on applications for grants in aid of research from the department.

In the research grant program a total of $800,000 has been awarded to individuals at 23 universities since March, 1968. Of this amount, $600,000 was awarded in the natural sciences while $200,000 was for support of social science research. An estimated 60 per cent to 70 per cent of the funds awarded to date bear directly or indirectly on pollution problems.

The greatest challenge to federal-provincial co-operation comes in the doing—the actual planning and implementation of water resource management schemes. I feel quite sure the general public will not excuse inaction because of difficulties over federal or provincial jurisdiction. They want the job done. Recognizing the need for comprehensive planning and action, and in anticipation of the proposed Canada water act, we have offered a special co-operative program to the provinces. Two years ago, in May, 1967 the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources advised the provinces that the federal government was prepared to join with one or more provinces in each region of the country to undertake pilot studies in comprehensive river basin planning. I must confess that we have been unable to encourage either the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario to discuss joint planning on the Ottawa River. I am encouraged, however, by recent reports in the press on the statements of the new Minister of Energy and Resources Management for Ontario. I am hopeful that discussions with Ontario and Quebec may soon begin.

More progress has been made elsewhere and we are actively negotiating agreements with British Columbia, Saskatchewan and New Brunswick. I expect that these agreements may be concluded soon, all within the next few months. The fundamental problem in each of these river basins is one of water quality. We are eager to get on with the job and look forward to working in close co-operation with the provinces to improve the water quality as well as carrying out over-all comprehensive framework plans for the long-range development of their water resources.

Even before we begin these co-operative studies with the provinces, this department is moving ahead with a group of fundamental studies to gain a better understanding of the social and economic impact of water pollution, to develop proposals for determining priorities for federal action, and to recommend a sophisticated instutional and economic means of achieving pollution abatement.

Contrary to the motion, therefore, Mr. Speaker, a very useful program progresses on all fronts. We have not, however, engaged in a reckless spending spree on ad hoc programs. We are working toward a co-ordinated and co-operative federal-provincial plan.

Water quality programs permeate the entire process of water resource research, planning, development and management. It is difficult to isolate exactly the items which should be related to water pollution abatement in the 1969-70 estimates. At least $11 million or over 20 per cent of the total estimates for water and renewable resources activities is earmarked for water quality programs. I expect that more than this amount will be required in future years.

As I said before, the disposal of wastes created directly or indirectly by man and all his activities is a basic element of the social and economic system of all societies, primitive and modern. In all industrial societies a

constantly increasing tonnage of solid, liquid, and gaseous material must be burned, buried or washed away daily. No nation has yet succeeded in disposing of such enormous quantities of waste without fouling the air, soil or water, sometimes on a global basis. Despite the vastness of our land, Canada has not escaped this critical environmental problem and we find ourselves today facing an urgent problem of national dimensions.

The total costs of waste disposal are too large and the disbenefits to those who use our air or water downwind or downstream of the pollution sources are too great to permit us to accept solutions to the problem that are not at once efficient and effective. The simple solutions proposed in the past are demonstrably inadequate as the world-wide pollution problem itself clearly proves. We must seek modern management methods with mechanisms that restore, maintain and improve the quality of our environment on a continuing, perpetual basis as an integral function of our socio-economic-legal system. The suggestion is frequently made that massive inputs of funds from the public treasury are needed and justified, primarily to subsidize waste treatment in the private sector. It is also argued that a series of punitive measures adapted to specific uses would suffice. We reject these notions on the grounds that they are inefficient and ineffective and that they would place an unnecessary financial burden on our economy.

• (5:30 p.m.)

What is required is an approach which deals with water problems basin by basin. There must be sufficient flexibility to meet the special needs of each basin. There must be a balance between the interests of all those who may wish to use the water, water which belongs to the public generally rather than to infividuals. Those who use or pollute our water must bear the proper cost of their activity. The goods produced must bear a proper portion of this cost. Such proposals require a federal involvement to ensure that regions of the country do not compete with one another in permitting pollution as an incentive to industry but at the cost of others outside the region who have the pollution imposed upon them.

In the past three years this department has done much to unravel the fundamental nature of the pollution problem in Canada through research within the government, by government supported studies in the private sector and through research in universities. We have also acquired a considerable amount of data and information on water quality. We have established major research facilities, and we have provided the machinery for co-ordinating the entire federal effort in this field. We have also, as I have said, begun to see the fruits of our continuing efforts to achieve a joint federal-provincial approach as witnessed by current negotiations with British Columbia, Saskatchewan and the Atlantic provinces as well as the recent favourable public statements from Ontario. We now believe that the base has been laid for a major federal-provincial anti-pollution campaign.

It was with this in mind that I announced earlier my intention to introduce the Canada water bill this session. My plan was to have first reading in this session, to hold the essential federal-provincial discussions this summer during the recess, and to re-introduce the bill early in the fall. In this bill the federal government will propose to exercise to the full its undoubted responsibility for water resource management. In particular, it will provide the institutional structure to establish an anti-pollution program in concert with the provinces and incorporating the concepts and mechanisms which I have described.

The approach to be articulated in this bill is based on federal-provincial co-operation and upon respect for all provincial responsibilities. It is a realistic, pragmatic approach to the thorny constitutional problems which arise when several governments are involved. At the same time the bill will recognize the urgency of water quality and water management problems and provide for strong federal initiative whenever and wherever the circumstances demand. The officials in this and other departments have spent the past several months preparing this bill for introduction. The preparation has taken longer than anticipated. Everyone will surely agree, however, that a major bill on such a complex issue of great and lasting national significance deserves the best possible preparation. It is apparent now that these preparations will take several more weeks. It is now my plan, therefore, to issue a policy statement in July together with a draft of the bill itself as a basis for federal-provincial consultations and to allow hon. members and the public an opportunity to study the important implications of our proposal.

Finally, I put it to the house that the motion to condemn this department for failure to act on water pollution is clearly without merit. We have a broad, carefully developed anti-pollution program tailored to the

complexities of the problem and the realities of federal-provincial relations. It would have been easy to make a great show of activity by opening the public treasury, but we are not seeking short run answers nor will we mislead the public with ill founded proposals. We have been searching for permanent, effective and efficient solutions to the problems of waste disposal and environmental quality—problems that have existed as long as society itself, problems that industrial man has yet to resolve. We intend to continue our program not only with a sense of urgency but also with full appreciation for the careful deliberation that this important issue demands.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—old age security—reduction of guaranteed income supplement upon receipt of pension by spouses; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—treasury board—Courtenay, B.C., letter carrier service; the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles)—failure of U.S. pleasure craft to report to customs officer, Port Dover, Ontario.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—SUGGESTED LACK OF ACTION TO COMBAT POLLUTION

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Aiken.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, needless to say, in common with all other members of the house we were delighted to hear the minister refer to some of the rather minor activities in which the department and the government are engaged; to hear that they are examining here, looking there, and making some studies elsewhere. I do not say that these are not essential. They are, and they have to be done to provide a basis of some action in the future. But after listening to the minister I must say that his speech was another example of the ability of this government to twist and evade, to contort the facts and to play with realism in an effort to cover over their inadequacy to deal with this one of the many major problems which confront us. What has happened, of course, has been that the government in its traditional way, has flung itself into a position of masterly inaction which it is presenting to the public.

I am anxious to take part in the debate concerning this motion moved by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) for several reasons. I do recognize the tremendous problems of the pollution of our environment, although I shall confine my remarks to the problems of water pollution. Second, I am most disturbed at the indecision, the confusion and the contradiction that is presently evident within the government, and I use these words because parliamentary rules forbid me to use stronger ones. I am disturbed at the government's preoccupation with the economic development of our water resources without regard for the other aspects of this resource. It is disturbing when one reads statements such as:

> Clearly there is no need to push the panic button. Problems like the cleaning up of Lake Erie can gradually be solved using existing techniques.

Those were the words of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis). I am disturbed when I hear the former minister of energy, mines and resources, the present Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), say:

> Constitutionalists recognize that pollution is essentially a provincial jurisdiction. If "resources" are provincial, the misuse of same is also provincial.

I think that this statement has to be challenged. The legislature records of the federal government are studded with illustrations of instances where the federal government, using its powers under the constitution, has seen fit to legislate in matters which lie within provincial jurisdiction.

I think that the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce simply cannot be accepted in so far as it deals with this very serious problem. I am also disturbed to hear the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, who obviously did not hear the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, say:

> —we have a national fisheries act. We have a one hundred year old piece of federal legislation which, with a few simple improvements, can be used to reduce pollution in all the waters of Canada.

Today the minister referred to the water act. He indicated that for various reasons the act had not been produced, despite the very specific undertaking which was given to that effect. It is my suspicion that the act has been lost somewhere in the labyrinth of the new government committee structure in the cabinet, which has been created by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and which not only serves to confuse the people of Canada but has so thoroughly confused the cabinet that a great deal of the delay has been caused with regard to a great many government measures.

• (5:40 p.m.)

We have introduced a resolution condemning the government but we do not intend to confine ourselves to condemnation. We intend to make useful proposals. I believe a study of the list of amendments put forward by representatives of this party would indicate that contrary to what has been said elsewhere there is a total record of proposals in connection with most of the problems which affect us. An examination of the speeches and resolutions which have been placed before this house would indicate beyond doubt that there is not a single problem of major importance which this party has not brought forward during the course of this parliament and upon which it did not have some proposals of its own to make. To say otherwise is to be completely inaccurate. The government says it intends to introduce a water act. We would be glad to see it, if we could do so now, before the session ends—and this is not impossible; we may yet see it before the session ends.

Mr. Stanfield: If they get it before fall.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, and I am not sure which fall. We are told this bill would allow Ottawa to co-ordinate the activities of federal and provincial government agencies wherever and whenever the development of Canada's major river systems is concerned.

If the minister does introduce such a measure, and if it has the capacity to do what he says it does, I shall be the first to stand up and approve. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot blame us for having doubts. For example, I can recall, with regard to the Peace River, that under a Liberal government the then secretary of state for external affairs, now a shining ornament in the other place, was instrumental for purposes of his own, in collaboration with the premier of British Columbia, in permitting the federal government to disregard its rights under the Navigable Waters Protection Act and allow the desecration of the Peace River. I was up in that area the other day. I was glad that the difficulties in connection with navigation have been partly cleared up. But the level of the Peace River as it flows past the settlements in Alberta and British Columbia is extremely low for this time of year and I prophesy that before a year has passed the situation will be even worse. I lay the blame for this directly at the door of the Liberal party.

Mr. Orange: You formed the government at that time. Why didn't you stop it?

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the confusion which has arisen, I should like to take a few minutes in which to investigate the constitutional aspects of water pollution control. The need for my doing so is reinforced by the somewhat naïve conclusions which hon. gentlemen opposite have reached in this complex area. A good example is the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), when he was minister of energy, mines and resources, that pollution is essentially within provincial jurisdiction because, if resources as such are provincial then their misuse is also a provincial matter. What surprises me is that the minister should have chastised members of the opposition for proposing simplistic solutions to what he described as complex issues. Yet what could be more simplistic than the theory advanced by the minister? For years we have asked that the government set up a parliamentary committee to study this question. I am not asserting that a parliamentary committee could solve it any earlier, but it would have the effect of reducing to simple terms the tasks with which this government has failed to deal.

I sometimes think that 100 years from now, when this building is torn down, they will find in a secret cell in the depth of the basement four or five skeletons near a sign saying: "Experts Studying Federal-Provincial Issues. Do Not Disturb." These issues can only be dealt with when the people of Canada are aware of them; when they have been reduced to terms understandable by the ordinary man and woman. This is the purpose of committee hearings, and because of the government's failure to send this whole question to a committee it is necessary for the opposition to take the initiative today and give the government the benefit of advice on the constitutional problem to which the minister

referred in his speech today when he said: "This is a complex issue and we do not intend to touch it."

What is the basis for saying that pollution control is a provincial matter? It is an extended argument beginning with section 109 of the British North America Act which says, among other things, that all lands, mines, minerals and royalties shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Although there is a different means, the result is the same for the four western provinces. The argument, then, is that having accepted ownership the provinces have also acquired the water rights incidental to those lands. There is a Privy Council decision relevant to this point in the case of Burrard Power Company v. Regina, 1911. While this much is conceded, it must be borne in mind that ownership does not automatically grant immunity from legislation. In other words, the relevant consideration is not so much who owns the water as who has the legislative competence. The Criminal Code is full of examples of instances where the federal government has legislated, intervening in matters which are provincial, because it has been obliged to do so in order to fulfil its responsibility of legislating in cases where great problems have arisen, and where matters which normally would fall under provincial jurisdiction have become of such moment that the federal government felt called upon to intervene by way of legislation under the Criminal Code.

The argument for provincial legislative competence relies primarily upon section 92(5) of the B.N.A. Act which gives the provinces exclusive jurisdiction with respect to the management and sale of the public lands belonging to them. In diminishing degrees of importance the provinces may also argue on the basis of section 92(13) affecting property and civil rights, section 92(16) referring generally to all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province, and section 92(10) covering local works and undertakings.

The argument for federal competence has an electric nature similar to the provincial argument. The section primarily relied upon is 91(10) which gives the federal government legislative authority with regard to navigation and shipping, with supplementary authority from 91(9). In other words, every body of water which can be navigated in Canada is subject to the exclusive control of the federal government with regard to all matters concerning navigation. Section 91(12) which deals with sea coast and inland fisheries is equally important. It provides the federal government with the legislative competence for the Fisheries Act, which, as I indicated earlier, is regarded as the panacea in this area of pollution control by the Minister of Fisheries. Furthermore, since the federal government alone is competent with regard to the criminal law, it could investigate pollution control through prohibitory measures. Finally, although the provinces have been given the authority to deal with local works and undertakings there is a specific exception attached to works which are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

• (5:50 p.m.)

These are a number of the points to which I might have referred. What concerns me is that this problem may develop and expand until it hangs like a black cloud over the people of this country. While federal and provincial governments may still be arguing over questions of jurisdiction, and the federal government may still be engaged upon minor excursions into examinations, tests and studies of the subject, it may well be too late for the people of this country, through federal jurisdiction, to exercise the competence they have if they so see fit.

In the matter of restrictive trade practices, the federal government has used the criminal law as a means of regulating certain issues. On the question of the food and drug administration, the federal government has also relied on the criminal law as a means of dealing with such problems. I am not suggesting that this is the proper way to proceed, but I am suggesting—and here I agree with the minister—that there should be an opportunity for the federal government and the provincial governments together to work out a process of co-operative action.

For example, authority can be delegated. As of today it would be possible, without any changes to the constitution of this country, for both the federal and provincial governments to delegate to crown agencies that jurisdiction which is required, each within its own area of legislative competence, to deal with this problem. It is not enough not to talk about the problem or simply to make examinations or conduct studies. Before the problem is finally solved it will be essential to pass regulations and to apply sanctions, if necessary. Industry and those concerned must be told in no uncertain terms that they cannot go on indefinitely polluting the air and water that is so essential for our preservation as a society.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

I suggest to the minister and the government that it simply is not good enough to tell the house they are planning this long range group of studies and examinations and that they will look into the matter. It is essential, not later but now, for the federal government to secure the necessary authority to take action. If the government cannot secure this authority from the provincial governments as a group, then certainly under a series of bilateral agreements it would be competent for the federal governments so to act.

No good reason has yet been advanced by the minister, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or by any other member of the treasury benches for not taking this action. This problem did not just arise today or yesterday; it has been with us for a great many years and has been the subject of a great deal of literature as well as speeches both in this house and in the provincial legislatures.

I am not by any means downgrading the importance of many of the federal-provincial conferences that have taken place on other matters, but this much is of the essence: unless an approach is taken that will produce solutions to the problems facing us, with regulations laid down and sanctions applied against those who are concerned, then we are in for a very serious time on this continent.

To bring in the water act is fine. To engage in all these studies the minister has told us about is fine. But I think we have to go a step further. Before this session is over, or certainly during the time when the minister has indicated he intends to issue a white paper with a draft copy of the bill attached, I should like the minister to indicate what is going to be the government's view, and what the government is going to do if it cannot secure from any of the provinces the consent that is required. This is not to suggest by any means that the federal government would have to transgress the constitution; I have indicated that there are ways and means by which a government that has determination and the power to do so can take action.

Use can be made, for example, as the minister is aware, of the peace, order and good government clause. Let us assume that we reach a moment in our social history when the pollution of the St. Lawrence system and the Great Lakes suddenly passes the stage of safety. Surely then, under the peace, order and good government clause the federal government would have every right to intervene. I am not suggesting that that time has come, but with that knowledge, and having in mind the confederation debates that have shown beyond doubt what the powers of the federal government are to be, I suggest there is the power to delegate authority. As the minister knows, as a result of the Prince Edward Island case it is now competent for the federal and provincial governments, not to delegate authority to each other, but to delegate authority to an agency which can then take action.

Under those circumstances I urge the government not to wait but to take action. I urge the government to take the steps that can be taken, and which I indicated are available, so that before this problem overwhelms us the government will outline a clear and precise method of dealing with it, as well as the powers the government can exercise if it has the ingenuity and determination to do so.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the time I wonder whether I might call it six o'clock?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

BOY SCOUTS OF CANADA

REQUEST TO REFER PETITION TO PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): Mr. Speaker, would the house allow me to revert to motions?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Isabelle moved:

That the petition of the Boy Scouts of Canada—Scouts du Canada—asking for the adoption of a bill to change its name in French to "Les Boys Scouts du Canada" and asking for the incorporation of "L'Association des scouts du Canada" and filed after the time prescribed in Standing Order 90 be referred to the Standing Committee of Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders with the fourteenth report of the Clerk of Petitions tabled in the house on Monday, June 23, so that the committee may make the recommendations deemed useful.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED LACK OF ACTION TO COMBAT POLLUTION

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Aiken.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, may I begin my remarks by referring to what the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) said. Among other things he said, I believe, that in the field of pollution the government has displayed absolute neglect. I was therefore pleased to hear the minister, after some opposition speakers had spoken, point out clearly that this government has not been absolutely neglectful. In fact, the minister's statement proved that charge to be wrong. He outlined many programs the department has undertaken. Many constructive programs have been undertaken that many know nothing about. I am, therefore, sure that the minister welcomed the opportunity of putting on record those programs that are being undertaken so that hon. members of this house and the people across Canada may know what is happening. He referred to the trailer complex with respect to the Inland Water Centre at Burlington, Ontario, which the committee visited. The trailer complex consists of 55 units. As research develops and continues at this centre, some of these trailers will be transferred to locations in other areas of Canada in order to carry on research there. This complex can be subdivided into many units. That project, which the committee had a chance to visit, is an extremely constructive one.

One cannot talk about pollution without recognizing, as is spelled out in the fourth report of the standing committee, that there is a jurisdictional conflict in this area. We are concerned about the conflict and those who participated in the drafting of the report know how concerned we were and are about it. Unfortunately the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka was not present at our deliberations when this report was first drafted.

The provinces of Canada, Mr. Speaker, guard their jurisdictions with great jealousy. The province of Ontario has made pollution control the responsibility of one particular minister. Is this action not an admission that the provinces indeed have a great responsibility in the area of pollution? I do not think, therefore, that the federal government can bulldoze ahead as some have suggested it should in an attempt to do what we all desire with regard to pollution. As I say, this jurisdictional conflict was of great concern to the members of the committee. The committee recognized and regretted the great division of authority in this area and the resulting jurisdictional conflict.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I wish to put on the record an excerpt from the committee's report. I quote:

> Your committee is concerned by increasing magnitude of air, water and soil pollution and the jurisdictional conflict which hampers the finding and implementing of proper solutions.

I commend the members who participated in writing this report. In our committee we had a very frank discussion. We are trying to recognize problems and give direction to them. In the drafting of that report there was no real evidence of partisanship or bias from members of various parties on the committee.

The federal government's responsibility lays in research. It lays in joint jurisdiction on interprovincial and international waters. Problems in the Great Lakes must be solved by representatives of eight states of the United States, the International Joint Commission, Washington, Ottawa, Ontario and so on. This is no small problem to overcome. This fact has been mentioned many times in this house. It is a problem of great interest to me because my constituency borders on the Ottawa River. The pollution of the Ottawa River is more severe in the Ottawa area.

I think the emphasis which has been given to this problem in this house has made it appear as though the federal government has total responsibility, when indeed the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and Ottawa share that responsibility. Let there be no question about this.

Mr. Winch: It still stinks, no matter who is responsible!

Mr. Hopkins: If anything constructive results from this debate, it should be that of protraying to the Canadian people the great need for a higher degree of transfer of powers to the federal government. Pollution does not stop at provincial boundaries, nor does it stop

at international boundaries. If the opposition is really serious about tackling this problem, they must agree with this. They are telling us that it has taken a long time to bring in the water bill. This bill is the result of co-operation and co-ordination among many governmental bodies. Anyone who has dealt with many agencies at one time is fully aware that it takes much longer to get business done in such a situation.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), and I pay him a compliment by referring to so many of the items he mentioned, talked about what the United States had done and the strong measures the United States government had taken. Surely the hon. member is not trying to confuse the issue. The United States federal government has been granted substantial powers to deal with these situations. Constitutionally speaking, the state governments of the United States are much weaker than the provincial governments in Canada. There is really no great comparison between the powers of the federal government in Washington and the federal government in Ottawa. I wish our constitution gave the federal government of Canada the strength and powers the government of the United States has today.

Matters of this type emphasize my concern over the jurisdictional conflict. We cannot fight modern problems with constitutional powers, some of which would be applicable to the days of the horse and buggy. I stand firmly in favour of constitutionally strengthening the federal government in Canada. Meanwhile, it is irresponsible to ignore the constitution and barge ahead holus-bolus. Such a procedure cannot help but create internal problems, and we have enough of those already.

Reference was made today in this debate to the peace, order and good government clause of the B.N.A. Act or the Canadian constitution. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) stated this provision was not workable. We realize this has been used in wartime and periods of crises, but if we are going to wait until there is a crisis to amend the Canadian Constitution, a crisis great enough to use the peace, order and good government clause, then it is a mistake and it is wrong for the future of Canada. If we are not going to strengthen the powers of the federal government, and if we are not going to use the elastic clause to a certain extent, then we have no other choice but to deal with many bodies. If this happens, it will take a lengthy time to pass legislation in this house respecting interprovincial-federal bills.

I wish to read again from the report of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works:

> Your committee also recommends that a centre or centres similar to the Canada Centre for Inland Waters be set up to centralize all existing and future federal research in air and soil pollution and to extend and speed up such research so that codes of standards may be drafted to protect the air and soil from pollution.

There is a lot of work involved in setting up these centres. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, who started off this debate today, said that nothing had been done about these recommendations to date. Our report has been in this house for three weeks, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member is complaining because no research centres have been set up. This government is swift in action, but projects of this magnitude cannot be brought in overnight. However, I gratefully acknowledge the indirect compliment to this government by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka in thinking we are so speedy in action.

Mr. Aiken: That was so indirect I did not understand it.

Mr. Barnett: Is the hon. member not aware recommendations along those lines were put before the government at least three years ago?

Mr. Hopkins: This is a good report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Barnett: Yes, it is a good report.

Mr. Hopkins: This is a good report and we commend it to all hon. members of this house. As I stated previously, it was compiled without bias. All that glitters in this report is not gold. There is one thing that concerns me and that is that part of the motion which refers to "other estimates relating to this department". Since Atomic Energy of Canada reports to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, it is related in that way to that department. I wish to again quote from the report of the committee:

> During its study of the estimates of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, your committee was informed that there would not be any "Canadian Produced" heavy water available in Canada this year. Your committee recommends therefore that the words "Canadian Produced" be deleted from vote L20 thus enabling the company to purchase heavy water from non-Canadian sources.

Why is there no Canadian heavy water being produced or available in Canada this

year? I wish to explain this fact, Mr. Speaker. I wish to quote from an article written by Robert Stall of the Montreal *Star* dated May 24, 1969. Before quoting I wish to say that we could have produced Canadian heavy water this year at $20.50 per pound. We require one million pounds. We will be paying $26.50 per pound to purchase this abroad. This water was not available by July 1, 1966, as it was supposed to be. The Canadian owned plant at Glace Bay, which was the great dream of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) when he was premier of Nova Scotia, has not to date produced one pound of heavy water. Yet it was to be ready on July 1, 1966.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The article which I mentioned reads in part:

In 1963 the Premier of Nova Scotia, Robert Lorne Stanfield, made a decision which was not one of his best—

Mr. Stanfield's idea in 1963 was to boost his humble province into the nuclear age. Nova Scotia would finance the construction and operation of a prestigious new plant that would produce the vital "heavy water" that must be used in various types of atomic reactors—

The whole thing started in 1963 in Ottawa when the Federal Atomic Energy Commission was shopping around for heavy water to use in its nuclear reactors. The commission sought tenders for a long-term contract to supply the product—and the Stanfield administration in Nova Scotia decided to submit a bid—

The details and extent of the loss are only now becoming apparent. Mr. Stanfield is now Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa and his expensive decision of six years ago is just that much heavy water under the bridge. Although chief interrogator of the government on all million-dollar issues, he has never asked a question about the Nova Scotia plant—

By October of 1963, Nova Scotia owned the majority of shares in Deuterium of Canada and, because of its new position, had incurred the $30,000,000 debt that construction of the plant required at that time.

Mr. Spevack says today that the 1963 take-over was in the form of an ultimatum by the Nova Scotia government. "It had to be done or there would be no project... Well, we agreed. We were assured that this would in no way alter our relationship with the company. It was merely a formality and we accepted it on that basis.

In the spring of 1964, Deuterium of Canada was awarded the federal contract. The plant was to be opened by July of 1966 and a price schedule was concurred in from then to 1982. Things looked very good for Deuterium and for Nova Scotia, the controlling stockholder.

Today, three years after the scheduled opening date, the plant is still not open.

Jerome Spevack has been fired as President of Deuterium.

The original $30,000,000 investment has risen to $110,000,000 and will go much higher.

And Nova Scotia today owns 100 per cent of the whole mess including, of course, all of the debt—

In addition, the technical problems make it virtually certain that Nova Scotia will have to invest another $20,000,000 into the plant before it can open. And, even then, it will be capable of producing only a raw form of heavy water that will have to be subcontracted out for refining elsewhere.

This is the reason we do not have Canadian produced heavy water in Canada. I make this clear because Atomic Energy of Canada is a federal agency and I do not want to see that Crown corporation charged with any fault in this situation. That Crown corporation was not involved in it directly.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, it is a great temptation to go rabbit hunting but I will not do that tonight. I simply say to the previous speaker that the events of this summer and fall will prove the point. I know the hon. member is a sensitive individual, and I know he will be quite embarrassed when the announcements are made that will indicate to the people of Canada, and in particular of Nova Scotia, the wisdom of the then premier of that province moving into this field.

Previous speakers in this debate have indicated the dangers of continued uncontrolled pollution of our rivers, lakes and strams caused by the inability of governments to come together and create a structure of rules and regulations establishing standards to regulate pollution. This governmental inability is one of the greatest pollution problems we have.

For a few short moments I want to turn hon. members' attention to the warnings we are presently receiving about the pollution of the oceans that surround us, and particularly of our coastal and territorial waters. In particular I wish to question the government's role in the development of international standards with respect to the deposit of industrial and municipal waste in coastal waters and oceans, and respecting the use of the oceans by governments as disposal places for critically dangerous forms of waste. In recent years the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations has warned that continuous dumping of this type of waste is having undesirable effects upon fish and other marine life. In very clear terms it has cautioned the entire world about the lack of international controls.

But before moving to establish international controls our government must do something to clean up our own legislative pollution. In recent weeks we have seen a startling example of what can happen when harmful industrial waste is emptied into bays and harbours. We can now be reasonably certain that the red herring plague in Placentia Bay was the direct result of the dumping of waste and by-product material from an electrical reduction plant. I understand that only swift action in closing the plant has saved the local fishermen from a worse disaster than the inconvenience of losing part of one year's earnings.

But how many other plants use the oceans and take advantage of the absence of clear and meaningful regulations to dump untreated or improperly treated waste? We do not know, for example, what type of waste is being dumped by other plants. We do not know in what quantities it is being dumped and we do not know how lethal this is to the inshore river and marine life. With the enforceable laws, regulations and statutes I suggest there is very little incentive to investigate these questions as they relate to the international situation. I suggest that unless investigative work is started now in concert with parallel effective remedial action—and I do not fear to make this statement because it is becoming increasingly obvious to those people who are expert and knowledgeable in this field—we will soon face a type of problem in respect of our coastal waters similar to that which we now face in respect of our inland streams and rivers.

• (8:30 p.m.)

A further indicator of our lack of concern about what we are doing to the oceans surrounding us comes from a report that the United States government or the United States army, whichever it is, is giving consideration to the dumping of world war II poisonous gas in the depths of the Atlantic ocean as a primary means of disposal of this now obsolete instrument of war. As I understand it, their present plan is to move the gas from its location in the heartland of the United States out to the Atlantic coast where it will be loaded on old ships and transported to the deep trench in the mid-Atlantic where the ships will be scuttled. Presumably the United States government authorities or the army people believe they will protect forever and a day the gases that are included in these disposal units. I wonder, however, whether or not even the depths of the Atlantic ocean will be sufficient to contain this poisonous gas. I think any of us who live on the Atlantic coast are well aware of the effect of corrosion, particularly in salt water. Any motion caused by the water, current or tide creates a very rapid deteriorating situation in the form of oxidation of the containers.

Surely if we are to protect the waters that surround us, and the fish that are in these waters, we have no moral right to take a calculated risk of this type. I think we owe a greater debt to the generations that will follow us and to the millions of people who are starving or undernourished because of a lack of a sufficient amount of protein than to even consider endangering the protein that is available in the sea. Just in the last few days we had a report from Halifax which came over the national broadcasting system concerning man's ability to convert the protein in fish into very tasty and edible cookies. We also know that some of the finest butter in the world can be made from the protein in fish. A complete meal can be made from the protein that is derived from the waste products of fish. It is not necessary to use the whole fish.

When we know that we have the technical capability to do this with the products from the sea it is inconceivable that we would even remotely consider using the sea as a dumping ground for lethal poisonous gas. I am afraid as time goes on consideration might well be given by the United States and other countries to even using the ocean as a disposal bed for the waste from fissionable material. If this is even being considered, then I must react with almost horror. It is regrettable if accidentally we create a situation where we pollute something to the point where it is no longer usable in its fullest sense or to a point where society can no longer take full advantage of the resource. But if it is accidental and from the accident we learn something, then it is understandable. But it is totally beyond my understanding that we would even consider using the Atlantic, the Pacific, The arctic, the Antarctic, the Indian or any of the oceans of the world as a dumping ground for potentially lethal waste products.

It is not our place to be critical of the United States. I believe, however, as a nation with a tremendous coast line we have a responsibility in this regard and that the government should speak out loudly and clearly. I think we have a responsibility ourselves to stop using the ocean as a dumping ground for

any waste products. We could set an example in this regard which hopefully the rest of the world might follow. The responsibility I believe can best be expressed by the government taking an effective lead now in this year 1969 in the establishment of a dialogue concerning international standards. Next year there is to be an international conference on this matter. But why should we wait until that conference? I direct my remarks to the minister's parliamentary secretary. Why should we wait until next year before establishing at least our own dialogue and our own standards concerning what we as a nation will do with regard to the waters surrounding our coast?

We are doing tremendous work in identifying the causes of and remedies for pollution in our fresh waters. We are doing this at centres such as Burlington, Ontario. Just this morning the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) announced the establishment of a $7.5 million institute on the University of Manitoba campus to deal, among other things, with our fresh water lakes and the fish that are in them as well as the marine life on which these fish depend. We have gone far; indeed we have gone to the point where two or three weeks ago we were told that at the Inland Centre for fresh water studies at Burlington they have advanced to the point where we can save Lake Erie and Lake Ontario from a fate I guess worse than death; that is, our tremendous bodies of water can be saved from becoming almost totally unusable by the people who live adjacent to them. If we are able to do this—and we are making tremendous strides—I ask why the government cannot move in this direction so far as our Atlantic and Pacific waters are concerned. We have at Bedford or at Burnside in the city of Dartmouth, one of the world's renowned centres for oceanographic studies, a centre for which the government had tremendous plans when it was initially established.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Somehow these plans have been badly sidetracked. There is a basic, trained school of individuals supported by the academic institutions at Dalhousie. They, in turn, are supported by a very viable fleet of scientifically equipped ships with laboratories and technicians. In short, we have all the ingredients to launch into an investigative program in respect of our salt water. So far we have not done so, and this is regrettable. The problem is worldwide and is international in scope. Again, I leave with the minister the thought that while there is an international meeting called for 1970, and out of this probably will come at least a first step in the establishment of international standards regarding the use and abuses of oceans and surrounding air, it is time the government pursued this matter. We must establish a dialogue in this country in respect of our own standards in relation to international standards.

I should like to ask the minister why there has been a delay and why there has been nothing done in this field? Why is it that it is always weeks after a problem develops in our inland bays and waterways that we try to settle down and do something about it? Why have we not established a dialogue in respect of doing something about pollution of our Oceans?

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): I am happy today to act on behalf of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro), in joining with his colleague from Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang) in asserting that our government has been far from asleep in the control of the quality of the Canadian environment. I do not seek to deny that there is a problem. That would be like some hon. gentlemen from a former administration who used to seem to think that there was no such thing as galloping unemployment in Canada—that was just a nasty rumour started by a lot of people out of work.

We admit there is a problem. Mankind has been taking the marvellous technical advances of this century and using them indiscriminately to foul, to both greater and lesser extents, the air he breathes, the water he utilizes for drinking, bathing and processing, and the soil from which his very food supply must come. We know that action is needed, and needed to an ever increasing degree, if man is to avoid transforming his own planet into an unlivable wasteland.

But we have been moving. The minister has explained what his department has been doing to ensure that our waters remain a usable resource for Canadians. Towards this objective, I know that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) has been exerting his best efforts as well, and I am pleased to say that the Department of National Health and Welfare has been able to assist in the battle. Because of its effect on health and on the use of recreational facilities, water pollution has long been a matter of concern to the Department of National Health and Welfare. The

water pollution activities of the department are carried out by the public health engineering and radiation protection divisions of the health services branch and by the medical services branch. The department works closely with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in these activities. They include advisory responsibilities, surveillance, special studies and research. The department also supports outside water pollution activities through its national health grants program. Close collaboration with the provinces is maintained in the conduct of all these activities.

The advisory services provided keep these people indeed busy. Departmental staff serve on a number of advisory committees and boards such as the International Development Commission technical advisory boards, the Atlantic Development Board's supervisory committee on resource study of the Atlantic provinces, the interdepartmental committee on water programs, Central Mortgage and Housing advisory committee on household sewage treatment units, the reactor safety advisory committee of the atomic energy control board and various provincial pollution committees. But the department's activities go beyond just advising a host of committees. There is an important surveillance function fulfilled. Allow me to cite some examples.

International Joint Commission studies currently involve the St. Croix river, New Brunswick, and the Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and international section of the St. Lawrence river. Measurements are made of physical, chemical and bacteriological parameters including turbidity, suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, nirtogen, phenols, toxic constituents, coliform and fecal organisms.

Another project follows from completion of a comprehensive inventory of federal facilities, where assessment studies of waste water treatment plants are being undertaken at five regional centres across Canada.

In a more specialized field, the department determines radioactive effluent discharged into the environs of nuclear reactor sites, through a systematic reactor environment monitoring project, including water samples taken near Chalk River reactors, the nuclear power demonstration reactor, the Douglas Point nuclear power station and the Whiteshell nuclear research establishment. Another task is keeping a regular check on potable water supplies aboard common carriers.

[Mr. Isabelle.]

There are also special investigations done towards specific goals, over a short period of time. I would point out that this often leads into a continuing surveillance study. Two examples of this are: a pilot plant project at the request of Prince Edward Island in Charlottetown, to develop an effective method of treating food processing wastes having high bio-chemical oxygen demand and suspended solids characteristics, and, at the request of New Brunswick, pollution assessment studies on international rivers emptying into the Saint John river—including the Meduxnekeag, Presquile and the Aroostock rivers.

This may not sound exciting, but I can assure you that they are vital to maintaining a proper audit of the health effects of water pollution, both immediately, and more importantly, potentially. Similarly unglamourous, but immensely valuable to the protection of Canadian health, is the department's research program. Current projects give an idea of the long range importance of these studies. To cite some, I would name the development of effective methods for the removal of phenols from industrial wastes; the development of effective methods for the disposal of digested sludge; the development of effective methods for the enumeration of bacterial pollution indices; the development of effective methods for the microbiological oxidation of specific organic matter; the development of effective methods for the isolation of salmonellae from water and waste water, and the development of Canadian drinking water standards.

But above the water, there is the sky, and the sky today in many places is not the pristine fresh blue of our grandfather's era. Each and every day in our metropolitan areas, the exhausts of tens of thousands of automobiles, the stacks of scores of industries, and the fumes of countless heating plants and units belch forth their smoke and gas into the atmosphere. Even the rural areas are not immune; pesticides used in crop control are not just harmless mists. The current debate on d.d.t. points up the potential hazards of even long used materials, let alone the numerous new products being introduced on the market annually.

We talk of the "big sky" but we must realize that there are definite limits to the amount of cubic feet of air that can safely absorb the junk, if I might use that term, that our affluent western industrial society expels upward. In the past, in many large cities intensive weather conditions of a special nature have combined with air pollution

to cause the death of literally thousands of people in a short period of time. Take carbon monoxide as a case in point. This is an extremely deadly gas, yet it is the major component of pollution from motor vehicles. The continuing growth of the automobile population means that we may be approaching a saturation point.

There are other groups of elements to cause worry too. Nitrous oxides are one; hydrocarbons are another. In all, there are certainly enough of these types of substances to impel the Minister of National Health and Welfare to seek new and positive action. This concern is not new to the department. As a matter of fact, it has been in the field for about 15 years. For instance, the department has for a long time provided consultative and technical services in the solution of in-plant air pollution problems as a part of its broad industrial hygiene activities. With increasing attention being given to the broader question of urban air pollution generally and its effect on health and on the economy, the department has been expanding its activities. The air pollution activities of the department are now carried out by the occupational health and radiation protection divisions of the health services branch. These activities include advisory responsibilities, surveillance, special studies and research. The department also supports outside air pollution control activities through its national health grants program. Close collaboration with the provinces is maintained in the conduct of all these activities, including in-service training for some provincial staff. In connection with I.J.C. studies, the department also maintains close relationships with United States federal and state departments of health.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Some concrete examples of our activity can be mentioned, such as the I.J.C. survey in the Detroit-Windsor and Port Huron areas on the subject of trans-boundary pollution. This work is carried out in co-operation with the province of Ontario. Measurements include dust-fall, smoke density, suspended particulates, sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, oxidants and hydrocarbons. Related meteorological data are provided by the Department of Transport. We also make radio-active fallout measurements on daily filter samples collected by a 24 station sampling network across Canada.

In addition, special studies are undertaken on the same basis as they are in the water pollution field. Right now, a general study is being made in the national capital region, and a specific inquiry in the same location is going on with respect to automobile emissions. On a larger scale, as part of the department's broader industrial hygiene activities, studies have recently been completed including load surveys in a smelting plant and in mines in New Brunswick; tests for toxic gases and solvents in the Ottawa area; dust conditions in working areas in Windsor; dust conditions in grain terminals; chlorine measurements in Vancouver and an insecticide study in New Brunswick.

Thus, over a year ago, the Dominion Council of Health, including all deputy ministers of health in Canada, passed a resolution in co-operation with the provinces, concerning the role of the federal government, in air pollution control. Among other things the council called for an effective Canadian network of air pollution sampling stations; uniform air quality criteria applicable to Canadian conditions; emission standards for industries and motor vehicles; research on the behaviour and control of air pollution in special geographic areas; as well as a model control unit to assist the provinces, on request, in handling specific problems which would serve as a means of training provincial air pollution personnel.

The federal government intends to respond to this appeal. Already a partial sampling network is in place. Data on smoke density in sulphur dioxide is being collected and published frequently from nine cities across Canada. This program also enjoys a cross-feed from the Ontario sampling network. Moreover, in the realm of training facilities we have established a special air sampling tower at the Central Experimental Farm in Ottawa. This tower is equippped with associated meteorological instrumentation in order to provide a testing and training facility as well as a surveillance facility.

The coming year will see a new offensive working toward a national standard of clean air, for the Minister of National Health and Welfare takes very seriously, not only his responsibility to preserve and protect the present health standards of Canadians, but his responsibility to insure that we are able to leave behind us for future generations the heritage of a better atmosphere than the one in which we live now. It is a fundamental part of our program to build a better quality of life for all our citizens. Thus, he will be

working very hard toward this end in close collaboration with his colleagues in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Department of Transport, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, as well as his provincial counterparts.

That, in essence, is the message. Action is under way; more action is forthcoming. The health of our nation demands control of air pollution. Therefore the federal government, along with the provinces, fully intends to meet that demand.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, we in this party welcome at least part of the motion of the official opposition, as far as the word "pollution". The wording of the motion could have stopped there and we would have had more than sufficient subject matter to keep us all busy for the entire day. However, the additional wording in the motion concerning Vote 1 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources allowed the minister, quite rightly, to deal at length with the activities of his department at present. It seems strange to many Canadians that we can spend so much time, attention and money on so many mundane things and yet through our governments, our organizations and our industries are unable to effectively deal with the problem that has to do with the survival of our own people as well as the survival of mankind as a whole. We worry even about deodorants. We worry about our armpits. We could well be running around with nice smelling bodies while we breathe in dirty, smelly air and bathe in dirty, polluted water.

It seems to us that our society has ground to a halt or a painfully slow crawl in taking effective action to reduce present pollution and head off future pollution. We are in a morass of conflicting jurisdictions, a multiplicity of departments, boards and commissions between and in the three levels of government. Departments and boards are all too often unaware of what each is doing and their responsibilities overlap.

I was quite interested to hear the elucidation of the minister on the activities of his department. We consider many of them great. We agree perfectly with and approve of the efforts being made in research into water pollution carried out by his department as well as by other departments. There is little or no argument from any corner of the house on the kinds of programs which he mentioned earlier. But he still evaded presenting the kind of effective action which the government must take to deal with pollution. One could even point out a few minor specific examples of instances with which the federal government could deal immediately.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro), and perhaps even the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis), might ask the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) to consider the sewage disposal units of Canadian forces bases. To be more specific I should mention the one at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan which, believe it or not, still has a separate sewage disposal plant that only gives primary, not secondary treatment to sewage, and dumps it into Moose Jaw creek after which it flows downstream to the city. Surely, it would make sense in this case for the Canadian forces base to integrate the sewage disposal system with that of the city near which it is located to provide a better treatment of sewage disposal. I suggest to the ministers whom I have just mentioned that they draw the attention of the Minister of National Defence to the situation at all the Canadian forces bases and at other federal government establishments throughout Canada.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) made a statement in the House of Commons on May 29 as reported on page 9203 of *Hansard* concerning the National Capital Commission and the development of the national capital in which he mentioned that federal assistance was part of a wider development program under which action would be taken to eliminate air and water pollution throughout the whole capital region. May I mention an additional example of a case in which action is required? The minister did not mention this in his statement and I have seen no mention of it before or since. I refer to the operation which goes on in the middle of the national capital. I have heard of no plans of a reasonably long range nature, ten or 15 years, or a shorter period if possible, to do away with the assault on our eyesight and the insult to our noses in the middle of our national capital. I speak of the E. B. Eddy Company. Surely plans are being made for the gradual removal of that plant and the re-establishment of a new modern one somewhere else in this area.

There are other aspects of pollution which I should like to discuss. The first concerns the heat pollution caused by large electric generating plants using lake or river water for cooling purposes and then returning it to its source. This was mentioned by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) in the course of his remarks. The heat picked up will cause temperatures in the lake or river to rise, upsetting the balance of aquatic life.

There is an article in the *Globe and Mail* of March 7 from which I should like to quote briefly.

> Waste heat from electrical generating plants, says Dr. John Cairns, Jr., professor of biology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, writing in *Scientist and Citizen*, is capable of polluting our environment just as surely as do sewage, industrial waste and agricultural waste... The main offenders are plants which burn coal, oil or gas to produce electrical energy.

What has aroused the interest of ecologists recently is the ninefold increase foreseen in the production of electric energy from nuclear plants which waste 60 per cent more energy than those using coal or gas, and since this country is moving toward production from nuclear power plants on a large scale, they are asking what is being done now in the research field to guard against this kind of pollution.

Reference has been made to herbicides and pesticides. What is the immediate intention of the Canadian government with regard to d.d.t. and the whole group of pesticides known as chlorinated hydrocarbons, the group called the dirty seven, including not only d.d.t. but its chemical cousins aldrin, dieldrin and lindane? A few days ago an article appeared in the Regina *Leader Post*. The New York *Times* news service reported:

> A few weeks ago Sweden became the first nation to declare a moratorium on the use of D.D.T. and its chemical cousins, aldrin, dieldrin and lindane.
>
> In the United States, the Michigan Agricultural Commission, following a government seizure of 34,000 pounds of Michigan cohoe salmon contaminated with excessive amounts of this pesticide, banned indefinitely the sale of D.D.T. in a desperate effort to save its fishing industry.

What action is Canada taking?

The two major kinds of pollution of water are those caused by municipalities and by industry. Many statements have been made about industrial pollution. While I have no desire to pick on any particular company I will mention one to illustrate that even those with the best intentions in industry end up by being incapable of dealing with the pollution of water and air to which their activities give rise.

In November, 1967, as reported in the magazine "Civic Administration", the vice-president of the Steel Company of Canada Mr. A. D. Fisher stated that industry had a responsibility to provide substantial capital outlay to effect its contribution to overall environmental control. He made this statement to a meeting of delegates to the Ontario industrial waste conference in Niagara Falls. The report continues:

> The Steel Company of Canada vice-president said pollution problems can only be solved through a directed and co-operative effort between industry, community and government.

He told the delegates industry should implement a six point program as its contribution to pollution control. The fifth point in his program was:

> Support with technical competence and financial resources corrective programs necessary for control of waste emissions and conservation of water sources.

What actually happened, Mr. Speaker? A year and a half prior to Mr. Fisher's statement, the Steel Company of Canada sought and obtained from the Hamilton City Council authority to pipe additional water into their plant, up to 45 million gallons a day. According to *Canadian Labour* of June, 1967, and no provision whatsoever was made by Stelco for the repurification of the water after use; it would be pumped back directly into Hamilton Bay, increasing the danger to the domestic water supply of that city and other municipalities.

• (9:10 p.m.)

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the same company carried out what it admitted to be intentional spillage. A short time ago the company whose spokesman, Mr. Fisher, laid down this six point program for industry, discovered that hydrochloric acid was eating away its boilers and pipes in part of the plant. They did not know what to do with it so they dumped it into their lagoon system and from there it entered Hamilton Bay. And the company is continuing to do this on a daily and weekly basis in spite of the assertion of its vice-president that industry should adopt this six point program to play a proper role in the control of pollution.

I am dealing mainly with the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River and the Niagara and

Detroit Rivers in the course of my remarks because, surely, these constitute an area which no minister can claim to be within provincial jurisdictions. Surely, these are international waters—unless the federal government plans to build partitions to board off the water in the middle of each of these lakes and rivers.

The International Joint Commission began its research into the pollution of Lakes Erie, and Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence River in 1964. It brought out an interim report in December, 1965 dealing with municipal pollution on the United States side of Lake Erie. It noted that 53 per cent of municipal waste from a population of 10 million people was receiving secondary sewage treatment, which was not too bad. Some 47 per cent of the sewage from that population of 10 million enters Lake Erie with either only primary or no sewage treatment. On the Canadian side the situation is somewhat better. From one and a half million people 79 per cent of the sewage receives secondary treatment, the remainder receiving only primary or no treatment whatever.

On the U.S. side of Lake Ontario only 25 per cent of the sewage from a population of almost two million receives secondary treatment whereas 75 per cent receives only primary treatment. From what little I have been able to find out in the last few days concerning the difference between primary and secondary treatment, I suspect that secondary treatment means they have taken out the smaller lumps. On the Canadian side of Lake Ontario the picture was again somewhat better; 82 per cent of the sewage from two and a half million population received secondary treatment, 17 per cent received primary treatment and only one per cent no treatment whatever.

In light of this, the International Joint Commission recommended to both the Canadian and the United States governments that appropriate action be taken by these two governments, in association with state and provincial governments, to ensure (a) sufficient purification of all municipal and industrial waste before discharge to achieve maximum possible removal of phosphates; (b) prohibition of the construction of combined sanitary and storm sewers and the initiation of programs of separating existing combined sewers and (c) an effective system of regular sampling of effluents discharged into these waters and their tributaries.

What has been the result, Mr. Speaker? Three and a half years later, namely last September, the International Joint Commission made another interim report, and sad to say the volume of sewage disposal has increased during this four year period. This means that the same percentage of untreated or undertreated sewage is still entering those two Great Lakes and three rivers, and this after four years of reporting to governments, federal, provincial and state.

Into the Detroit River the city of Windsor is still pumping raw sewage, although the city corporation has announced that a new and improved sewage system will be opened within the next month or two. The position at Windsor is bad enough, even though the population is but 300,000 people, but in the Detroit area there are over three million people. Detroit is still operating a totally inadequate sewage treatment system, possessing an antiquated plant built in the early twenties. Their sewage barely receives primary treatment, yet it is still pumped into the Detroit River.

As far as the Niagara River is concerned, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, but Niagara Falls, New York, is still pumping sewage that has only had preliminary treatment, which is just screening and which I gather means taking out the large lumps, into the Niagara River right across from the Brock Hotel. Only 8 to 10 per cent of the pollution of the Niagara River is from the Canadian side, 90 per cent is from the United States side. The boundary waters treaty between Canada and the United States specifies that one country shall not pollute the waters of the other. Both countries are continuing to violate that treaty. Hamilton city sewage system is providing primary treatment only, with no secondary treatment. The supervision of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, I am reliably informed, of Hamilton and other areas around Lake Ontario is inadequate. This is mainly due to the shortage of bodies and investigatory staff.

Pollution by municipalities is a social crime, a crime not only against nature but against future generations of Canadians. The cost of this kind of municipal pollution will have to be carried by the taxpayers in one way or another, since we taxpayers have been accessaries in our communities to the perpetrating of that social crime. The cost of preventing and overcoming this pollution cannot be borne totally by the municipalities

unless we are prepared to allow them 25 to 50 years to cope with it. However, we just have not got that much time. For it to be dealt with immediately requires massive provincial and federal funds and other kinds of assistance. All Canada will have to pitch in to help solve, and pay for the reduction and prevention of, municipal pollution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, may I have another two or three minutes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If there is unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I became so interested in what I was saying that I forgot the time.

May I conclude by mentioning a matter that has been raised so many times, namely the constitutional and jurisdictional question. I should like to ask the minister to read a magazine called *Civic Administration* for November 1967 which carried an interview with the former Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The headline reads: "I've said it before—it's not our baby". The article deals with water and air pollution, and so far I cannot believe that the present minister has that attitude. This question can no longer be a legalistic fantasy for governments of all levels to hide behind. It is strange how in some matters the federal government can act without worrying about provincial jurisdiction. The federal government has previously inserted itself into provincial jurisdiction, and I mentioned the Combines Investigation Act as one example. One can also mention housing standards under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as well as in the matter of fisheries. In this connection I ask hon. members to read the speech made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) last May 22. So there are lots of past experiences and present examples, and there is nothing to prevent future action. There can be federal intervention without hiding behind what I call this legalistic fantasy of federal, provincial or municipal jurisdiction. There is no reason why the same kind of federal intervention cannot be made in regard to pollution, whether committed by individuals, municipalities or industry.

I am not one of those who believe that air and water fall under provincial jurisdiction. Nor do I believe that they should. Our water, whether it be in Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia, belongs to all Canadians. As a visitor to Niagara Falls from Saskatchewan I am as likely to get sick drinking or bathing in the water there as any other Canadian, but it is still Canadian water. Water is no respecter of boundaries.

As a layman may I suggest that there are two facets of pollution that should surely come under federal jurisdiction completely and solely. I refer to air and water pollution. I submit that if this government were to ask the provinces for jurisdiction over this area of pollution now, they would get it. If they did not get it, I am confident there is enough awareness of this problem and concern about it in the minds of Canadians in every province that they would raise cain with any province that refused to relinquish its jurisdiction in this regard to the federal government. So here is another and final area into which the minister and the government should move. They need no longer use the British North America Act as one way of avoiding the exercise of their responsibilities and the taking of effective measures to control and prevent pollution.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, the motion under debate alleges neglect in asserting federal leadership in respect of pollution and criticizes the approval of the estimates of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources by the standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works. Those departmental estimates were referred to the committee on February 20, and the fourth report of the committee was presented on May 30. The committee was, of course, composed of members of all parties. The mover of the motion, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), is one of the Progressive Conservative members, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) who was the second speaker in this debate is an N.D.P. representative on that committee and I happen to be one of the Liberal party representatives. It is truly amazing how that report, which seems to be in such clear English, can be so misunderstood or misconstrued. One therefore questions the responsible attitude of its critics. The committee heard many witnesses. We took trips and examined many facilities and projects.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

We made detailed and exhaustive studies of the subject matter under debate, pollution, and we came up with a unanimous report. It was not a majority report, Mr. Speaker; it was one that was agreed to by all members of all parties. That took place only three weeks ago. May I now refer to some of the highlights of the report. I quote from the committee report:

> Your Committee recommends that as soon as possible—

That means as soon as financially possible.

> —the government allocate more money for scientific research projects that are now under way, as well as to continue new programs for the future.

That paragraph obviously refers to scientific projects launched by the federal government. I continue quoting:

> The Committee wishes to state that it has been greatly impressed by the contributions from the Canadian science community and commends all personnel involved in scientific progress in Canada on their achievements.

That paragraph obviously refers to leadership in the water pollution study. Another paragraph of the report read:

> The Committee commends the government on the establishment of the Inland Waters Centre at Burlington and the work being carried out there on water pollution research. We recommend that this be given full and increased assistance and that other complementary centres be set up where needed.

The hon. member for Kootenay West said that the recommendations of the report were good and he is still of that opinion. He went on to complain about lack of action and gave some examples of pollution. I do not quarrel with the stand he took on the deplorable situations he described, but each and every one was clearly of provincial concern. I suggest he would have been better to have written to his premier or he could send him a copy of his speech.

An. hon. Member: Here we go again.

Mr. Chappell: He also said that since the provinces had been in default in not acting, we, the federal government, should act. I point out to the hon. member for Kootenay West, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) that three weeks ago when we sat together drafting this report we said:

> Your Committee is concerned by increasing magnitude of air, water and soil pollution and the jurisdictional conflict which hampers the finding and the implementing of proper solutions.

[Mr. Chappell.]

> Your Committee recommends that the government draft a code of standards for the cleaning up of and the future protection of all Canadian waters; that provincial approval of such a code be sought; and that the federal government provide an enforcement procedure—if necessary by means of an amendment to the criminal code.
>
> Your Committe also recommends that a centre or centres similar to the Canada Centre for Inland Waters be set up to centralize all existing and future federal research in air and soil pollution and to extend and speed up such research so that codes of standards may be drafted to protect the air and soil from pollution.

The committee recognized that we had no right to invade provincial boundaries and close factories that are polluting streams or the air and this force people out of work. We all know that provinces have laws and that municipalities have by-laws. Four years ago we saw an example where a factory was polluting animals and milk at Thorold, Ontario. In that case the province found authority to act. In each of the cases cited in this house, in each example given, it was the responsibility of the provincial governments to act.

What is to be done, Mr. Speaker? We recommended that the federal government provide research. That research is now well under way at Burlington. As I understand it, this is one of the most advanced projects of its kind in North America. Already it is yielding valuable results to the provincial government and to United States authorities.

We went further than that and recommended that the government, through that organization, prepare a code of standards which the provinces might be induced to adopt in order to bring uniformity in this field across Canada. If the mover of the motion and critics of the government who spoke subsequent to him had been serious in their criticisms they could have made sure that the suggestions they have been making today were included in the report of the committee. They could have made those suggestions at the time the committee members were sitting together drafting the report. Or they could have introduced a motion, which would have been on record, to show that they did not agree with the report of the committee.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka asked today, "Are we going to wait for provincial governments to take joint action with us?". I say again that if the hon. member had wished us to rely on joint action that point of view could have been brought out in committee and suggested in the report. The report indicates no such thing. Moreover, I submit the report indicates that that concept

was rejected unanimously. Instead, the committee favoured research and persuading the provinces.

The hon. member also said that we must collect air, water and soil sample data in order to assist in the solution of this problem. If my hon. friend for Parry Sound-Muskoka had gone with us on the trip to Burlington he would have seen that that is exactly what has been going on for some months. There, they are carrying out the very research which he says ought to be carried on.

In conclusion I say, Mr. Speaker, that no single person and no single country has all the answers. If someone had all the answers I am sure all the rest of the world would quickly seek advice to solve this naughty problem. Frankly, every example of pollution mentioned in this house today has been of provincial concern. All have been provincial matters, the only exception being the Niagara River, which is an international matter.

Mr. Peters: That's right. Blame it on the provincial governments.

Mr. Chappell: I submit that the federal government has given strong leadership. We are well advanced through our research facilities in setting standards which we hope the provinces will adopt.

Mr. Speaker, because this matter is of national importance, because many hon. members from all parts of Canada wish to speak on it and because three times today hon. members of the opposition have gone beyond their allotted speaking time by obtaining unanimous consent to extend their remarks, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand):

That pursuant to standing order 6(5)(a) this sitting do continue until 11 p.m. for the purpose of considering the business presently under consideration.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those who object to this motion will please rise.

And more than ten members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker, I come from the southwestern part of Ontario. This is probably the most affected part of Canada from the point of view of pollution, chiefly because there is the greatest concentration of the population of Canada, in the area from Oshawa to Windsor. There is the greatest number of industries in that area and, oddly enough, probably the greatest amount of water considering the area is surrounded by the Great Lakes. Since there has been great public alarm, with justification, regarding the pollution of the waters in this area, and even the soil, this whole question of pollution is of the greatest importance and interest to the people in southwestern Ontario.

It has often been stated that perhaps the greatest problem we have in Canada is our outmoded constitution. That probably is quite true. This outmoded constitution has been used by this and other governments as a means of endless procrastination, for doing nothing and buck-passing. The federal government says, "we will have to talk to the provinces; we have to discuss it". This has gone on almost indefinitely.

Mr. Perrault: It started when your government was in power.

Mr. Nesbitt: There is that loquacious member from British Columbia! I hope he rises in his place instead of always shouting from his seat.

Mr. Perrault: Tell us about when your party was in power.

Mr. Nesbitt: Regardless of excuses by various levels of government, particularly this one, something must be done and done now. All the reliable authorities on the subject of pollution, water, air or the soil from which we obtain our basic foods, tell us that something must be done soon. Other speakers have dealt with other points. There are a great many matters one could deal with on the subject of pollution. I will limit my remarks to one or two particular aspects.

A few years ago in the city of St. Catharines there was a man who had a small business raising orchids. McKinnon Industries, a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors Corporation set up a plant there. Fumes from that plant destroyed the orchids. The florist instituted an action against McKinnon Industries which has the full power of the General Motors Corporation behind it. He conducted his case himself and was successful. It is a pretty formidable obstacle, to be faced with all the legal talent of the General Motors Corporation.

When this case went to the Appeal Court of Ontario, the florist won it again. He asked not

only for damages, but a permanent injunction. This case eventually went to the Supreme Court of Canada. The defence of McKinnon Industries was that they could not remove the offensive matters from their plant and that it would not be in the public interest to close the plant because the city of St. Catharines depended largely on the payroll from McKinnon Industries. The Supreme Court of Canada did not accept that argument and issued a permanent injunction. Within a very few days the noxious fumes, which the company stated they could not remove, were suddenly removed very quickly.

This is the type of activity that is going on in southwestern Ontario, and I am sure in many other parts of Canada as well. In my own area there are very large deposits of limestone. The Canada Cement Company has a huge plant there, a $50 million or $60 million plant. There are plants of the North American Cyanamid Company, Domtar and others. As a result of their processes, these plants emit quantities of fine dust. Houses all over the area in the path of the prevailing wind are covered with a fine, gray dust.

The people in the area have been complaining for years. The Ontario government has taken some steps in this regard, but perhaps not enough. The result is that the people in that area are suffering great inconvenience, hardship and even damage to their health. The trees are not green in that area, they are gray. They are covered with dust.

It may be said that the average citizen has a remedy in civil law. He can sue the company, as the man in St. Catharines did, but most people are not familiar with the courts and lawyers are expensive when they have to deal with companies such as Domtar or Canada Cement. The public should not have to do this. The state should protect people from this kind of activity. There is no point in the federal government procrastinating and stating they will have another conference. These conferences go on endlessly, but never seem to get anywhere. Something must be done immediately because many people are being adversely affected. My area is only one small area. This situation is probably multiplied 50 or 100 times all through southwestern Ontario. Some steps must be taken now. Certainly, the federal government has the power to take the necessary steps. This can be done by means of the Criminal Code. This type of activity can be stopped if it is made an offence. If no agreement can be reached with the provinces on what measures should be taken, the federal government, as the senior government of this country, should take the lead.

If the federal government does not want to use its powers under the Criminal Code, it can give very substantial tax reductions to processing firms so that this money can be invested to remove pollution that, as a result of their industrial processes, is going out of their chimneys. I am told by engineers that although expensive, this can be done. If the federal government does not wish to adopt the punitive approach, it can do something by means of a tax incentive. Most companies would not pay attention to any minor tax incentives. However, a substantial tax incentive would accomplish the required result. If that did not work, the government could then revert to using the Criminal Code. These are two suggestions.

There is no one in this house or in the city of Ottawa who is not familiar with the air pollution caused by that big company across the river, The E. B. Eddy Company. When walking to the parliament buildings in the morning, one gets the taste of sulphur dioxide coming from that plant. It is a great shame that our capital city should have probably the most offensive smells, if I can put it that way, of any city in the entire country.

I have talked to many tourists and visitors to this city. I have been told by them that Ottawa is a lovely place, but it is a great pity they can hardly breathe in the morning because of the terrible odours coming from across the river. This is largely sulphur dioxide which, as most people know, has a number of adverse effects on health. These are suggestions as to what could be done. The government must do something about them now. If the government wants to use the soft approach it can use the tax incentive method. If that does not work it can use the Criminal Code. Tens of thousands of people in southern Ontario are adversely affected by air pollution.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I next want to deal with the subject of noxious substances that are scattered at random around the country, of which d.d.t. is one. A pamphlet put out in the spring of 1969 by the Canadian Wildlife Federation, a very reputable organization, points out the possible dangers resulting from the use of d.d.t. I am not a research chemist and so cannot say, but all this may well be true. If what the pamphlet says is true, then certainly something

should be done about the matter quickly. The government should immediately institute research to find out the extent of the danger, if any, resulting from many substances that are suspected of causing permanent damage to the soil and water, substances such as detergents, pesticides and the like. The National Research Council is already doing some of this work and should be commissioned to do a great deal more.

As I recall it, a few years ago at the United Nations, Canada led a project to collect samples of radioactive fallout, to analyse samples of air, soil, water and basic foods. We even offered to do this for any other country that wanted us to do it. The necessary facilities were ready. I am sure that these facilities could be revived to test samples of soil, water and basic foods to determine what damage, if any, is being done by chemical wastes and detergents. I suggest that a program be got under way immediately.

The same thing is necessary with respect to the Great Lakes. The pollution of Lake Erie has been the subject of much comment. Some of the stories one hears have been slightly exaggerated, but only a few days ago I and my colleague from Halifax-Dartmouth were checking on a research station on Lake Erie. We were told that on one side of Long Point Island the water is quite drinkable, but on the bay side it does not test very well.

According to information supplied by the research station at Burlington, scientists have concluded that both Lake Erie and Lake Ontario can be saved if action is taken at once. The estimated cost of arresting pollution and giving the lakes a new lease of life is something in the order of $2 billion. This result can be achieved at that cost if work is started now, and within five years Lake Erie could be saved. Fortunately, Lake Ontario is not in quite as bad a shape as Lake Erie, but if there is much delay it may be impossible to save both lakes. These were the points that I wanted to make this evening, and as I know other hon. members wish to take part in the debate I shall sit down now.

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of participating in this debate which is mainly on pollution. This is a very timely topic all over Canada, and it is one that is very important in my riding. Pollution is a perplexing problem and one that in many ways is also very frustrating. It is frustrating in the jurisdictional sense in that the provinces have some powers and the federal government has some powers, but there is a great lack of co-ordination in attacking the problem. I hope that we will see a new major direction provided for the good of all Canadians as a result of the introduction of the Canada water act. The people in my riding will be watching this legislation with a great deal of interest. I am not going to speak tonight on the topic in the broad sense as I wish to deal mainly with a particular problem in my own riding. This is the proposed diversion of water from the Shuswap-Thompson River system into the Okanagan system, with all its implications for water pollution.

This is a very great issue in the Shuswap-Thompson areas. Never before have I seen the people in those areas get so worked up about a matter as they have about this one. And I say this is great because too often the silent majority will sit back and watch while an important issue is dealt with by the vociferous minority. This is public concern has been largely led by a group called the Shuswap-Thompson River Research and Development Association. I would like to compliment this group for the very fine work they have done and the very positive and objective stand that they have taken on this diversion issue.

As an example of the interest that the people have in this matter, no less than 15 groups made presentations on the subject when the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestries visited Salmon Arm and Kamloops on its recent swing out west. Some of the committee members said that never before had they seen such public concern about water pollution. Our main concern is not that our area is badly polluted and that we want to control pollution; it is more that the area is not polluted and that we want to keep it that way. The issue of the diversion started a few years ago when many of the people in the Okanagan became most concerned about their need for a greater future supply of water. Later, as a result of action in that area, an ARDA report was instigated and prepared by the provincial government of British Columbia. In essence, that report stated that it was physically possible to divert water from the Shuswap system into the Okanagan. This proposed plan would supposedly alleviate the water needs of the people of the Okanagan and ensure them of a supply for the future. Further, because of pollution problems in the Okanagan, it was also hoped that the increased water supply would flush out some of the pollution.

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

The people in the Shuswap-Thompson area are not looking at the matter from an isolationist point of view. They are not isolationists. They believe in the development of resources to the fullest, and that there should be sharing of resources for the benefit of all our people. But a resource should not be tampered with in a way to benefit one group of people and take benefits away from another.

Some of the objections to the proposed diversion from many of the groups are:

(1) Concern that diverting Shuswap water to the Okanagan and thus into the Columbia system could in some respects lead to international control of the Shuswap, Thompson and Fraser rivers. Many feel that the international ramifications of such a project should be fully studied.

(2) Many people have pointed out that the study done by ARDA is too narrow because it deals only in a physical sense with the diversion of water from one area to another without assessing all of the implications in all of the areas concerned. Another important point is that once water has been diverted and committed to the well-being of thousands of people it is very difficult to uncommit it.

For a few moments I would like to deal with the importance of the water resource in the Shuswap-Thompson area. It has been said many times, and I think hon. members who have seen the area will agree, that it is one of the most beautiful vacation spots in the country. It has many lakes that are beautiful and important, but one of the most important in the whole system is Shuswap Lake itself.

Thousands of tourists visit the area each summer. We will have even more tourists this year as a result of the opening of the new Yellowhead highway. There are some 700 to 1,000 miles of good beaches along the Shuswap lakes, much of them taken up by cottage owners, and with some allocated for public use. Any appreciable change in the water levels of these lakes could greatly damage this most important industry and start a pollution problem, that is now non-existent, through increased silt deposit and lack of flushing action which is presently afforded every year by an abundant passage of fresh water through the system.

Another important resource is fisheries. The Shuswap river and its tributaries annually support 2,000 to 5,000 Chinook, 1,000 to 3,000 Cohoe, and 20,000 to 30,000 Sockeye salmon. Approximately 80 per cent of the Chinook, 30 per cent of the Cohoe and virtually the entire Sockeye population utilize the section of the Shuswap between Mabel Lake and the mouth of Fortune Creek. Adult migration commences in July and continues until November. Spawning is confined primarily to September and October. Following incubation, the young fish emerge from the spawning gravel in April and May.

[Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo).]

• (9:50 p.m.)

Chinook and Cohoe fry remain in the river throughout the year and or migrate downstream soon after emergence from the spawning gravel to take up residence in the lower river and lakes. Sockeye fry migrate to lake rearing areas immediately upon emergence from the spawning gravel. Sockeye, Cohoe and an undetermined portion of the Chinook salmon juveniles maintain fresh water residence until the following spring whereupon they migrate seaward coincident with the annual fry migration.

The observed distribution of spawning salmon in the Shuswap River reveals that the entire spawning population must traverse the section of river occupied by either of the proposed diversion dams, and those fish destined for spawning areas tributary to Mabel Lake must pass the Mabel Lake storage dam site. Conversely, the entire downstream migrant population must pass through the diversion dam area. Thus there is the problem of adult fish passage over the dams as well as the more complex problem of preventing downstream migrants from entering the gravity canal or pumphouses. It is also apparent from the outset that the low velocity impoundments resulting from dam construction will effectively eliminate spawning areas currently utilized by a small percentage of the Chinook and Sockeye salmon populations.

Agriculture is the third resource in my riding that could be detrimentally affected by the diversion. The cattle population of British Columbia is up to some 400,000 during peak times of the year and Kamloops is the centre of the ranching industry in the province. In our type of climate one of the most important limiting factors in the ranching industry is the provision of adequate winter feed. I do not think I need tell you how important water is in an area that has a total annual precipitation of about 9.5 inches. Alfalfa hay is the most important cattle feed grown in the area. Under irrigation, which most of the ranchers are now using, we can usually cut three crops and obtain up to six tons per acre of hay on a dry matter basis. On dry land we

can generally take off one good crop and if we are lucky get up to two tons of hay per acre.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been rambling a little bit and I hope that I have not abused your goodwill in taking too much latitude in my remarks. But I thought it was most important that I set the stage as to how this diversion ties in with pollution and how, in turn, it is related to many of the important resources in the Shuswap-Thompson area of my riding.

What are we to do at this point? I am convinced, as I know many of my constituents are, that nothing should be done to fulfil the water needs of the Okanagan until a comprehensive study is made of their needs. In this connection, I should like to endorse the first recommendation that was made by the Shuswap-Thompson River Research and Development Association in their brief to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. It reads:

> That no major projects such as the proposed Shuswap-Okanagan Diversion shall be carried out before complete comprehensive river basin studies have been carried out over the affected regions—including ecological studies of recognized scope and depth and widely ranging cost-benefits analysis covering all available alternatives and that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry for Canada shall take immediate, strong action to make this mandatory in all salmon spawning waters to stop the piecemeal destruction of salmon spawning and rearing habitat.

I understand that discussions are now going on between the water resources people in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the water resources branch of the provincial government in British Columbia on the terms of reference and conditions for such a study. I hope that the minister will soon announce that the agreement has been consummated with the province of British Columbia. I hope, too, that some of the things the comprehensive study would determine or estimate are: First, the short and long term agricultural requirements for water in the Shuswap, Thompson and Okanagan areas. Second, the short and long term industrial water requirements of these areas. Third, a definition of the parameters of any water pollution problem in the area with suggestions for its control.

I know time is limited and that other members would like to make some remarks. I am glad to have had the opportunity to make these few remarks.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): There are only five minutes left, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: You could have had longer.

Another hon. Member: We will sit all day tomorrow if you like.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could we have order, please.

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have dealt with the environmental crisis facing man, but perhaps I can summarize it by saying that man is living through an environmental crisis of his own making. My interest in pollution stems from the fact that I am a member of the Fisheries Committee, and certainly, like all members, am concerned about the problem. Sources of pollution of our waters, both above and below ground are wide and varied. Increasing population and industrial production lead to ever increasing pollution dangers in the face of a more or less fixed distribution of fresh water supplies.

Pollution has been around for a long time. The Romans were worried about it and made attempts at controlling it. We have a big country with a lot of water and a lot of air. But anyone who has smelled the river outside this building or has travelled down the Gardiner expressway on a still morning or who makes his living providing the country with herring from Placentia Bay knows what pollution is about. We cannot afford to sit back in confidence. We should count ourselves lucky that we have no Los Angeles where carbon dioxide levels are 10 per cent higher than normal. We cannot afford to be complacent. There are many areas I could mention. Many have already been discussed.

Let us, however, take a brief look at fishing. Forest spraying in New Brunswick has led to observations of fish mortality from 50 per cent to 98 per cent. Pollution has seriously affected shellfish beds. It is estimated that 25 per cent of clam and oyster beds have been closed as a result of pollution which has made them unfit for consumption. It becomes a vicious circle. Pollution leads to higher costs for everyone. Fish processing plants have been forced to bring in water from far out to sea because of local pollution. The Atlantic Development Board has subsidized operations such as this.

Let us look at a related problem, that of the fresh water fisheries. There are many lines

we can follow here. The problem of pollution for the commercial fishermen of our big lakes needs no elaboration. We cherish our heritage of outdoor life and recreation. But who enjoys fishing in water he cannot bear to smell? These are the hidden costs which government must weigh and act upon. I could speak of agriulture. Since agriculture by its very nature uses more ground water than other sectors, ground water pollution is our biggest concern here. What does it cost in terms of lost production? I do not know, but I know there are costs involved. I could elaborate. I am going through my pages rapidly.

Mr. Perrault: Just ask for extra time. Your boys will support you here.

Mr. Comeau: Who is that hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I won't mention him.

Mr. Perrault: Don't be muzzled by your leader.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty pursuant to Section 11 of Standing order 58 to advise the house that the consideration of the motion is deemed to have expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether anyone on the government side of the house could give the order of business, so that we might terminate the week in an orderly and sensible manner.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the week will be terminated in an orderly and sensible way will depend on whether or not the opposition acts in a responsible way. Very reasonable suggestions have been made to the opposition members.

In case hon. members are interested, on Thursday we will call item 84, Bill C-202 in respect of incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities. This will be followed by item No. 90, Bill C-207 in respect of the Atlantic Transportation Assistance Act.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[Mr. Comeau.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—COURTENAY, B.C. LETTER CARRIER SERVICE

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not see the President of the Treasury Board here. I should like to know whether there is anybody authorized to speak on his behalf before I continue.

Mr. Forest: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I asked the President of The Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) when the government intends to lift the freeze so the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) can get on with the business of establishing a letter carrier service in the city of Courtenay. This question to the President of the Treasury Board arose from an earlier question I had addressed to the Postmaster General and which became the subject matter of one of these late evening discussions between the Minister of Communications and myself. On May 16 I was informed by the minister in his reply that on March 1, 1968, a well known economy drive was launched by the government of the day and a freeze was instituted in virtually all of the departments in an attempt to limit spending and reduce the burden of the taxpayers who, incidentally, are the electors of hon. members opposite as well as of members on this side of the house.

The minister went on to say that as a result, Courtenay is one of 24 communities where letter carrier service is justified under our criteria, but where for lack of funds the government could not introduce it until such time as the freeze was lifted.

I submitted my question to the President of the Treasury Board and claimed that it clearly arose from the answer given me by the Minister of Communications. Incidentally, the reply he gave indicated that this question goes far beyond the question of letter carrier service in the one community of Courtenay, which is in my own constituency. In my submission, there is clear evidence of discrimination against the citizens of Courtenay as well as the citizens of the other 23 communities which the Minister of Communications indicated are involved. The answer given to me by the minister revealed that the solution of the problem lies outside the jurisdiction of his department.

This so called freeze is on all fours with something that was known under the regime

of a previous government as an austerity program. I refer, of course, to a government headed by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he was in office. I recall at that time how Liberal spokesmen in this chamber labelled the Conservative austerity program as an example of government bungling and mismanagement. I agreed with the Liberal spokesmen at that time with respect of what was done under the Conservative regime. At this time, I must say that these remarks apply equally to the administration which is presently in office.

About a year or so ago when we were discussing the estimates of various departments in committees the suggestion was frankly put forward that the hopes and aspirations of the department involved the development of a program on the basis of a five year period. I thought this was a sound attitude which the government ought to take toward planning and spending programs.

This question I have raised goes far beyond the question of discrimination against the citizens of this community of Courtenay in connection with letter carrier service. It goes to the very heart of rational planning and management on the part of the government. For this reason, I felt I should raise the question with the President of the Treasury Board. It is not good enough for the President of the Treasury Board to tell me that a treasury board ruling merely put a general ceiling on government departmental spending and that it is up to the department itself how it is going to stay within that freeze. I suggest that if we are going to have proper management and proper spending of public funds, it should be done without infringing upon the right of all Canadian citizens to the normal services of the government.

The Minister of Communications pointed out to me that this freeze would reduce the burden on the taxpayers and, incidentally, on the electors who are in my constituency. I submit that whatever the level of government spending, those electors are paying the same kind of taxes as other electors in the country, and therefore they are entitled to equal services under comparable conditions to those obtained by other citizens of the country.

I hope that the spokesman for the President of the Treasury Board can give me some indication as to when the government intends to lift this stupid freeze because I can think of no more irrational way of running the public affairs of the country than to indulge in this kind of unplanned chopping and changing so far as the spending programs of the government are concerned. The Liberal administrations have often tried to give the people of Canada the impression that somehow or other they are businesslike people who know how to manage the affairs of the country. I submit that if this government approaches the planning of the spending programs of this country in the manner that is indicated in this example, the people of Canada should no longer labour under any such illusions. I hope that the spokesman for the President of the Treasury Board can give me some indication that the government is coming to its senses in this respect.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Minister of Communications and Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) to answer the hon. member's question. It is seldom that the Postmaster General is not here himself to answer such questions.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood that the parliamentary secretary was speaking for the President of the Treasury Board and not the Minister of Communications.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is no point of order at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. Forest: It is the Minister of Communications and Postmaster General who asked me to answer the hon. member's question. I was pointing out that usually the Postmaster General is here, but he could not make it tonight.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a question of privilege. I addressed a question to the President of the Treasury Board and I do not want to be answered once again by the Minister of Communications on this subject.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I might point out to the hon. member that the practice at the hour of adjournment is not to accept points of order or questions of privilege.

Mr. Forest: I suppose that the question concerning mail delivery at Courtenay or communities in which the hon. member is interested is answerable by the Post Office Department. I wish to point out that the

minister has already answered a similar question earlier and said that the Post Office Department is unable at this time to consider extending letter carrier service to Courtenay or other communities as a result of the freeze on the hiring of new personnel. However, consideration is being given to providing some type of interim service from a number of central locations in such communities. A decision will be made as soon as a study of these possibilities is completed. I regret that I cannot advise the hon. member when the freeze will be lifted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A motion to adjourn the house is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Wednesday, pursuant to Standing Order 2 (3).

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BARNETT—COMPLAINT RESPECTING REPLY GIVEN IN ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege arises from the proceedings on the adjournment motion on Monday last. My name was listed for debate under the heading, "Post Office Department—Courtenay, B.C., letter carrier service".

Before debate commenced I drew attention to the fact the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) was not in the house, and asked if someone present was authorized to answer me on his behalf. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest) said that he was.

On June 10, I asked the President of the Treasury Board "When the government intends to lift the freeze". My question arose from a reply given me by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) during the adjournment debate, in which he told me, as reported at page 8815 of *Hansard:*

> Courtenay is one of 24 communities where a letter carrier service is justified under our criteria, but where for lack of funds we cannot introduce it until such time as this freeze is lifted.

When the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council rose to reply to my statement on Monday night he stated he was answering on behalf of the Postmaster General, and as reported at page 10579 of *Hansard* said:

> I wish to point out that the minister has already answered a similar question earlier—

This was a contradiction of the assurance he had given earlier that he was authorized to answer for the President of the Treasury Board.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while under the provisions of Standing Order 40 no minister is required to answer either on his own behalf or through a parliamentary secretary, if an answer is given it should be an answer to the question raised, and should be made by or on behalf of the minister under whose jurisdiction the subject matter of the question lies.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that he may have a grievance or perhaps a point of order, but I doubt very much that the point he is now making can be accepted as a question of privilege. In any event, since there is no motion before the house we will now proceed with the ordinary business of the house.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN THE SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF INDIAN LEADERS

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, before reading my statement, I should like to bring to the attention of the house the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a group of Indian leaders representing all provinces. May I welcome those citizens on the occasion of their visit.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place the government's statement on Indian policy before the house. The statement outlines the views the government brings to the consultations which must now be carried on with the Indian people and the provincial governments.

Throughout a year's consultation with Indian leaders, the government has reviewed its programs for Indians and their effects on the present situation of the Indian people. The review has shown that this is the right time to change long standing policies. The Indian people have shown their determination that present conditions shall not persist.

From the early days of this country, a trustee relationship of a highly paternalistic

nature developed between the central government and Indian people. The Indian people should have the right to manage their own affairs to the same extent that their fellow Canadians manage theirs. Under present conditions they do not have anything like this degree of control over their land, their funds, or in fact any of their responsibilities. This is the central fact about conditions today, and it must change.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Opportunities are present today in Canadian society and new directions are open. The government believes that Indian people must not be shut out of Canadian life and must share in these opportunities. The policy is founded on the belief that Canada should be free of discrimination. People must not be kept apart from one another by artificial barriers. The goal of a non-discriminatory society can only be achieved if many ideas change. Change must not be confined to the Indian people; other Canadians must change their attitudes, too. True equality presupposes that the Indian people have the right to full and equal participation in the cultural, social, economic and political life of Canada.

The government believes that the framework within which individual Indians and bands could achieve full participation requires the following:

First, the legislative and constitutional basis of discrimination must be removed.

Second, there must be a positive recognition by everyone of the unique contribution of Indian culture to Canadian life.

Third, services must come through the same channels and from the same government agencies for all Canadians.

Fourth, those who are furthest behind must be helped to catch up.

Fifth, lawful obligations must be recognized.

Sixth, control of Indian lands must be transferred to the Indian people.

The government is prepared to take the following steps to create this framework:

First, to propose to parliament that the Indian Act be repealed and take such legislative steps as may be necessary to enable Indian people to control Indian lands and acquire title to them.

Second, to propose to the governments of the provinces that they take over the same responsibilities for Indians that they have for other citizens in their provinces. The takeover would be accompanied by the transfer to the provinces of federal funds normally provided for Indian programs, augmented as may be necessary.

Third, to make $50 million available over the next five years for economic development in Indian communities and for Indian people.

Fourth, to wind up that part of my department which deals with Indian affairs; the residual responsibilities for the federal government to be transferred to other appropriate federal departments.

The government will appoint a commission to consult with the Indians and to study and recommend acceptable procedures for the adjudication of claims. The commissioner will be appointed soon.

I intend to meet with the executive committees of the Indian associations as soon as possible. I shall seek meetings with the provincial premiers or their representatives in early July. The department will immediately establish a unit of senior personnel who will have no duties other than to consult with Indian people, consult with provinces, consult with other federal departments about the means of implementation and the pace of it. This unit will also consult Indian bands to determine their views on control of their own land—complex questions which offer many alternatives. I hope that we can end the single, separate service agency within five years. I hope the Indian people will agree that this system which sets them apart is no longer useful. This will be the first goal of the implementation group.

The policy proposal will be referred to the Standing Committee of the house where it can be fully discussed. I seek the support of the house for the aims of the policy. I seek the good will, the support and the energy of the Indian people. I seek the support of all Canadians. I seek the co-operation of the provincial governments.

Finally, I want to thank my department, which has supported me in this policy completely and enthusiastically since its inception.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his courtesy in sending me within reasonable time notice that he would be making a statement, and the copy of the statement which accompanied that notice. I hope this permits me to make a reply, keeping well within the framework of the injunction Your Honour laid down the other day.

I thank the minister for the statement he has made. There was a reminiscent tone to it. I recall during the last years of administration under the leadership of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) that a joint committee studied this issue. The wording of the report of that committee dealt with the winds of change which were blowing through the ranks of the Indian people of Canada. Many of the thoughts which the minister expressed in his statement were good thoughts, repeating the thoughts in the report of the committee.

We welcome the statement by the minister. It amounts to an acceptance of many proposals made by the Indian people through the years, and made by those who have worked on their behalf, in this party and elsewhere. As the minister made clear, it is only a statement of position and to a degree a statement of a bargaining position. There are a lot of "ifs" and a lot of implications. I am not offering carping criticism about this, Mr. Speaker, because the extent to which this will be successful will depend on the full understanding and knowledge of the problems which lie ahead that must be overcome.

There are at least two major constitutional questions. First, there is the question concerning an agreement of the provinces to assume the responsibility referred to. Clearly the provinces will not agree unless they also receive resources adequate to their responsibility. Clearly the provinces have not agreed and apparently have not been asked to agree. We must express the hope that the minister, by making his statement now, has not introduced an aspect of ultimatum and inflexibility which would complicate the transfer.

The second constitutional question concerns giving effect to any changes. An amendment would be required in due course to the British North America Act and we can only assume that the minister has some reason to believe that agreement could be reached on such an amendment. We hope this will be the case.

There is also bound to be apprehension among some of the Indian people. While the Indian Act and the federal authority have been unpopular, they have also been familiar. Their proposed removal will raise questions and concern about Indian lands and other rights. In some cases the Indian people may not welcome the prospect of having to rely upon provincial authorities. I note that the minister intends to establish what he calls a "unit of senior personnel", to deal with the Indian people and others on the problems of implementation. It is essential that those members of this unit which deal with the Indian people comprise persons whom the Indian people feel they can trust. It would be foolish and harmful to overlook the very real suspicions with which many Indian people now regard officials of the department.

I note also that the minister now intends further consultations with the Indian people. I was sorry that he did not refer to the representative committee established by the last Indian consultative meeting here in Ottawa, which sought federal financial assistance in order to carry out consultations of their own. I hope this omission does not mean that the minister intends to bypass this group, which was specifically chosen by an able and representative meeting of the Indian people.

There is bound to be some contention about aspects of the statement. For instance, many provinces might be reluctant to accept the proposal if the federal government would in time withdraw financial contribution to the provinces. That proposal amounts to simply transferring responsibilities without revenues.

The statement involves what would seem to be a limited interpretation of existing treaty rights, and a reluctance to deal with specific claims of aboriginal rights. There are bound to be some very serious problems about who has the right to be consulted and the fulness of the consultation. By and large this must be regarded as a welcome statement and a step forward toward equality for the Indian people of Canada. We assume it is proposed in good faith and not merely as a bargaining instrument.

• (2:20 p.m.)

It would be callous gamesmanship and a very real tragedy if this statement had any other inspiration than a genuine attempt to help the Indian people of Canada. We in this party assume that that is its intention, and we are prepared to help the government achieve the general goals which are outlined. I would hope that the matter would be referred at an early date to a standing committee of the House of Commons in order that the response of the provinces and of the Indian people involved can be known by the whole of parliament and taken as a guide to our action in the future.

Statement by Minister on Indian Policy

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, we listened with a great deal of interest to the minister's statement. Like the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I would like to express my appreciation for his courtesy in ending a copy of it along to me about an hour or so before the house met, thus affording members an opportunity to study it in a bit more detail than is possible when hearing it straight out of the blue.

As I say, we listened with interest to what the minister said, because in a sense what he was saying was exactly the same thing as many Indian leaders and people have been saying for quite a number of years, and in a sense what he said was a reiteration of what many of us in this house have been saying for the last five or ten years.

The hon. member for Peace River and I had the opportunity in 1959, 1960 and 1961 of participating in the Joint Senate and House of Commons Committee on Indian Affairs, to which the hon. member for Peace River alluded, and the report of which committee contained the same ideas and concepts that the minister has now outlined. Even though it has taken some period of time to get a cabinet minister to agree with those concepts, it is still welcomed.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that on March 6 we took one of the opposition party opportunities to institute a debate about Indian Affairs, partly to give parliament an opportunity to express its views to the minister, and partly also with the hope that any attendant publicity would give people throughout the country an opportunity to react to the debate and make some comments of their own.

Some of the ideas contained in the minister's statement are good. Some of them are not so good. A great many of them are rather vague. I do not say this in an unkind way, and I am sure the minister does not take it in an unkind way. Many of his comments must necessarily be vague, as he is not dealing with this matter in a unilateral sense but in an area of conversation and discussions with the native Indian people and with the provinces. Naturally he cannot have any predetermined position to outline to them.

For years we have advocated the necessity of discussion, conversation and consultation with the Indian people. We hope this will now be acted upon. The minister talked about transferring certain of the activities of his department to the provinces so that services

provided by provincial governments will be available to Indian people on the same basis as they are available to other people in Canada. This follows the concept of equality of treatment within the law which we have been advocating for a long period of time. We assume this will include educational matters, health matters, social welfare matters and similar types of services.

I submit it is extremely important that in the negotiations, discussions, or whatever they may be that the minister will have with the provincial governments, the negotiations or discussions proceed only at a speed commensurate with the desires of the Indian people in the provinces concerned. I hope they will not be conducted in such a manner as to provide straight bilateral agreement at the governmental level without regard for the feelings of the native Indian people. This is something which has gone on previously, and if I am not mistaken the minister himself participated in such conversations with the provinces without regard to the feelings of Indian people, and without consulting them.

According to the statement, the minister will seek to appoint a commissioner to work with the Indian people on matters with respect to treaties. I maintain it is extremely important that this commissioner, if it is to be one person—and I take it from the minister's statement that it is—or if it is to be more than one person, have an orientation towards international law, and not the domestic law that exists within Canada. I hope that these people or this commissioner will be people who have an understanding of the relationships between nations of people, because after all this is what existed at the time the treaties were signed. The native Indian people were grouped into nations. With regard to treaties I think the minister should resist any proposal to take those treaties to our internal domestic courts, because he would be bound to receive decisions that would not be based on a full concept of equity in international law.

The government makes passing reference to the very fundamental question of land in British Columbia, in respect of which only a few treaties and land conveyances are involved. Passing reference is also made to land as it relates to the great bulk of the native people in the province of Quebec, and the Indian and Eskimo people in the Territories. I think it is fundamental that some solution should be provided in this regard before

many of the other programs which are dealt with can be settled satisfactorily Unless this is mutually agreeable, the perpetuation of the difficulties will go on.

An amount of $50 million has been announced as being available for the development of the Indian people. I would caution anyone about accepting this at its face value because, as the minister knows, $50 million over a five year period is not a very large amount of money in any event. His predecessor in office a few years ago announced a $112 million five year housing program. This was fine on paper, but the previous minister of finance got hold of that $112 million program and, because of subsequent budgetary matters, sliced it until the $112 million program did not exist. Unless the minister can guarantee absolutely that he has this money to be used for this purpose over the next five years it is a meaningless declaration, because any minister of finance in any subsequent budgetary year can stretch it, reduce it or cut back on it.

The policy statement is a step in the right direction, but the old adage of the proof of the pudding being in the eating is applicable here. I think the success of this program depends upon two factors: It depends upon the continued acceptance by the government of the views of the native Indian people themselves because they are of primary importance; it also depends upon the speed with which the government puts into effect those accepted views.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like also to thank most sincerely the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for sending us, a little beforehand, a copy of the statement we have just heard with pleasure, so that we could study it briefly.

We are glad that the federal government is willing to transfer its administrative powers to the provinces since we have been requesting for a long time that the Indians be recognized as true Canadians and I feel that the federal government is now taking an important step in that direction.

After having for a long time attempted to administer Indian affairs, the federal government now realizes its helplessness, its incompetence and it is now asking the provinces to see to the administration of the affairs of Canada's first inhabitants.

I do not know how far those negotiations between the provincial and federal governments concerning the transfer of powers have progressed, but I would ask the minister and the government to be quite firm during the negotiations, in order that the Indians may obtain all the rights to which they are entitled.

I have reason to believe that some Indian bands are not too satisfied with the administration of a certain province, and we should be assured that the transfer of funds proposed by the minister would really be used for the administration of Indian affairs and not to fill gaps in provincial budgets. Therefore, I ask the minister to see to it that the funds transferred to the provinces will be used for the administration of Indian affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the decision of liquidating Indian affairs at the federal level will benefit the Indians, so that they may become real Canadians, acquire the same rights and privileges as other Canadians, and have the opportunity to improve themselves, to get an education and to own something, according to their initiative, competence and wishes.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

AGREEMENT THAT INTEREST RATES BE CONSIDERED BY STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions about the suggestion of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to refer the question of interest rates to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. If the house would give its consent I wonder whether the following could be made an order of the house:

> That the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs be empowered to consider the present level of interest rates in Canada and their relation both to rates in other countries and to economic conditions in Canada and elsewhere.

If there is unanimous agreement perhaps that could be made an order of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion proposed by the hon. President of the Privy Council. Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

Privileges and Elections

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

AGREEMENT TO REFER TO STANDING COMMITTEE PRIVATE MEMBERS BILLS DEALING WITH ELECTION MATTERS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that earlier in the session certain private members bills which referred to the general subject matter of elections were not proceeded with, but that the subject matter thereof was referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. It seems equitable that other private members' public bills in the names of hon. members that did not have the opportunity of such reference should also be referred to the committee. If the house is generally agreeable perhaps an order could be made in the following terms:

That, the order for second reading of Bills C-33, C-52, C-77, C-80, C-90, C-92, C-107, C-117, C-127, C-133, C-145 and C-181 be discharged and that the subject matter of the said bills be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Later:*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

SUGGESTION TO REFER TO STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT ON WORK OF CANADIAN PENSION COMMISSION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the general consent of the house to revert to motions in order to make another consent order? I believe that subject to the approbation of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe there would be general agreement to make government order No. 93 a consent order of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker I welcome the government motion that the report of the committee to survey the organization and work of the Canadian Pension Commission be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. It is our intention to dispense with debate. It is unfortunate that this was not done before, because a great deal of progress could have been made. We regret that the white paper is not ready. This is one of the reasons for the delay. However, it is likely that the white paper will be available by the time the committee is ready to deal with the report in September. I wish to assure the minister that the members of the committee from my party—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am wondering under what standing order the hon. member is now addressing the house. There was no statement made by the minister. The hon. member cannot have the floor at this time unless he has the consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member has the consent of the house, I understand that other hon. members may want to take part in the debate which would be initiated by the hon. member's statement. I suggest to hon. members that perhaps we should go on with the business of the house.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order Your Honour has raised, I understand that the President of the Privy Council used the word approbation and approbation has this type of wide interpretation.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There are negative responses; therefore, the proposal of the President of the Privy Council is not acceptable.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PARLIAMENT HILL PARKING LOT

Question No. 1,651—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. At what stage are the plans for building a parking lot on or beside Parliament Hill, construction of which was scheduled for the winter of 1967-68?

2. Has there been any delay in this project and, if so, for what reasons?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. A study for estimating purposes has been made for a parking garage located

on the slope west of the Centre Block. Feasibility studies are being conducted on two other sites, one immediately west of the West Block and the other at the end of Bank Street where a parking lot is now located.

Construction is not planned for 1969-70.

2. Yes. It was deferred from 1967-68 Estimates in relation to priorities for other projects in order to curtail capital expenditures.

[*English*]

RIVERS, MAN.—C.N.R. MISHAP INVESTIGATION

Question No. 1,882—**Mr. Skoberg:**

Has the Canadian Transport Commission completed their investigation into the mishap on the C.N.R. Rivers subdivision on April 28, 1968, where three employees were killed when the engine went through the bridge and, if so, what were the findings of the investigation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: The Canadian Transport Commission has not yet completed its investigation into the accident.

NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

Question No. 1,962—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many nuclear power plants are there in Canada (a) where is each located (b) what is the present power output of each, and (c) what is the power potential of each?

2. How many additional nuclear power plants are proposed during the next five, ten and fifteen years, where will they be located and what power potential is anticipated from each?

3. Is it the intention of the federal government to provide nuclear power for export purposes?

4. Is it the intention of the federal government to provide nuclear power to take the place of coal?

5. What is Canada's capacity, at the present time, to provide heavy water?

6. What is the government's program to increase the production of heavy water?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Atomic Energy of Canada Limited advises as follows: 1. (a) (b) (c): The following nuclear power plants are in operation with the power output and power potential indicated: (i) Nuclear Power Demonstration Station; Rolphton, Ontario, 25 megawatts, 25 megawatts; (ii) Douglas Point Generating Station, Douglas Point, Ontario, 210 megawatts, 210 megawatts (This Station is shut down at the present time for annual maintenance.)

2. The following nuclear power plants are committed: (i) AECL's 250 megawatt nuclear generating station being constructed in co-operation with Hydro-Quebec at Gentilly, Quebec; (ii) Ontario Hydro's 2,000 megawatt station being constructed at Pickering, Ontario; (iii) Ontario Hydro's 3,000 megawatt generating station being constructed at Douglas Point, Ontario.

3. No. (If by this question is meant the export of power plants, AECL is engaged in an export marketing program.)

4. No.

5. Nil.

6. (i) The government, through AECL, has contractually undertaken to underwrite the sale of all heavy water produced; (a) by the Deuterium of Canada Limited 400-ton per annum plant under construction at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia; and (b) by the Canadian General Electric Company Limited 400-ton per annum plant under construction at Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia; (ii) The government, through AECL, is constructing an 800-ton per annum heavy water production plant at Douglas Point, Ontario.

LOCATIONS OF HEAD OFFICES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 1,963—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many government agencies and/or corporations have their head offices in (a) Montreal (b) Toronto (c) Vancouver (d) Winnipeg and, what are their names and where are they located?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): (a) Air Canada, Place Ville Marie, Montreal 113, Que.; Canadian Film Development Corporation, 800 Place Victoria, Suite 910, Montreal, Que.; Canadian Livestock Feed Board, Place Decaire Building, 5250 Ferrier Street, Montreal, Que.; Canadian National Railways, P.O. Box 8100, Montreal 101, Que.; Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, 625 Belmont Street, Montreal 101, Que.; Industrial Development Bank, 901 Victoria Square, Montreal, Que.; National Film Board, 3155 Côte de Liesse, St. Laurent 379, Que.; (b) Nil; (c) Nil; (d) Board of Grain Commissioners, Grain Exchange Building, Winnipeg, Man.; The Canadian Wheat Board, 423 Main Street, Winnipeg 2, Man.

NICKEL BELT, ONT., POST OFFICES

Question No. 2,002—**Mr. Serré:**

1. How many post offices have been built in the constituency of Nickel Belt since 1960, and (a) where was each located (b) what was the cost of each?

Questions

2. How many post offices in that constituency have been closed since 1960?

3. Which post offices in the constituency of Nickel Belt does the department intend to close in the next two years?

4. Where in the constituency of Nickel Belt does the department intend to build post offices between 1969 and 1972?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Public Works and Post Office as follows: 1. Five post offices and one addition

(a) Location	(b) Cost
Azilda	$21,651 including land
Chelmsford	84,985 including land
Noelville	22,026 including land
St. Charles	26,498 including land
Val Caron	33,562 including land
Hanmer (1964) addition	16,350 including land

2. Four.

3. At this time the Department does not intend to close any post offices in the Nickel Belt constituency.

4. The Department of Public Works intends to construct post offices during 1969-70 at Rutter and Wanapitei, subject to funds being available. From now until 1972 the Department's preliminary planning includes the provision of accommodation at Capreol, Dowling, Garson and Onaping, subject to confirmation of requirements by the Post Office Department at the time of construction and to approval of funds by Parliament.

*SELLING PRICE, FORD "MAVERICK"

Question No. 2,060—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What were the results of the meeting between the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and representatives of Ford of Canada regarding the selling price of the new "Maverick" car in Canada?

2. After making allowances for exchange rates and sales tax, will this new car be made available at the same price in Canada and the United States and, if not, for what reason?

3. If the price of the "Maverick" will be higher in Canada than in the United States, will Canadian manufactured "Maverick" cars exporting to the United States at lower prices be violating GATT anti-dumping regulations?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as the answer to this question is quite long would the house agree that it be printed and the answer considered as read?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Serré.]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Scott, president of the Ford Motor Company of Canada noted that the price differential between Canadian and United States produced cars had steadily diminished since the inception of the auto agreement. He expressed confidence that despite certain higher business costs experienced in Canada, the price gap would continue to narrow as the economics of industry rationalization were more fully realized.

The suggested retail prices for the "Maverick" are United States $1,995 for sales in the United States and Canada $2,375 for sales in Canada. After making allowances for exchange and the higher federal sales tax in Canada, and allowing for the effect of dealer mark-up, a difference of about Canadian $100 or 5 per cent still remains.

For Maverick sales to be made in volume in the U.S. market the car must be priced competitively with other cars in the Ford range and competitive cars of other makers. Since the general level of prices is still lower in the U.S. than in Canada this results in a differential pricing situation between the two countries.

If the selling price of the "Maverick" in Canada were higher than in the United States, this would not in itself be dumping. Under the GATT code to which both Canada and the United States subscribed, dumping would only occur if the export price of the Canadian car, following adjustments for exchange and differences in quantities and other circumstances of sale, were found to be lower and, furthermore, if material injury to the United States industry resulted. Both the elements of lower adjusted price and injury must be present to constitute dumping.

PUBLIC SERVICE REHABILITATION TRAINING

Question No. 2,107—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

1. With reference to certain "lay-off" procedures designated in the *Canada Gazette*, Part 2, Volume 10 Extra, pertaining to the Public Service Employment Act, is it the intention of the government to provide members of the Public Service declared "surplus to staff" with (a) rehabilitation training (b) rehabilitation grants?

2. If the answer to any part of paragraph 1 is no, what are the reasons for not doing so?

3. Is the government considering the advisability of revising the legislation governing the payment of Unemployment Insurance so as to permit voluntary participation by Public Servants?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am in-

formed by the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Unemployment Insurance Commission as follows: 1. With reference to "lay-off" procedures pertaining to the Public Service Employment Act: (a) An employee laid off from the Public Service is entitled to all the benefits of the Adult Occupational Training that apply to any unemployed person. These include occupational training; (b) The Adult Occupational Training Act provides for training allowances. Furthermore, Public Service employees when laid off, depending upon their status under collective bargaining, are entitled to either severance pay or retiring leave. Most collective agreements signed to date provide for severance pay equivalent to up to 28 weeks' pay, depending on length of service. For other employees, there is provision for up to 26 weeks' retiring leave on full pay under the Public Service Terms and Conditions of Employment Regulations.

2. Not applicable.

3. The coverage of employment in the federal public service is now permitted, under Unemployment Insurance Regulation No. 70, for employees who have not been declared permanent. The advisability of revising the unemployment insurance program is being studied, and the status of employments now excluded from the Act will be reviewed as part of this study.

*CLOSING OF ONTARIO POST OFFICES

Question No. 2,288—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. How many post offices were closed in Ontario?

2. What number had rural routes emanating from each post office?

3. What was the average cost per patron?

4. What is the average cost for city delivery per patron?

5. What was the cost per patron when added to other rural mail routes?

6. How many postmasters were not notified of the closing of the post office and how much severance pay was required?

7. How many rural mail carriers received severance pay and what was the amount?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this question is also quite long and I wonder whether the house would agree that it be printed and the answer considered as read.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Forest: In so far as the post office department is concerned—

1. 144 since 1 April, 1967.

2. There were 32 routes emanating from the following 31 post offices: Clontarf, Corkery, Dorland, Fairfield East, Fallbrook, Halloway (R.R.1 & R.R. 2), Lonsdale, Rankin, South Monaghan, Wemyss, Anten Mills, Cresswell, Duncan, Dunedin, Rathburn, Riverview, Aberfeldy, Belton, Crinan, Eden Grove, Greenock, North Bruce, Ostrander, Pinkerton, Science Hill, Walkers, Alderdale, Eau Claire, Ice Lake, Ophir, Rydal Bank.

$28.03 per annum was the average cost per rural route patron for the 31 offices concerned.

$24.27 per annum is the national average cost for offices where letter carrier delivery service is provided.

$26.18 per annum was the average cost per rural route patron for the offices concerned.

All postmasters were notified of the closing of their offices and no severance pay was required.

Nine contractors received severance pay totalling $1,028.03.

CHILCOTIN, B.C., FORESTRY STATION

Question No. 2,338—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1 Has any department or agency of government built or otherwise acquired a forestry station or similar structure in the Chilcotin area of British Columbia?

2. If so, when was this built or acquired, what is its location, what costs were incurred, and what is its purpose?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,350—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Labour have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): 1. No, Department of Labour staff are designated specifically for public relations responsibilities which activities are carried out within the general program of the Public Relations and Information Services Branch made up of 22 officers and 34 support staff.

2. It is not possible to specifically identify public relations expenditures.

Questions

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,360—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. The Department of Manpower and Immigration does not employ public relations officers as such. It employs Information Service Officers some of whom perform public relations activities as part of their duties.

2. 1966-67, $100,496; 1967-68, $149,156; 1968-69, $142,912.

COST OF NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING

Question No. 2,362—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Is it considered the construction of the Northumberland Strait Crossing would be more expensive than the continuation of the present ferry system and the maintenance or improvement of present levels of service?

2. Was this view held by the government in 1965?

3. If not, what factors have changed the opinion of the government in this regard?

4. What plans are there for the future use of the Causeway approaches already constructed, how much did they cost, have they been completed and, if not, when is it expected they will be completed?

5. Will technical information, engineering studies, models, etc., be made available to the Government of Prince Edward Island with respect to the Northumberland Strait Crossing?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, on the basis of discounted cash flows to 1968 for a 30-year period.

2. No, in 1965 the estimated cost of the crossing for rail and highway traffic was substantially less than present estimates.

3. Answered in 2.

4. The crossing approaches have cost $5.5 million. The construction on the Prince Edward Island side will be used to carry traffic to the ferry and will be completed in 1969. The construction in New Brunswick will not be used.

5. Technical information will be made available if requested by the government of Prince Edward Island.

[Mr. McNulty.]

USE OF UNEMPLOYED IN AREA DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,368—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. Is it the governments intention to initiate a policy of using the unemployed for the development of certain areas of Canada?

2. If so, what is such policy?

3. How many unemployed people would the government expect to employ?

4 If this policy is already being carried out, what regions have received benefits from such policy and how many unemployed people have benefitted from such policy?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. and 2. No. However, the Government maintains Canada Manpower Centres throughout Canada which provide general counselling, placement, training, mobility and other employment related services to employed and unemployed workers.

3. and 4. Not applicable.

GRANTS TO CANADIAN VICKERS

Question No. 2,371—**Mr. Skoberg:**

For each of the fiscal years 1955-56, 1958-59, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70, what have been the federal government's financial grants, subsidies or incentives to Canadian Vickers Limited of Montreal regarding the construction of marine vessels?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The following subsidies were paid to Canadian Vickers Limited under the Ship Construction Assistance Regulations and the Ship Construction Subsidy Regulations: 1955-56, Nil; 1958-59, Nil; 1961-62, Nil; 1962-63, $253,361.71; 1963-64, $1,099,100.00; 1964-65, $1,125,467.99; 1965-66, $2,303,671.96; 1966-67, $5,258,327.20; 1967-68, $2,850,537.80; 1968-69, $532,739.00; 1969-70, Nil; Total, $13,423,205.66.

TRADE WITH MAINLAND CHINA

Question No. 2,373—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What amount of import and export trade did Canada have with the Peoples' Republic of China in each of the years from 1958 to 1968?

2. What amount of cultural contact or exchange has Canada had with the Peoples' Republic of China in each of the years from 1958 to 1968?

3. What immediate programmes are presently being planned or implemented with regard to cultural exchange and contact with the Peoples' Republic of China?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as follows: 1. Canada's import and export trade with the Peoples' Republic of China in each of the years from 1958 to 1968 is shown in the following statement:

Year	Domestic Exports $'000	Re-exports $'000	Total Exports $'000	Imports $'000
1958	7,809	1	7,810	5,370
1959	1,720	–	1,720	4,840
1960	8,737	173	8,910	5,638
1961	125,448	–	125,448	3,233
1962	147,438	1	147,439	4,521
1963	104,738	–	104,738	5,147
1964	136,263	2	136,265	9,420
1965	105,131	16	105,147	14,445
1966	184,879	1	184,880	20,594
1967	91,306	1	91,307	25,074
1968	163,243	6	163,249	23,439

2. Since all contacts and exchanges in the fields of culture and education have been organized under non-governmental auspices, complete records on a year-by-year basis are not available. Contacts of this kind have, however, included a tour of Canada by the Peking Opera in 1964, an exchange program between the Faculty of Medicine at McGill University and the Chinese Medical Association, and numerous visits to China by Canadian individuals and groups.

3. In discussions with Chinese representatives on the subject of mutual recognition and diplomatic relations, the Canadian side has formally proposed that the further development of cultural exchanges on a basis of reciprocity should be one of the subjects for discussion. So far as the Canadian Government is concerned, no specific programs are yet being planned, although the Government is aware of some plans by groups and individuals in Canada for further activity in cultural relations with China, and is prepared to give any appropriate co-operation to such projects. Should diplomatic relations be established with the Peoples' Republic of China, the Government would hope that there might be opportunities for the further expansion and development of cultural and educational exchanges between Canada and China.

29180—670½

LANDING RIGHTS FOR U.S. MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,377—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Where in Canada do United States military aircraft have landing rights?

2. How many U.S. military personnel are stationed at these locations?

3. What is the total number of U.S. military personnel in Canada?

4. Are any members of the U.S. Armed Forces being trained in any way in Canada and, if so, what is the nature of the training?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Under the the authority of P.C. 2307 dated April 17, 1952, United States military aircraft may land in and take off from Canada and its territorial waters by making prior arrangements with the Department of National Defence.

2. With the exception of Goose Bay and Argentia, which are used by United States forces under other agreements, no United States military personnel are stationed in Canada to accommodate visiting United States military aircraft. However, such aircraft may land where some United States military personnel are located.

3. Approximately 3,800.

4. Yes, vacancies on Canadian Forces courses are offered to U.S. Armed Forces personnel as follows: National Defence College,

Questions

Canadian Forces Staff College, Canadian Land Forces Command and Staff College, Basic Survival Course, Midshipman Exchange Program, Maritime Warfare School (Standard and Advanced Courses), Aerospace Systems Course and an Instrument Check Pilot Course.

WHEAT STORAGE EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,379—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

How much has been expended for storage of wheat in all the facilities for storage, month by month, since the first day of January 1967?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Storage payments by the Canadian Wheat Board are not paid on a regular monthly basis and therefore it is not possible to answer the question in exactly the way it is asked. Total storage costs incurred on wheat by the Canadian Wheat Board in the 1966/67 and 1967/68 crop years were $29,583,697 and $44,389,454. Of these amounts the government paid $24,294,357 in 1966/67 and $34,979,633 in 1967/68 under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. The amount of storage costs incurred by the Board on wheat in the 1968/69 crop year is not yet available.

PUBLIC WORKS INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,423—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Public Works provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, expenditures detailed below:

Year	Cost
1959-60	$ 50,520
1960-61	52,306
1961-62	61,209
1962-63	78,239
1963-64	78,961
1964-65	73,943
1965-66	94,318
1966-67	126,512
1967-68	133,661
1968-69	111,813

2.

Year	Number of information sheets and press releases	Number of publications	Annual cost of publications
1959-60	543	5	$6,803
1960-61	477	7	4,494
1961-62	371	7	5,727
1962-63	308	5	5,757
1963-64	249	8	5,231
1964-65	285	4	5,243
1965-66	372	4	4,146
1966-67	424	4	5,171
1967-68	400	5	7,070
1968-69	442	4	5,738

Cost of individual publications is not available.

3. The staff magazine, "Dispatch": a copy is provided to each employee, with additional copies for libraries, students, etc. mailed on request—total press run each issue, 10,000.

The Department of Public Works Annual Report and the Trans-Canada Highway Annual Report: 450 copies for tabling in Parliament; additional copies to interested organizations, students and libraries on request—total press run of each 1,000 copies.

A booklet "Seven Rideau Gate" was produced in 1967 for visiting guests—press run 1,500 copies. This and a number of other booklets, produced several years ago, are distributed on request, chiefly to students.

YUKON TERRITORY—RAILWAY TO WATSON LAKE

Question No. 2,425—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. Does the government intend to build a railway to Watson Lake, Yukon Territory, in the near future?

2. If so (a) when will the work begin (b) when will it be completed?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. No plans exist to build a railway to Watson Lake at this time.

2. An economic feasibility study and technical feasibility studies are currently being undertaken which will indicate when or if the railroad should be built to the Yukon.

FLYING PAY TO PILOTS

Question No. 2,464—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Is it the federal government's intention to continue to pay pilots "flying pay" when they perform administrative duties primarily?

2. Is it the federal government's intention that those in the Canadian Forces performing the same function with the same rank receive the same pay regardless of qualifications?

3. How many officers formerly RCAF aircrew, without university degrees, are there in the Canadian Forces and how many are there in each Officer rank and how many of them are not on flying duty per se?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. See reply to your question number 1554, *Hansard* dated 10 March, 1969, page 6388.

2. It is difficult to determine what is meant by qualification and its relation to entitlement to a specific rate of pay and the function being performed. Circumstances of employment must also be considered. Where the employment is to gain further experience and a wider knowledge of administration and organization, then it is possible that although of the same rank and performing the same function, the rate of pay may not be the same because of qualification. However, where qualification is not a determining factor for entitlement to a specific rate of pay, the pay is the same for the same rank performing the same function.

3. 3114 as follows: LGEN, 1; MGEN, 5; BGEN, 16; COL, 67; LCOL, 182; MAJ, 479; CAPT, 2168; LT, 196.

Of this number, 689 are not on flying duties per se.

SURVEY RESPECTING DEMAND FOR UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Question No. 2,469—**Mr. Rose:**

1. With reference to the statement of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration recorded at page 8783 of *Hansard* that "We do not believe that Canada itself will be able until 1972 to supply the demand for university teachers in this country", what surveys or projections led to such a conclusion?

2. If copies of any such surveys, statistics or projections are in the possession of the government, will they be Tabled in the House?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. My statement of May 16 regarding the ability of Canada itself to fill the demand for university teachers was based on an initial evaluation made by officers of my Department of data produced by the National Research Council. This material originally appeared some time ago, but recently was reproduced in the Macdonald Report to the Science Council, Graduate Students and Faculty Resources of Canadian Universities and Colleges.

The data to which I refer appears in Tables 4 and 5 of the report. These Tables projected the demand for, and supply of, new university teachers in Canada and show us as meeting the demand from our own resources by 1970-71 on the basis of an assumed 4 per cent turnover of academic staff.

The initial view of my officers, to which they still hold, was that the estimated supply was somewhat overstated because it included a large number of doctoral candidates who are neither Canadians nor landed immigrants and who would not normally obtain academic posts in Canada.

At the same time, it was felt that the projected size of the Ph. D. graduating class was somewhat high; this too would affect the predicted number of new doctorates available to enter university teaching. It has turned out, for example, that whereas the report estimated the 1967-68 Ph.D. graduating class at 1,245, the actual figure as subsequently reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was 1,006.

2. See first paragraph of "1" above.

VETERANS AFFAIRS PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,487—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

Questions

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Yes; twelve.

2. 1960-61, $29,571; 1961-62, $34,435; 1962-63, $65,848; 1963-64, $95,329; 1964-65, $69,567; 1965-66, $69,419; 1966-67, $103,947; 1967-68, $327,798; 1968-69, $117,427.

PARTICIPANTS IN BUDGET PREPARATION

Question No. 2,495—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Were there any individuals not in the Public Service of Canada who participated in the preparation of the June Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance?

2. If so, who are these individuals and what was their remuneration?

3. When did these individuals participate in the preparation for the Budget?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. No.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

LIVE TURKEY IMPORTS

Question No. 2,496—**Mr. McKinley:**

1. What is the total, in pounds, of live poultry, including turkey imported into Canada in the period from January 1, 1968 until May 31, 1969 inclusive?

2. (a) What was the total, in pounds, of broilers imported in this period (b) what was the total, in pounds, of fowl imported in this period (c) what was the total, in pounds, of turkeys imported in this period (d) what was the total, in pounds, of dressed or eviscerated poultry, including turkey imported into Canada, in the period from January 1, 1968 until May 31, 1969 inclusive?

3. What was the total pounds imported by months?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1. The number of live poultry, including turkey, imported into Canada, January 1, 1968 to April 30, 1969 inclusive was 2,701,307. Statistics on number of pounds of live poultry imported are not available.

2. Import statistics, January 1, 1968 to May 31, 1969 inclusive are as follows: Poultry, fresh or frozen N.E.S., 1,399,700 lbs.; Turkeys, fresh or frozen, 896,100 lbs.; Chicken, cut-up, fresh or frozen, 2,066,200 lbs.; Chickens eviscerated fresh or frozen N.E.S., 3,868,500 lbs.

Note: No breakdown for broilers. N.E.S.—not elsewhere specified.

3. Import statistics, by months (see attached table).

Month	Chicken, cut-up fresh or frozen	Chickens eviscerated fresh or frozen n.e.s.	Turkeys fresh or frozen	Poultry fresh or frozen	Total
	cwt.	cwt.	cwt.	cwt.	cwt.
1968—January	1,805	818	2,760	—	5,383
February	1,459	920	1,275	340	3,994
March	1,049	2,531	366	120	4,066
April	1,449	4,068	277	78	5,872
May	1,496	11,643	—	1,369	14,508
June	2,156	4,903	520	1,326	8,905
July	1,819	1,847	480	2,220	6,366
August	943	1,970	372	3,153	6,438
September	1,777	564	510	684	3,535
October	885	1,760	161	2,199	5,005
November	436	528	60	1,197	2,221
December	1,862	1,097	195	435	3,589
1969—January	729	3,174	746	49	4,698
February	1,027	784	390	295	2,496
March	1,039	860	75	317	2,291
April	731	1,218	774	215	2,938
Total	20,662	38,685	8,961	13,997	82,305

CAPACITY PLATE ON POWER BOATS

Question No. 2,501—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the intention of the federal government to require power boats and power pleasure craft to carry an official capacity plate indicating horsepower and load capacity?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Small Vessel Regulations, P.C. 1969-436, administered by the Department of Transport, now require that small pleasure craft, powered by an outboard motor or motors of 10 H.P. or more, carry official plates showing recommended maximum horsepower and load capacity.

CANADIAN FORCES ORDER RESPECTING PHARMACISTS

Question No. 2,511—**Mr. Marshall:**

Does Canadian Forces Administrative Order (CFA06-1) and specifically Serial 4 of Appendix 1 for pharmacists apply equally for all provinces of Canada for direct entry as officers in the Canadian Forces?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): The academic/professional qualifications for pharmacists outlined in Annex A, Appendix 1, Serial 4 of CFAO6-1, apply equally for all provinces of Canada. It was the intent of this order that all direct entry pharmacists must hold a degree in pharmacy granted by a university or recognized school of pharmacy. To clarify this intent, an amendment to this order has been prepared to specify the requirement for a degree. Applicants who do not hold a degree, but are eligible to join the ROTP, are encouraged to consider this plan for university training in pharmacy.

TAX RECEIPTS FROM QUEBEC

Question No. 2,519—**Mr. Laniel:**

1. What amounts has the federal government collected through all forms of direct and indirect taxation from residents of the Province of Quebec during the last five years?

2. What has been the overall total of federal government expenditures in the Province of Quebec over the same period?

3. How is that total distributed by categories; equalization payments, direct social security expenditures, etc.?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. This information cannot be provided owing to the fact that there is no acceptable statistical data or technique for reporting the amount of indirect taxation paid by residents of a province.

2 and 3. Information is not now available to provide an accurate answer to this question and the necessary expert staff is not available to undertake the large amount of work which would be required to gather the necessary information.

INSURANCE FEES ON APPROVED LOANS

Question No. 2,523—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What is the total amount received on account of insurance fee on approved loans made by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in each year since its inception?

2. What amount, if any, has been paid out of this fund in each year since the fee has been collected?

3. What is the aggregate amount of all N.H.A. loans covered by the insurance fee?

4. To what use is the insurance fee fund put to by the federal government and what income is derived from it?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. and 2.

Year	Total fees received Mortgage Insurance fund	Claims paid
1954	$ 2,389,850	$ —
1955	9,237,250	—
1956	9,839,746	—
1957	7,278,911	38,185
1958	13,816,071	62,130
1959	13,146,403	275,336
1960	8,456,279	1,496,596
1961	10,970,952	6,729,824
1962	11,576,518	11,619,161
1963	9,868,797	14,014,301
1964	2,063,480	14,731,488
1965	13,483,365	15,400,770
1966	14,290,873	10,372,977
1967	16,491,251	4,643,830
1968	14,640,563	2,101,655

3. Gross contingent liability to December 31, 1968, $9,429,745,000.

4. Surplus funds are invested in obligations of or guaranteed by Canada from which income of $44,059,673 has been received since inception of the fund to December 31, 1968.

TREATMENT AT NATIONAL DEFENCE MEDICAL CENTRE

Question No. 2,540—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What categories of persons are eligible for medical treatment at the National Defence Medical Centre?

2. What is the capacity of the hospital, and how close to capacity does it operate?

Questions

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Members of the Canadian Armed Forces, individuals with Department of Veterans' Affairs entitlement, and others who may be authorized by the Minister of National Defence. The latter are responsible for making payment for services rendered in accordance with Ontario Hospital Commission rates.

2. 326 beds. The hospital operates at 80-90 per cent of this capacity (85 per cent is considered full capacity).

LENGTH AND COST OF TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Question No. 2,543—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What is the total length of the Trans-Canada Highway in each of the provinces?

2. What is the total cost of construction of the Trans-Canada Highway to date?

3. What is the proposed expenditure to complete the highway to required width, with asphalt and/or hard surface topping?

4 Does the federal government intend to construct any additional links to the Trans-Canada Highway and, if so, where will each be constructed and what is the estimated cost of each link?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1.

Province	Mileage
Newfoundland	565[1]
Prince Edward Island	71
Nova Scotia	278
New Brunswick	376
Quebec	388
Ontario	1,453
Manitoba	310
Saskatchewan	406
Alberta	333[2]
British Columbia	616[3]
Total	4,796

Notes: [1] includes 25 miles through Terra Nova National Park. [2] includes 51 miles through Banff National Park. [3] includes 64 miles through Yoho, Glacier, and Revelstoke National Parks.

2. As of March 31, 1969, the total value of work approved is $1,192 million of which Canada's share is estimated at $802.9 million. Canada's contributions to the provinces at this date were $756.3 million.

3. The Trans-Canada Highway legislation sets a ceiling of $825 million as Canada's contribution to the provinces. It is estimated this amount will be contributed to the provinces for work to December 31, 1970, the construction termination date under the legislation.

4. No.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

CANSO, N.S., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,545—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to construct a post office at Canso, Nova Scotia during the present fiscal year?

2. If not, for what reason?

3. If so, when will tenders be called?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Post Office will be accommodated in the federal building to be constructed at Canso this fiscal year.

2. Not applicable.

3. It is anticipated tenders will be called this fall.

CHATEAU LAURIER-CENTENNIAL CENTRE TUNNEL

Question No. 2,549—**Mr. Harding:**

What was the cost of opening up the tunnel between the Chateau Laurier Hotel and the Ottawa Centennial Centre for the Federal-Provincial Conference?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Cleaning, washing of walls, ceiling and floor, $290; Removal and replacement of temporary partitions, $7; Total Cost, $297.

*COST OF LIVING INDEX

Question No. 2,558—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

On the basis of a cost-of-living Index of 100 in May 1949, what would the index number be in the same month in each of the years 1962, 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that:

The movement of the Consumer Price Index since May 1949, with the indexes on a base of May 1949 = 100, would be as follows:

Month	Index (May 1949=100)	Percentage change since May 1949
May 1962	131.1	31.1
May 1967	149.2	49.2
May 1968	155.3	55.3
May 1969	162.6	62.6

*ILLNESS—ANIMAL RESEARCH DIVISION

Question No. 2,564—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. How many people working in the Animal Research Division of the Department of Agriculture were ill during the years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 and what was the total number of days taken off work to date?

2. Were any of the diseases related to the employee's work with the animals?

3. How many animals were involved in research and how many animals died in the years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture): 1. Related to Animal Diseases Research Institute:

Fiscal Year	People Ill	Days taken off
1966-67	121	1,529
1967-68	126	1,661
1968-69	143	1,395
1969-70	82	340

The above days taken off were associated with injuries, sickness and leave without pay because of sickness.

2. Yes. In 1967-68 two people contracted illness related to their work with animals.

3. In each of the past four years, approximately 11,500 animals were involved in research at the Animal Diseases Research Institute. All animals used in research projects are either sacrificed at the termination of the research project or used in other work at the Institute.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CONSULTANT STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

Question No. 1,121—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What outside consultant studies have been undertaken or are presently in progress sponsored by the Department of Industry for the fiscal years 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69?

2. What was the cost for each outside consultant study prepared for the department and was the contract awarded by competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

INDUSTRIES SUBSIDIZED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,204—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What industries are subsidized by the federal government?

2. What was the total amount of subsidy paid to each industry, by province, in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order in respect of question No. 1323. There have been discussions with the hon. member for Moose Jaw and I understand that he is agreeable to that order on the basis that the Department of Transport will not be included in the question, and that the question will be answered otherwise by a return to be tabled. If that is agreeable we can make that order on that condition.

CONSULTANT STUDIES—GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Question No. 1,323—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. For the fiscal years 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69, what outside consultant studies have been undertaken or are presently in progress sponsored by the following Departments and Agencies (a) Agriculture (b) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (c) Consumer and Corporate Affairs (d) Defence Production (e) Energy, Mines and Resources (f) External Affairs (g) Fisheries (h) Forestry and Rural Development (i) Indian Affairs and Northern Development (j) Justice (k) Labour (l) Manpower and Immigration (m) National Defence (n) National Health and Welfare (o) National Revenue (p) Post Office (q) Prime Minister's Office (r) Privy Council Office (s) Secretary of State (t) Solicitor General (u) Trade and Commerce (v) Transport (w) Treasury Board (x) Veterans Affairs?

2. What was the cost for each outside consultant study prepared for each department and agency and were the contracts from each department or agency awarded by competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

GRAIN—SHIPMENTS FROM PORT OF VANCOUVER

Question No. 1,846—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What were the total demurrage costs in relation to shipment of various grades of Canadian wheat to overseas buyers from the Port of Vancouver in (a) January and February 1967 (b) January and February 1968 (c) January and February 1969?

2. What was the total amount of wheat of various grades shipped from the Port of Vancouver in (a) January and February 1967 (b) January and February 1968 (c) January and February 1969?

3. What were the amounts of barley, oats, flour and oilseeds shipped from the same Port for the same periods as above?

4. What were the totals for box-car deliveries of wheat to the Port of Vancouver for the months of January and February respectively in the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

5. How many bushels of damp grain were dried at terminal facilities situated at the Port of Vancouver during January and February 1969?

Return tabled.

FERRY SERVICES

Question No. 2,014—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many ships does the federal government have in ferry service in each of the provinces and territories of Canada and where is each ship located?

2. What is the age, speed and tonnage of each ship?

3. How many passengers have used each ship during the years 1960-68 inclusive?

4. What is the profit or loss on the operation of each ship since it was incorporated into the ferry service?

5. What is the total loss and/or subsidy paid by the federal government towards ferry service in each of the operations where ferry service is provided for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

MUTUAL DEFENCE ARRANGEMENTS

Question No. 2,037—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. With which countries does Canada have mutual defence arrangements?

2 How many separate defence arrangements are presently in force and what is the nature and duration of each?

Return tabled.

HIGHER EDUCATION—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Question No. 2,073—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What was the federal contribution to each Canadian university and educational institution in 1968 and what was the total federal contribution to higher education, by province, in 1968?

2. What was the federal contribution to higher education per capita, in each province, in 1968?

3. What was the federal contribution per capita in each institution of higher learning, in 1968?

Return tabled.

VIET NAM—DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION

Question No. 2,190—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Does Canada give diplomatic recognition to any government in Viet Nam and, if so, which ones?

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

2. Are communications or other forms of contact maintained with any government in Viet Nam and, if so, indicate which ones and on what basis?

3. Which governments in Viet Nam does Canada not give diplomatic recognition to and for what reason?

4. Through which governments in Viet Nam has Canada directed its external aid and for what reasons?

5. What percentage of the civilian population of Viet Nam is estimated to have been served by Canada's External Aid Programme?

Return tabled.

INFORMATION SERVICE—SOLICITOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,195—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Solicitor General provide an information service and, if so, what is the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

REVENUE FROM NATIONAL MUSEUMS, NATIONAL PARKS, ETC.

Question No. 2,407—**Mr. Robinson:**

What amount of revenue does the federal government receive from (a) national museums (b) concessions in national museums (c) national parks (d) concessions in national parks (e) historic sites (f) concessions in historic sites (g) concessions in airports (h) concessions in railway stations (i) concessions in federal public buildings (j) tolls on bridges (k) tolls on roads (l) tolls on waterways, except the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Return tabled.

HOMES FOR AGED—LOANS APPROVED BY C.M.H.C.

Question No. 2,499—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. What was the amount of the loans approved by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the construction of homes for the aged during the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968 (a) in the Province of Quebec (b) in the constituency of Beauce?

2. What were the amounts of such loans approved for (a) L'Accueil de St-Georges Inc., East, in the Beauce County (b) Le Foyer St-Georges, West, Beauce County (c) Le Foyer St-Gédéon, Beauce County (d) Le Foyer St. Joseph, Beauce County?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 192, 213, 215 and 216 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING PILOT PROJECT

Motion No. 192—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the pilot project on the Occupational Training for Adults Program showing the results of 2,700 ex-trainees under the Program, as stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his address to the Canadian Vocational Association on May 23, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

HIGHWAY FROM NANAIMO TO NORTHERN VANCOUVER ISLAND

Motion No. 213—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence received by the government, other than from the Government of British Columbia, on the subject-matter of federal government sharing of the construction costs of a highway between Nanaimo and/or Kelsey Bay and Northern Vancouver Island, and of replies thereto, since May 31, 1968.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH GULF OIL RESPECTING DEVELOPMENT

Motion No. 215—**Mr. Thomson:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Gulf Oil Canada Limited regarding offshore oil development near St. Pierre-Miquelon Islands.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MOBIL OIL RESPECTING DEVELOPMENT

Motion No. 216—**Mr. Thomson:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Mobil Oil Canada Limited regarding offshore oil development near St. Pierre-Miquelon Islands.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 190, 191 and 212 are acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motions numbered 190, 191 and 212 be deemed to have been adopted.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADIAN VICKERS LIMITED CORRESPONDENCE

Motion No. 190—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Canadian Vickers Limited regarding the closing of its shipbuilding division in Montreal.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH P.E.I. ON HOUSING

Motion No. 191—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island with respect to amendments to the National Housing Act since July 1, 1968.

Motion agreed to.

HIGHWAY FROM NANAIMO TO PORT HARDY

Motion No. 212—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between the federal government and the Government of British Columbia subsequent to June 3, 1964 on the subject-matter of "a Trans-Canada Highway connection from Nanaimo to Port Hardy" referred to in the letter dated May 26, 1964, from the Premier of British Columbia to the Prime Minister, tabled in the House July 29, 1964.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 119, 138, 177, 180, 181, 185, 186, 202, 205 and 208?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

Motions for Papers

[*English*]

CONSULTANT STUDIES ON SCIENCE POLICY

Motion No. 119—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the five consultant studies referred to by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, in their submission to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, April 30, 1969, Appendix "K", Page 50, of that Department's submission.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps this notice of motion could stand. I believe the document is not quite complete.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

CANADA-U.S. CORRESPONDENCE ON SHUSWAP DIVERSION

Motion No. 138—**Mr. Rose:**

That an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all information, studies, correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America, related to the proposed Shuswap River diversion project, dated since January 1, 1969.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, with reference to motion No. 138 for the production of papers dated since January 1, 1969, exchanged between the government of Canada and the government of the United States in relation to a study of the possibilities of diversion of water from the Shuswap River, I wish to advise that there has been no exchange of papers of the nature referred to by the hon. member, either through the Department of External Affairs or through the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Under the circumstances I would ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT REPORTS

Motion No. 177—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a list of all existing companies that were, on April 18, 1969, in default of filing their annual report under the provisions of the Canada Corporation Act, due on June 1, 1968, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,918, reported in *Hansard* of April 28, 1969, page 8039.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is agreeable that the list to be produced under this motion be a list of companies which were one year in default and did not file a report by May 31, 1969, rather than April 18, 1969. If this amendment to the motion is acceptable to the hon. member, I am prepared to have the list produced forthwith.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the Minister, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion numbered 177 be deemed to have been adopted?

Motion agreed to.

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENTS

Motion No. 180—**Mr. Benjamin:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report on amendments to the Canada Corporations Act by a Task Force under the direction of Professor Robert Dickerson of the University of British Columbia.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the material called for by this motion is of a confidential nature, never intended for other than internal use by my department in the preparation of amendments to the Canada Corporations Act. In view of this I would ask the hon. member to agree to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

MERGER REGISTER

Motion No. 181—**Mr. Benjamin:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the merger register of all corporate mergers in Canadian industry that have been undertaken by the Combines Investigation Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the material asked for in this motion consists of a very large number of documents which fill an

entire filing cabinet. The cost of reproducing these documents would be very substantial. I believe the hon. member has been informed that he is free to examine at his leisure the documents in my department. On that condition I would ask him to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): The hon. member could spend his summer holidays over there.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY STUDIES

Motion No. 185—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all reports and studies related to the chemical industry as reported in the Annual Report of the Department of Industry, April 1, 1967-March 31, 1968, on page 51.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is not able to accept this motion as the work referred to by the hon. member for Broadview is:

(a) based largely on confidential information supplied by industrial chemical firms, and

(b) is now only partially complete.

There is an agreement by the department and the Canadian Chemical Producers' Association not to release this comprehensive study. The minister hopes the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Transferred for debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate under Standing Order 48.

CANADIAN APPLIANCE INDUSTRY STUDY

Motin No. 186—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by the University of Toronto School of Business Studies on the Canadian appliance industry as reported in the Annual Report of the Department of Industry, April 1, 1967-March 31, 1968, on page 51.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member for Broadview that the study referred to in this motion has not been completed as yet. There is an agreement between the University of Toronto and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that a report, not including commercial confidential material, will be published within one year of the completion of data collection and analysis. It is expected that data collection and analysis will be concluded some time in 1970. In view of this, the minister hopes the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

TRADE PROMOTION STUDY BY MR. P. SCHUTTE

Motion No. 202—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study on the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce trade promotion policies showing a 12:1 cost-sales ratio as stated by Mr. P. Schutte, Chief of the Trade Fairs Abroad Division of the Department.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce that this study contains confidential information provided to the department by Canadian firms on the understanding that such information was not to be released. In view of this, the minister hopes the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Transferred for debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 48.

ENERGY BOARD STUDY OF REFINERY CAPACITY

Motion No. 205—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the National Energy Board studies assessing refinery capacity and market demand for refined petroleum products in Regions I, II and III, referred to by the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources before the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Public Works on May 8, 1969, page 361 of the Proceedings.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the National Energy Board that the Studies regarding regions I and II have not yet been completed. The study concerning region III is a classified

document since it contains confidential information supplied to the board by individual refineries. However, the board has prepared "A Summary of National Energy Board Survey of Ontario Refinery Capacity" which is unclassified. If the hon. member would consent to withdraw his motion, I would be prepared to table this document now.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the request that I withdraw I and II because those studies have not yet been completed. But I ask that III be transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 48.

STUDIES ON PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PRODUCTIVITY

Motion No. 208—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the preliminary cost-benefit study on the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce's new program to enhance productivity (PEP) as stated in reply to Question No. 1,955 as reported in *Hansard* of June 4, 1969.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member that this study will not be tabled. This was also stated in written question No. 1,955, tabled on June 4. The reason is that it would not be in the public interest to table an analysis of a program still under development. The minister hopes the member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, the reason is not acceptable. I ask that the motion be transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 48.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, since it has not been possible for almost two months to deal with my notice of motion for the production of papers No. 140, is the government prepared to take action on it next Wednesday?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I would hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The remaining notices of motion shall stand.

[Mr. Orange.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

OIL

REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADIAN MINISTERS AT WASHINGTON MEETING TO INCREASE CRUDE SHIPMENTS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the statement made this week by the United States Secretary of the Interior to the effect that the United States can absorb 500,000 barrels a day more crude oil than is at present permitted to be shipped from Canada to that country, has the delegation of ministers who are at present conferring with their counterparts in Washington been urged to strongly press that case for very substantial and immediate increases in shipments of Canadian crude oil to the United States until the level of 800,000 barrels a day has been reached?

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am sure the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings never had so much applause for a question.

I will merely say that the ministers who are in Washington are very much aware of the situation and that they are discussing with their United States counterparts the best possible oil policy for Canadians.

Mr. Hees: I sincerely hope they do better than those who negotiated the somewhat disastrous secret treaty in 1967.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: My supplementary question is as follows, Mr. Speaker. Has the delegation of Canadian ministers been instructed to advise the United States representatives at these meetings of the Canadian position with regard to Canadian troop withdrawals from NATO?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand the hon. member for Calgary North has a supplementary question. Perhaps we ought to stay with the same subject for the time being. This is why the Chair is now recognizing the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Hees: I have a supplementary question. I know the hon. member for Calgary North has an excellent supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North.

INQUIRY AS TO CANADA-U.S. SECRET AGREEMENT ON EXPORTS OF CRUDE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister. Last week I asked whether there was a secret agreement in existence between the United States and Canada with reference to the export of crude petroleum. Is there such a secret agreement in existence at this time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As the hon. member has told us, he asked this question previously. There has been no development since he did so.

Mr. Woolliams: May I put the question in a different way? With the greatest respect to the Prime Minister, the only answer I got last week from the right hon. gentleman was silence. I am putting it to him again: Is there in fact a secret agreement in existence like the one signed in 1967 between Canada and the United States?

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is typical of the attitude the Prime Minister adopts in the house toward the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: His arrogance today is showing right through into the industry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Mr. Hees: May I ask my supplementary now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The question the hon. member indicated he wished to ask a few moments ago was not a supplementary. I recognize the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. I will return shortly to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Hees: A question supplementary to the one posed by the hon. member for Calgary North. Did the Prime Minister refuse to answer that question because he is sulking, or because he is ashamed of the answer, which is that there is another secret agreement in existence, and he knows it?

An hon. Member: Foolish.

Inquiries of the Ministry

UNITED NATIONS

RHODESIA—INQUIRY AS TO CHANGES IN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—ECONOMIC AND MILITARY SANCTIONS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Namaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister? In view of the fact that Rhodesia has now severed its final connection with the United Kingdom, what changes does the Canadian government intend to make with regard to both its diplomatic and trading relations with that country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): We shall continue the policy we have followed in the past, that of supporting the Security Council and its boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. Hees: Now, Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask whether economic sanctions are still being applied, and whether the Canadian government intends to step up economic sanctions by including a restriction of telegraphic and postal communications, or any other intensification of economic pressure against Rhodesia?

Mr. Trudeau: We shall comply with the sanctions which are decided upon by the Security Council.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Would the government be prepared to participate in military sanctions against Rhodesia?

Mr. Trudeau: I know of no such proposition having been made by the United Nations and it would not be our intention to act unilaterally in this regard.

[*Translation*]

AIR CANADA

MONTREAL—ABSENCE OF BILINGUAL SERVICE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

Is the minister aware of the fact that Air Canada is at the present time supplying at the Montreal International airport an almost exclusively unilingual English service, to passengers or would-be passengers, and does he intend to have the matter looked into?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will be glad to look into the matter.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INDIAN AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF PLEBISCITE TO DECIDE WISHES OF INDIANS RESPECTING JURISDICTION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): My question arises out of a statement made by the Minister of Indian Affairs. It was complete and comprehensive and I am sure it will be appreciated by members of the house and by the country as well. However, there is one matter I should like to draw to his attention, namely, the extremely strong opposition which many Indians have to the idea that jurisdiction over them, or the responsibility for providing services to them, be turned over to the provinces. This feeling seems widespread.

In view of their strong disapproval to being subject to nine different concepts across Canada, in addition to the federal authority, would the minister consider making available to each of the Indian tribes across Canada a plebiscite on whether or not they desire to be under provincial jurisdiction in their particular provinces?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I said today that I intended to consult the Indians and the provinces with regard to this policy, and I shall do so. When I said that the provinces would extend their services to Indians, I did so because the Indians are citizens of a province, in the same way as they are citizens of Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am asking whether or not the objection of Indians to being under provincial jurisdiction in any way will be respected? I think that by and large what he has produced will bring about a distinct improvement in Indian affairs, and I pass on the suggestion I have just made by way of a question in order to be helpful.

Since he has opened up this subject, I ask him now whether or not the government has decided to place before parliament any amendments to the law, any changes in the legislation so that Indian treaties which were made prior to 1867 will become part of the law of the land, rather than unrespected arrangements sacredly entered into between the Crown and the Indian tribes?

Mr. Chrétien: I said in the statement I made earlier that the government intends to respect the treaties which the Crown has signed with the Indians in the past.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

DISPUTE IN QUEBEC—LABRADOR IRON ORE INDUSTRY

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

The employees of the Iron Ore Company on the north shore and in the province of Newfoundland have been on strike for a long time and they have asked the federal Minister of Labour to act as mediator, subject to the agreement of the governments of Quebec and Newfoundland. We were informed last week that the government of Quebec was agreeable to an intervention by the federal Minister of Labour. Could the minister tell us whether he has approached the government of Newfoundland in order to obtain authorization to intervene in the dispute?

[*English*]

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): As I mentioned Monday, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made that the federal government and the provinces of Newfoundland and Quebec try to solve on a joint basis the problem the Iron Ore Company is having with its employees in northern Quebec. The province of Quebec has expressed willingness; the province of Newfoundland has asked for a little more time to go into the arrangements. But progress has been made. Yesterday I received the first conciliation board report from the board set up to deal with the maintenance of way employees in federal jurisdiction, which I promptly sent back because I thought the report was not as complete as it should be.

WATER RESOURCES

POLLUTION OF CANADA-U.S. BOUNDARY WATERS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and arises from the reports of serious pollution of the Rhine River and the implications this has for Canada in relation to international and interprovincial waters. Is the government taking any special action to prevent a similar accident occurring in Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in so far as this matter could concern Canada, the action that we propose to take will be demonstrated in the Canada water act.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question which arises from the Prime Minister's appearance on television last night. Can we assume from his comments on television that in relation to pollution we are starting to get through to him on the need for pollution control?

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but since I do not see him in the house perhaps the Prime Minister would look into the matter. May I ask the Prime Minister to find out, when he is looking into the other matter, whether the Department of Health and Welfare is in touch with health departments in Europe regarding studies on the insecticide endosulvan, to see whether it is being used in Canada and what its effects might be on our waterways?

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PENSIONS OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport.

Would he advise the house whether he intends to take steps in the near future in order to improve the retirement plan of the C.N.R.'s non-operating employees?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter for the Canadian National Railways in negotiation with its employees. I do not see that there is a role for me in this particular matter.

[*Later:*]

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. What action is being taken with regard to retired employees of the national railways which were incorporated into the C.N.R.? I think the government has a subsidiary responsibility here.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will refer to the late show of about four nights ago, he will see that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and I had quite an exchange on the matter. I will spare the house the prospect of my reading it all over again.

UNITED NATIONS

DISCUSSION OF HUMAN RIGHTS FOLLOWING PERSECUTIONS BY U.S.S.R.

Mr. Walter Deakon (High Park): Mr. Speaker, may I direct this question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the new wave of persecutions perpetrated by the government of the U.S.S.R. against Ukrainians, Czechoslovakians and other minority groups behind the iron curtain, and because the Soviet Union is one of the signatories to the United Nations declaration of human rights, would the government consider requesting that this subject matter be placed in the agenda of the United Nations?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this is a long-standing and difficult problem to which continuous attention has been given, but in the light of the representations made by the hon. member we will look into it again.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

POSSIBILITY OF FREEZE ON EXPENDITURES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether it is government policy to put a freeze on the budget of the C.B.C. for the next five years?

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REQUEST FOR MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In the temporary absence of the chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, would the minister use his good offices to make arrangements to have the committee meet as soon as possible, since a number of undertakings were made with which the committee should deal, as well as a number of reports, and we may be getting close to the end of the session?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I assume that committee decisions as to meeting times are pretty much a matter for the committee itself, but any help that I can give I shall be more than pleased to give.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question. Perhaps the minister misunderstood the first

part of my question. In the unfortunate temporary absence of the chairman of the committee, who is the only one who can call the committee, would the minister make appropriate arrangements?

AIR TRANSPORT

SERVICE OF AIR LINE PILOTS UNDER CONDITIONS OF FATIGUE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Transport whether he now has an answer ready to the question I asked him last Friday, dealing with the hours that airline pilots are permitted to travel per month?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no; but I hope to have the answer for the hon. member in a day or so. We are making a complete investigation.

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the national assembly of Quebec has passed through all stages its bill 45, which increases the pensions of all retired civil servants of Quebec who retired up to the beginning of this year and provides for the automatic escalation of pensions of retired civil servants from now on, will the government of Canada study this bill in the hope that Canada may at least do as well for its retired civil servants?

Mr. Speaker: L'honorable député de Lafontaine.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Prime Minister did not get to his feet to answer my question, I wonder whether the Prime Minister and the President of the Treasury Board will accept with my compliments copies of Quebec's bill 45 so they may study it? I shall send copies over to them.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

COMMENTS OF FRENCH BROADCASTERS RESPECTING ST. JEAN BAPTISTE PARADE

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges-C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Does he intend to inquire into or to refer to the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts the matter of the responsibility given to Messrs. Pierre Perreault and Bernard Gosselin, with regard to the St. Jean Baptiste Day celebrations in Montreal? I suggest their comments made on the public network were a proof of incompetence and impudence, besides being foolish and insignificant.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

EDMONTON, ALTA.—POSSIBLE DELAY IN INTRODUCING FRENCH LANGUAGE STATION

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. In view of the government's freeze with respect to the C.B.C. budget over the next five years, will the minister say whether it is the government's expectation that the proposed French language television station in Edmonton will be postponed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, there is no—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not know whether this is a matter of urgency. If it is of urgency it can be debated at the time of adjournment.

GRAIN

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO ACCEPTANCE BY CANADA OF LOWER INTERNATIONAL PRICE—GUARANTEED FLOOR

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. In light of the discussions now being carried on with other wheat producing countries of the world in regard to the international price of wheat is the report that Canada's representatives have been authorized to accept a lowering of the current agreed price correct?

Mr. Speaker: Order. According to the rules the hon. member cannot ask a minister to confirm or deny a report.

Mr. Thompson: May I reword my question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might ask a related question or another question.

Mr. Thompson: Is Canada prepared to accept a lowering of the international price of wheat at the conference now being held?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, both these departments are answering questions in the house on a day other than today.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister related to the question asked by the hon. member for Red Deer. In view of reports that a cut in world wheat prices is being considered by the International Wheat Council, can the Prime Minister inform the house if the cabinet is giving or will give serious consideration to establishing a guaranteed floor price to the farmer of $1.95½ cents a bushel, the present minimum under the International Grains Arrangement?

Mr. Woolliams: You had better sell that wheat.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

POSSIBILITY OF SPECIAL PROTECTIVE MEASURES ON DOMINION DAY

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the deplorable incidents that have taken place recently in Quebec, on the occasion of a certain political carnival and on St. Jean Baptiste Day, does the Prime Minister intend to suggest that special security measures be taken on Confederation Day?

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MAINTENANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE STANDARD

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the serious effect that lack of transportation facilities has on those who use our tourist facilities and on Canadians as a whole, will he communicate with Canadian National Railways to ascertain whether it is now its policy to keep at minimum levels available transportation facilities? Do they intend to reduce the necessity of passenger service across Canada? At the same time, when asking that question will he use his influence to ensure that extra trains and railway cars are provided during the summer on transcontinental routes?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to discuss the first part of the right hon. gentleman's question with the railway. As for the provision of additional facilities for those who may wish to go west, we will be glad to do that as rapidly as possible, particularly for members of the opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about transcontinental trains that go all the way across Canada. Although I was not thinking about the members of the opposition and thinking only of visitors who come to Canada, needless to say I appreciate the minister's solicitude for the opposition.

HARBOURS

TORONTO—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN CONSTRUCTION OF PORT

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the urgency of this matter to the port authority of the city of Toronto and in view of its key importance to the plan for development of the whole Toronto waterfront, will the minister now agree to co-operate and participate in the construction of the port, in conjunction with the development of the new harbour there?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member's question is of very wide import. If there is special urgency about the details of the question the matter might be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Chappell: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA, ONT.—PARTICIPATION IN DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Will the government participate in the multi million dollar development scheduled for downtown Ottawa despite so-called cut-backs and attempts to freeze private construction in other cities?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is of a similar nature to that asked by the hon. member for Peel South. It is a matter of very wide import and that type of question ought to be placed on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DELAY IN CLOSING OF BASES PENDING DISCUSSION WITH REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence arising from his statement on Monday that a number of bases may be closed in Canada. In view of the implications the minister's statement raised for areas suffering from economic difficulties, will he refrain from taking action on such possible closures until there has been full and sufficient consultation with the Standing Committee on Regional Development?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in my statement I think I made the commitment that no such decision will be taken until we have consulted the appropriate departments of government primarily concerned with regional development and manpower. We will do that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I direct the minister's attention to that part of my original question having to do with the Standing Committee on Regional Development? Will he study the effect such closures might have on economically depressed areas of the country?

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of National Defence assure the house, in view of his recent statement respecting the closing of certain military bases, that the government's consideration of the brief from the Newfoundland Canadian Legion supporting the establishment of a Canadian Forces base in Newfoundland will not be affected?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—CHANGE IN POLICY RESPECTING INSURANCE COMPANIES PARTICIPATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and his parliamentary secretary, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the importance of the decision of the government of Ontario to enter the national medicare plan, can the Prime Minister indicate to the house whether there was a change in government policy regarding the participation of insurance companies as carriers in the medicare plan in Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question ought to be placed on the order paper.

[Mr. Speaker.]

HOUSING

EXTENSION TO OTHER PROVINCES OF ONTARIO MORTGAGE PROGRAM

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister in charge of housing and arises from the action taken by Ontario with relation to second mortgages. Will the minister examine this program to see whether such a combined mortgage program can be extended to other provinces which have fewer resources than Ontario?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement made yesterday by the minister of the Ontario government. I understand it was made after a considerable degree of recommendation by the Leader of the Opposition in that province. However, we will be glad to take a look at the implications of the announcement and see what can be done by other provinces. That will depend on the degree to which we are involved.

PUBLIC WORKS

RESULT OF PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES REVIEW

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the minister's statement that his department is reviewing its programs and projects for the current fiscal year, will he inform the house whether this review is now completed? If not, when will it be completed? If it has been completed, can he indicate in general terms the results of the review in regard to the programs and expenditures of his department?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, we have a pretty good idea what we are going to spend this coming year and in the two or three following years.

A question has already been asked in the house about the propriety of government spending at this time, when we are asking other people to hold back on their expenditures. My reply is that we are undertaking expenditures only in those areas where we think it is good business to do so. Instead of paying out in the city of Ottawa, as we are doing at the present time, $18 million a year in rent we would much rather provide our own accommodation.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton Centre might be allowed to ask a supplementary question. I had the impression that in his reply the minister to some extent was replying to an earlier question asked by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre. Perhaps he might be allowed to ask a supplementary, even though I said that his question ought to be placed on the order paper or asked at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, if the minister has any more chewing gum, will he please pass it up this way?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must remind hon. members that we are running out of time. Many hon. members are still anxious to ask questions. Perhaps we should not have too many supplementaries.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL CAPITAL

DISCUSSIONS TO CHANGE CAPITAL'S IMAGE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Following publication of a document requested by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, pointing out that the Ottawa municipal administration has considered language and culture issues from an essentially provincial standpoint, would the Prime Minister tell the house whether or not he intends to have talks with municipal officers in order to change the federal capital's tarnished image?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have already entered into discussions with Quebec and Ontario provincial authorities and we reached an agreement to the effect that the whole capital area should truly mirror Canada's distinctive features, but needless to say we must proceed through provincial governments since municipalities come essentially under their jurisdiction.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Will he at last agree that a clean-up is required at all levels of the C.B.C., and tell us that he is prepared to do his utmost so that the C.B.C. will no longer be used as a medium for separatist propaganda?

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TELESAT OPERATION

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Peace River. Will the request of the C.B.C. for an additional $43 million to build facilities necessary to enable it to use Telesat Canada be subject to review, or is the government firmly committed to provide these funds?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I stated a moment ago, in answer to another question, that the policy concerning the C.B.C. and its budget for the next five years is not yet drawn up, in spite of rumours which may have appeared in the press in that connection.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CANADAIR LIMITED, MONTREAL—LAY-OFF OF EMPLOYEES

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands asked me about notice given to employees being laid off by Canadair Limited, particularly because some of this company's work is under contract with the government.

The government is, of course, concerned about the fair treatment of all employees who work in plants with which the government has contracts. Our contract with Canadair requires that the company "shall comply with all labour conditions and with all health conditions and requirements applicable to the work". However, specific and detailed matters such as length of notice, or pay in lieu of notice, are matters of negotiation and agreement between the company and the local unit of the union and do not form part of the government's contract with the company.

I have been advised by Canadair Limited that all employees who were laid off received

notice, or pay in lieu of notice, as provided in the agreement between the company and the local unit of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister, first, how much notice they received and, second, if he will discuss with his colleague the Minister of Labour whether it would be advisable to have inserted in all government contracts a provision that in any government contract the employer must at least comply with the minimum standards set out in the Canada Labour Code?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the minimum notice was three days. Notice was longer than that for salaried employees who had longer service. The length of notice varied with the length of service. I have already discussed this matter with my colleague the Minister of Labour.

TRANSPORT

AVAILABILITY OF RAILWAY COSTING FORMULA REPORT

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister say whether the new railway costing formula report will be ready for distribution before the recess?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, I cannot say, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

DAMAGE TO EQUIPMENT CAUSED BY DRAGGERS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the Minister of Fisheries is not here I will direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. On June 18 I asked the Minister of Fisheries a question relating to the dragger operation in northwestern Newfoundland which is interfering with the operations of the Newfoundland fishermen. The minister stated he had asked for a report. Has the parliamentary secretary a report to disclose to the house?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries): I do not have the report, Mr. Speaker. I know there is to be one, but I do not have it here today.

[Mr. Richardson.]

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN RELIEF EFFORT—DAYLIGHT FLIGHTS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I would normally direct this question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but as he is not available and because of the importance of the question I will direct it to the Prime Minister. Earlier this year the government indicated that if Biafra were prepared to accept daylight flights this would substantially alter the government's position with regard to its willingness to participate in an air relief effort. Now that the authorities have indicated they are prepared to use the Uli airstrip for daylight purposes, will the Prime Minister advise what action the government is prepared to take? Has the Prime Minister or the government been in contact with the Nigerian authorities to see whether they will give clearance to the operation of a daylight relief effort?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I obtained a copy of the statement of the Biafran leader, Colonel Ojukwu. It is not very clear that the rebels are prepared to have daylight flights. As I read this statement, there are five conditions attached to it. I may remind the house that General Gowon offered to allow daylight flights on the sole condition that they not be used to bring in arms. This offer was made eight or nine months ago following negotiations by the Canadian government with General Gowon.

The statement made eight months later by Colonel Ojukwu contains the following conditions: (1) Should it become absolutely necessary; (2) while work on the exclusively relief airport is in progress; (3) the government is willing to consider the use of the Uli airport for combined day and night relief operations; (4) for a limited period; (5) subject to effective international or other third party guarantees.

This, Mr. Speaker, is in response to the Nigerian offer which has been outstanding for eight months and which is subject to only a single condition. It is not very encouraging. Our Canadian representatives in Lagos have repeatedly stated we want this daylight flight arrangement to be made. We still hope there will be a clear arrangement between the two governments that will permit it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the uncertainty that even the Prime Minister has expressed with regard to the conditions to be imposed

both by Biafra and Nigeria and the importance of a neutral third party to supervise such distribution, is the government taking steps now, perhaps in concert with the United Nations relief effort, to see whether third party mediation and assistance might be provided?

Mr. Trudeau: As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, there have been several volunteer offers from third parties—African states and United States officials—to arrange for relief operations to that part of Nigeria called Biafra. There is nothing the Canadian government can announce to the house at this time regarding its further actions.

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

INTEREST RATES—APPEARANCE OF MINISTER BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Now that the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs is going to study high interest rates in Canada, will the minister appear before the committee and give his views with regard to high interest rates charged by banks, the impropriety of their advertising techniques and also—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is referring to the course of proceedings in a committee. To that extent the question is not in order.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

VISIT TO LABRADOR OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. On what day this week will the standing committee visit Labrador in line with the committee's commitment of many months standing to do so?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member he is also dealing with internal matters of a committee. I doubt very much whether that question can be asked of the minister at this time.

Mr. Peddle: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, a point of order or a point of something: This is a very serious matter. In the absence of the chairman of the committee I ask that the minister answer, if possible.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that so far as I am concerned, and the extent of my responsibility in the matter, the committee can go to—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jamieson: —Labrador any time they wish. If it is appropriate at this time—I do not know at just what point in the proceedings it would be or if agreement of the house is required—I certainly have no objection.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—CHANGE IN POLICY RESPECTING INSURANCE COMPANIES PARTICIPATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Presuming on your tolerance, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the Ontario government's decision, the importance of medicare and the fact that the Prime Minister was looking for an answer in his files, would he care to answer my question on medicare?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was not actually looking for an answer in my files. I was looking to see which day a representative of the department answers in the house, and I find that today is one such day.

I am afraid I do not have the answer to the question, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—URBAN GROWTH—SUGGESTED FAILURE TO MEET CHALLENGE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West) moved:

That for the purpose of dealing particularly with the failure of the Prime Minister and the government to provide leadership in relation to the challenge of rapid urban growth as dealt with in the reports of the Economic Council of Canada and generally with the Privy Council estimates, consideration be given to the 1969-70 Privy Council estimates contained in the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates presented to the house on May 29, 1969.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present my party's submissions

regarding this motion. It is extremely unfortunate that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has seen fit to leave the chamber because I was going to wish him a happy birthday in terms of his first year in office, but as he is not here I will not do so. However, I think it is in order that we in the opposition congratulate hon. members on the other side, particularly new members who have completed their first year in parliament. As a new member myself I cannot say I am too happy with the progress that has been made. In any event, in my own charitable way I would like to wish this house a happy birthday.

In thinking of the date June 25 I recall that I was sent here as a representative of a portion of the great city of Hamilton, and I know that city sent me here to project the urban image, to be concerned about the need for leadership in regard to housing, pollution, the plight of old age pensioners and the problems of transportation. I must be concerned about the poor, and about how inflation and the high cost of living have drastically affected those on fixed incomes.

This past year has been very enlightening to me as a new member. I am very proud to have the opportunity to stand in this hallowed chamber in order to give some encouragement to the government and, as a matter of fact, some leadership. The government has failed to give leadership in the whole sphere of urban problems. In fact I suggest that during the past year the government became concerned about matters about which the Canadian people could not care less.

An hon. Member: Damp wheat?

Mr. Alexander: An hon. member mentions damp wheat. It has been of some concern, but I am vexed that as a result of the government giving first priority to the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code we spent so much time debating homosexuality and abortion. I am also concerned about the fact that the government believes the official languages bill is a must for the betterment of all Canadians. Perhaps it is, but at a time when urban problems are of such vital importance I believe the government should have given priority to bringing forth ideas, leadership and enthusiasm to tackle the problems of urbanites.

The government stands condemned for its callous disregard, indecision and inaction in the face of one of the greatest challenges that modern Canada must meet. It has failed to provide the vigorous leadership required to meet the challenge of rapid urban growth.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker: There is no greater area of concern to Canadians because we are increasingly becoming an urban people. The real problems which the great majority of our people face are problems related to urban life and the quality of that life. We seem to have forgotten the men, women and children who live in the cities. They have problems that, as I say, can only be resolved by farsighted government leadership, leadership which the present administration seems unable and unwilling to produce.

The facts of Canada's urban nature are well documented, and I do not have to go into them at any great length. The fourth report of the Economic Council of Canada has pointed out that Canada has the fastest rate of urban growth of all industrially advanced countries. By 1980 we will live in a society that will be 80 per cent urban. By that year 60 per cent of all Canadians will live and work in a total of 20 Canadian cities, of which Hamilton will be one.

When I think of how the government is trying to emasculate the role of the individual Member of Parliament, first with its proposed infamous rule 16A and now with its proposed rule 75C, I am concerned, and I believe it is necessary that I rise to plead the problems of the urban dweller with the government. There is no way that we on this side of the house can continue to stand by and allow the government to erode the function of a Member of Parliament who represents some 89,000 people.

The people of Canada are demanding action from the government. They want a government which is aware of the pressing needs of urbanites, which has enough compassion to care about their problems, and which is willing to exert vigorous leadership in the fight to enhance the quality of urban life. Does the present government meet any of these specific requirements? I submit that it does not have compassion. I submit that it does not have the leadership qualifications. I submit it has neither the will nor the interest.

Let no one deny the dimensions of the problems of our urban centres. Their dimensions have been clearly outlined by the government's own advisory body, the Economic Council of Canada. In its fourth report the Economic Council of Canada painted a dark

picture of the environment in which most Canadians are forced to live. It states:

• (3:40 p.m.)

Shortage and inadequacy of urban housing, traffic and transportation problems, air and water pollution, the confused jumble of conflicting land uses, decaying neighbourhoods and monotonous suburbs, urban poverty and social disgrace . . . these are the familiar problems to the average Canadian city dweller today.

My goodness, how can this government sit so complacently and so smugly when this picture sits smack on all fours on its doorstep? With problems like this how does the government expect the cities to cope with the continuous pressures of the next period of rapid expansion expected during the 1970's? Without concerted and co-ordinated action by the government now, the bulk of the Canadian people can only expect further deterioration in their surroundings. Concern and vision for the quality of urban life are fundamental requirements of good government. In this government we find that concern and vision seem to have been eroded by the philosophies of political theory. What does this government really do? It simply conjures up a constitutional smokescreen designed to conceal its refusal to exercise real leadership in meeting the problems generated by the Canadian urban explosion. In short, what they say is that the vast majority of the problems belong within provincial jurisdiction.

In Canada we have a federal system and each level of government must act within its legislative competence. But the constitution is no obstacle to federal initiative in these matters. The important words are initiative and leadership. The federal government is very much involved in the life of our cities right now. Through the normal exercise of its legitimate responsibilities the federal government has a very great impact on the direction of growth and change in our urban centres. Indeed, many of the crucial components of real urban planning fall within the responsibilities of the ministers opposite.

This afternoon I wish to mention a few areas of urban concern in which the federal government can, should and must be more effective. Even a brief examination of the record shows that the present government has failed to develop the areas in which it does have jurisdiction. Given this attitude of indifference, our cities may in fact be fortunate the federal government is not totally responsible for their well-being.

An announcement was made by the province of Ontario and in this regard a question was asked by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). He asked whether the Prime Minister or the minister of housing, since the province of Ontario has given this government leadership, would look into the possibility of such a program being initiated across the country.

The largest over-all physical impact on the growth of our urban centres will be felt in the field of housing. The failure of this government to come to grips with the real issues involved in the housing crisis has been fully documented in the house by myself and other members of our party. It is obvious that a truly concerned federal government could exercise a profound influence on the growth of our cities in this field. A few comments about the possibilities for urban renewal and rehabilitation should suffice to illustrate the general unwillingness of the government to be of help to our cities. The poor of the slums and the cores of Canadian cities are still waiting for the thaw in the general freeze on public housing projects, particularly urban renewal projects. Since the political demise of the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) the present minister has been kind enough to accede to some immediate requirements. But the general freeze is still on.

As I read the papers daily I am confused concerning what the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing has on his mind. I was under the impression at one time he had indicated to me that a decision would be made prior to the time the house recessed for the summer holidays. Now it appears that the minister wants to travel about the country in order to re-examine and reassess the same 12 cities that have been reexamined and reassessed for the past eight months. How much more can we stand of this type of thing? The city of Hamilton, which has a commitment of some $4 million to $5 million with regard to its urban renewal program, and many other cities are waiting for the government to make up its mind concerning what it intends to do. The minister has said that he is thinking about the matter. At least that is a positive statement. I understand that he intends to make a statement soon. I tell the minister that the poor cannot wait much longer and that the commercial aspect is secondary.

I warn the minister that he must not succumb to pressures from any of his more complacent colleagues in this regard. He must not provide merely for the regionally selective approval of such projects. The poor of Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary and Hamilton—you

name them—are among the real victims and are not the causes of inflation. Decent human housing for these people in the richer provinces cannot be postponed even in the cause of the anti-inflationary fight. The minister must clear up immediately the uncertainty surrounding the whole question of urban renewal, with which I have concerned myself since I was elected to parliament and had the nerve to stand up and say something. I have pursued it with vigour and I hope with responsibility. I hope the minister will clear up the uncertainty surrounding urban renewal because if he does not the effect could be disastrous. The minister was begged to do so by the Canadian Association of Mayors and Municipalities in their brief of April 21, 1969. This association, whose members have to face the problems of deterioration of the older sections of our cities, stated that the real problem was "the absence of any clear directives regarding urban renewal schemes". The breif continued:

> It is essential that the new urban renewal policy be defined and announced without further delay so as to enable the many concerned municipalities to amend schemes where possible and to proceed with implementation.

Action is being called for, but where is the action? When it comes to action, for the life of me I cannot understand why the government is hesitant to proclaim, institute, initiate and bring forth a separate ministry of housing and urban development. When we think of what I originally stated, that in another 20 years some 80 per cent or 90 per cent of our people will live in urban centres, surely we must wonder how anyone can state in 1969 that such a ministry is not required at this time. Such a ministry would set priorities, would determine involvement, would agree to guidelines and would separate jurisdictional functions, at the same time working together with the several provinces and the municipalities in order to come up with concrete answers to the very complex problems which are the result of urban expansion.

• (3:50 p.m.)

All I hope is that when the minister makes up his mind about urban renewal he will not forget the poor or exclude them. Regardless of the fact that Ontario may be one of the rich provinces, there are many poor people in Ontario and in all the large cities who demand and need attention. These people belong to the new era, the era of concern and social awareness. In their awareness they are also concerned about transportation.

[Mr. Alexander.]

Transportation is another area in which the federal government could take a leading role, just as I have said that the government must give leadership in meeting the challenge of urban growth. Our cities are truly communities in motion. The federal government could exercise a strong influence on the pattern of growth of our urban centres through its transportation policy and through the exercise of its regulatory powers in the development of waterways, ports, airports, pipelines, etc.

The activities of such Crown corporations as Air Canada and Canadian National Railways are also crucial. I was glad to hear the former Prime Minister direct a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) about the inconvenience and frustration resulting from inadequate service on the part of Canadian National Railways. Many people are desirous of taking holidays in our beautiful western provinces. They are told that they must make their reservations a year in advance, which seems ridiculous, or that there is not enough service to accommodate the people who want to go.

A transportation policy could be a potent tool in the guiding and planning of urban growth. With all due respect to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing, I think he had better start talking about transportation with his colleagues in terms of giving it priority because the need will develop as urban growth develops. As I said earlier, too often the government has simply adopted a policy to fit the uncontrolled and unplanned urban sprawl. I want to give the government a little hint. We had the good fortune to be involved a while ago with men from the United States. They were talking about their great megalopolises and what transportation problems mean to these great cities of the future. It is their humble opinion that transportation should be of prime concern to government.

At one point it appeared as though there might be some hope in respect of the transportation problems of our cities. They are important, and I cannot understand why the government always says that transportation is a provincial matter. The Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, composed of individuals with competence and intelligence, travelled throughout the country and after much deliberation came up with certain conclusions. One of them was:

> The federal government should encourage and co-ordinate a broad program of practical research into urban transportation problems and consider,

as other spending priorities permit, establishing a program of loans to municipalities for the development of effective urban transit systems.

It appears that the hon. member for Trinity discovered what all Canadians are slowly discovering, that this administration is not concerned and is insensitive to the problems of our urban population.

Mr. Baldwin: They have no compassion.

Mr. Alexander: Did I hear someone use the word "compassion"? This government has no compassion; it is complacent and indifferent. Yet it is in the great cities that its members got their votes. They have talked about Trudeaumania but let me tell them that even if they have 151 seats we have three and a half more years to go and things are starting to look tough over there already.

An hon. Member: Come on over, Linc.

Mr. Alexander: Don't worry, I will never go over there because the price is not right, nor do I need the formal friendship. On an informal basis we can always get together.

Where will Canada get the direction it needs? The answer to that question is that it will have to come from this side under the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), who has continually requested the government to accept responsibility regarding the priorities required by the people of Canada.

I was not here when the motion concerning air and water pollution was debated. The fact is that the government has also failed in this field. Since the house has received a full account of the policy sins of the government in that regard as recently as Monday last I will not go into that sorry tale in any depth today.

What I have been trying to do is to outline some areas of federal responsibility which have a real impact on the quality of urban living and in respect of which the federal government has blatantly refused to exercise its responsibility. This list could be extended, but of course other hon. members want to take part in this debate and may mention more.

The federal government has become more involved in programs related to human resources. Manpower retraining, unemployment insurance and assistance to the needy are programs which are basically urban oriented. They are attempts to help people cope with and adapt to the real and crippling problems which face the disadvantaged in our cities.

My main point, and I want to re-emphasize this, is that the federal government is very deeply involved in the cities. The fate of millions of Canadians is in its hands. The government cannot refer its problems to the constitutional limbo, the constitutional straitjacket, the constitutional smokescreen. It cannot cover up its failure to meet its responsibilities to provide effective leadership.

The chorus of demands is rising and becoming more blatant. In case the Prime Minister and his accomplices have just not got around to reading the report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, perhaps I should read a few examples of the type of action requested by the little people of this country. For instance:

The federal government, in co-operation with a provincial government, should seriously consider the construction of a "new city" as a pilot project where proposed urban solutions should be tested in an actual environment.

I hope the minister heard that and is considering the construction of a new city as a pilot project where these proposed urban solutions could be tested in an actual environment.

The task force also recommended that the federal government "should give early priority to the creation of a central information bank to collect, organize and disseminate available data on the subject to other governments, agencies and Canadians generally."

This report has been gathering dust while Canadians suffer. Somehow we must prick the conscience of the ministers of the government and of the Prime Minister especially. It is so easy to miss and not to see the problems and the deterioration of our cities. We could learn from the experience of the United States. I just want to touch on two points.

As a result of neglect and unconcern, as a result of the attitude that things will get better on the part of governments to the south, we have witnessed an eruption in that country the like of which we have never seen before. This is because some people there did not learn a lesson. We have to be concerned and we have to learn from experiences that are continually brought to our eyes and ears as a result of the United States social revolution. Surely we cannot be this close and not learn the lesson. Surely we cannot be this close and not realize that somebody over there is trying to tell us something. Why will the Prime Minister not take real action to

prevent the erosion of our cities, to prevent the type of development we are witnessing at the present time in the United States of America? What a confrontation that is. It is not only black versus white; the whole society is in an uproar.

• (4:00 p.m.)

What is needed is a federal model of the ideal city. What is needed is a well thought-out conception of what Canadian urban life should be like during the 1970's and 1980's. Only when the federal government has developed a carefully articulated model of city life, of what the total environment of the majority of citizens might be, can the present contradictory and self-defeating bumblings of the various departments be replaced by a co-ordinated, planned federal effort in Canadian cities.

Only if such a conception is developed will the other levels of government know what the federal government is likely to do that affects them. Only then will they be able to develop over-all plans tied directly to federal transportation plans, for example. Only then will they be able to plan total city development without the constant fear that now exists of the whole applecart being upset by sudden and sporadic federal intervention. Only in this way will we be able to eliminate squabbles and hassles such as those surrounding the selection of the site for the new Montreal airport. Only in this way will residents of the golden horseshoe of Oshawa, Toronto, Burlington and Hamilton be able to obtain an effective, co-ordinated transportation system involving rapid surface transit, regional jetports, local urban city airports, and so on.

Let me emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, that the people of our provinces and cities have a right to know—indeed they have an absolute need to know—exactly what the federal government has in mind for our cities of the future and what the quality of life is expected to be, if we are to have effective government and political participation at local and provincial levels. We still have a chance in Canada. I am not pessimistic in this regard; in fact, I am optimistic because we have a very potent opposition. That is the only reason I am optimistic. We have a chance which is denied to many unfortunate souls locked into many American cities. We have a chance to save our cities. We are in a battle against time. But most of all, we in this house are in a battle against massive federal indifference to the fate of our cities.

[Mr. Alexander.]

Here I am making a major speech on the problems of urban expansion and I am speaking to only four members on the government side of the house. Can you beat that, Mr. Speaker? This is the type of participatory democracy we are going to have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Alexander: I shall be only about 30 seconds more, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alexander: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that the price of failure in these battles is disaster. I refer to the battles we face in connection with the problems that exist in our urban centres. If the federal government refuses to take up the challenge of the cities, it and millions of us along with it will suffer the fate of all those who remain in clouds of smoke, whether they be constitutional or otherwise. All will suffer a fatal cancer, in this instance a terminal case of cancer of the cities.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has a significant and pervasive stake in the future of the urban environment of Canada. There is no doubt about that. Its decisions and activities touch communities all across this country. Its record shows it is aware of the responsibilities inherent in that fact. The role of the government has been an effective one, one that has been largely accepted by provincial, and municipal governments and authorities throughout Canada. This effectiveness and acceptability arise in large part out of the influence of the National Housing Act.

The National Housing Act has financed or guaranteed the financing of a substantial portion of new residential construction. The size of this contribution, to get the facts on the record, can be seen in the fact that half of Canada's existing stock of 5.4 million dwellings has been built since world war II. Forty per cent of these, many of them in urban centres, were aided under one or another of the provisions of the National Housing Act. That act has influenced not only the number

of new dwellings, their manner of financing, their architectural design and community planning; it has also encouraged anti-pollution measures, urban renewal and slum clearance. It has assisted particularly in meeting the special needs of students, low income families, the aged, the handicapped and the disadvantaged.

Increasingly over the past few years direct federal financial aid has been allocated to the area of social housing. More than $300 million has been invested in the production of limited dividend housing for low income families, some $125 million in loans to non-profit corporations, mainly for housing for the elderly.

Mr. Lewis: Over what period?

Mr. Andras: I will give the hon. member the comparison in a minute. Three hundred million dollars has been lent for public housing, and $160 million has been invested in federal-provincial public housing. In excess of $300 million has been made available in the way of loans to student housing projects. Virtually every Canadian city of major size has turned to the federal government for assistance in planning and implementing urban renewal programs. At the same time, more than 1,000 municipalities in this country have received loans totalling more than $300 million to assist in the construction or expansion of sewage treatment facilities. Under the terms of the National Housing Act one-quarter of this amount has been written off by the federal government.

Over the years federal legislation has kept abreast of changing municipal requirements by constantly updating the National Housing Act. Just the other day the house dealt with several important measures which are addressed squarely to meeting some of the more pressing needs of municipalities. Indeed, I can assure hon. members that since that time all the provinces and many municipalities which have recorded their feelings in this regard have indicated that they welcome the latest changes, particularly the broader assistance to assemble raw land for all housing purposes. We know from our discussions with them that they look to this measure not only as a means of reducing the high cost of serviced land but as a real incentive, facility and instrument for planning. Also welcomed universally across Canada was the proposal to extend the forgiveness period on loans for sewage treatment projects.

Although the federal government has contributed substantially to these areas of civic improvement, it has no prerogative in the actual physical planning of our municipalities. There have developed in many large urban communities complex, complicated, overlapping networks of municipalities in a single urban area, each responsible, autonomously almost, for its own planning, its own struggle for a balanced assessment between industrial and residential use, and all without regard to the larger urban area of which it forms a part. There is in most urban places the lack of an over-all plan of urban development for the whole area in which future growth is to take place. Consequently, instead of urban regional plans for the development of industry, housing, education, transportation, open spaces, recreation, pollution control and urban renewal on a regional basis there exist in many cases municipal restrictions to exclude those activities which do not produce sufficient municipal taxes to carry them.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The co-ordination of urban regional planning in Canada is the responsibility of the provinces, and only the provinces can take the direct action which is required to provide the necessary solutions. There is, of course, an inclination to think the federal role in contributing to the urban fabric has been confined to housing. In reality, many federal departments and programs have contributed to the urban development process. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in the construction of modern airport facilities, railway and terminal facilities and harbour facilities, all of which are essential for healthy urban growth.

Federal contributions to universities in 1968 and 1969 total about half a billion dollars, and to assist the provinces in the provision of adequate hospital care in our urban centres more than three-quarters of a billion dollars was spent in 1968 and 1969. Universities and hospitals must be considered as two essential and significant modern community enterprises.

The federal government has sponsored and supported information, educational and research activities directed toward the improvement of housing conditions and community development. Individuals, educational institutions and such well known organizations as the Canadian Housing Design Council, the Community Planning Association of Canada and the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research, continue to receive federal financial assistance. Virtually every major Canadian city has turned to the federal

government for assistance in planning and implementing urban renewal programs. More than 200 towns and cities have undertaken urban renewal studies aimed at improving the local environment.

The Department of Regional Economic Expansion is preparing to assist provinces financially to provide the necessary social infrastructure in a number of urban centres where it is clear that industry is going to settle due to the government's industry incentive program.

In his remarks opening the debate the hon. member referred to the subject of urban transportation. It is felt by many that there is an urban transportation crisis in Canada. This is purported to be a compound of congestion caused by an increase in automobiles, which is in part an effect of urban development, and the needs of public transit systems which cannot be financed from fares and which therefore require municipal subsidy. The argument has been put forward—and I detected overtones of this in the hon. member's observations—that the federal government, through initiatives under the National Housing Act, has caused suburban subdivisions to develop rapidly while failing to contribute to the solution of the concomitant problem of increased vehicular traffic and the difficulty of providing increased public transport to serve those areas. Further, it is argued that the high cost of scarce urban land has driven developers farther and farther from the centre of the city. The public transportation system set up to serve these commuters is often inadequate. Indeed, sometimes no such system exists.

In earlier days of national development, transcontinental transportation was accepted as a federal responsibility. The argument is now advanced that the concentration of Canada's population and wealth in approximately 29 urban areas makes the transportation of persons and goods a national economic and social problem, albeit with an urban focus. Yet the central government remains uninvolved.

In the first place, it is not the federal government but the provincial and local governments which determine the pattern of urban settlement, whether low density or high density, suburban or downtown. It is simply a myth that the pattern of suburban growth in this country has been determined by the kind of mortgage insurance aid offered under the National Housing Act. These lending aids are equally available whether a building is suburban or downtown, high rise or low rise, compact or dispersed. The premise of this argument, then, is nonsense. As to its substance, it is true that urban roads and public transportation systems are enormously expensive and that they constitute one of the main burdens which local governments bear. For the most part, however, they serve the residents of the area in which they are located and it is difficult to accept the view that responsibility for meeting these costs should be borne by the federal level of government. If local governments lack funds with which to meet the costs of the transportation services they should provide, they must also lack funds with which to pay for all the other things they need to provide. And they do, in many cases. This situation, however, reflects the acknowledged general financial difficulties facing local government and does not represent a transportation problem as such.

Contrary to the assumptions of the hon. member, the federal government will be playing an increasingly important part in transportation research. Recently the government contributed $75,000 toward the expenses of the first Canadian urban transportation conference and provision has been made in both the Transport Act and the Canadian Transport Commission Act for research studies to be carried out in this field, the results of which, it is hoped, will produce long-term benefits for all cities. But this is something quite different from taking a direct position, city by city, or province by province, in actual urban transportation activities.

Reference has been made to pollution, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) stated in the house a few days ago on June 24, the government intends to make a policy statement in the house concerning the proposed Canada water act and to engage in discussions with the provinces during the summer in preparation for introduction of legislation at the next session. Hon. members, I know, are awaiting this legislation to learn what measures of pollution control it will involve.

If one looks at the urban community, the results of the federal government's involvement can be seen in the homes, in the central city and in the suburbs. It can be seen in airport and railway facilities and in major urban utilities. The integrated plans of major urban centres are influenced by or depend upon the exercise of federal legislative powers in many areas including

research, building standards, building methods, urban transportation, the gathering, interpretation and publication of statistics, transport, railways, pipelines, telephone lines, canals, navigable waterways, aerial navigation, radio, television, interprovincial and international trucks and buses, health and welfare, income maintenance programs, health grants and physical fitness grants.

Indeed, one could say that since 80 per cent of the population will be living in major urban centres by 1980, to quote the hon. member opposite when he reminded us of an often-used Economic Council forecast, it can be argued that the whole of government will be largely devoted to the urban environment. Indeed, one might say that since 70 per cent of the population is already living in urban centres the government is even now devoting most of its activities to urban affairs. Certainly, virtually every government program has direct implications for the urban environment, and many international programs carry indirect implications.

• (4:20 p.m.)

It is not very long since I spoke in the house on the amendments recently made to the National Housing Act. I have no intention of repeating what I said in detail at that time but most of it is strictly relevant to the present debate. Because of all the urban problems that beset us today, none is more important than the shortage of housing. We cannot have good cities without adequate housing. I grant you, Mr. Speaker, housing is not the only important urban problem, but it is a vital one, the correction of which has been enormously aided by the federal government over the years.

To come back to the hon. member's point about time frames during the 1960's to date about 1.1 million new dwellings have been started in Canadian cities that have a population of over 5,000 people. I think this is significant because it represents over 20 per cent of the entire occupied stock of dwellings in Canada today. During the same period over half a million new dwellings, the great bulk of them in the same urban areas, were aided in one way or another under the terms of the National Housing Act.

This represents a major indicator of the scale of the federal presence in the growth and development of urban Canada. It is in no small part due to the role of federal housing legislation that Canada has been able to sustain rates of house building over the post-war period that were well in excess of the demands created by population growth. As a result there has been continued progress in the reduction of housing shortages, and nowhere have these improvements been more dramatic than in our cities.

Despite the rapid growth of urban population the number of doubled-up families in Canada has declined from about 450,000 in 1961 to under 300,000 today. And the number of substandard dwellings in occupation has declined even more rapidly.

Mr. Gilbert: Give us the figures.

Mr. Andras: Nevertheless, while there is some satisfaction in the consideration that things are better than they were, I will be the first to agree that we need still more houses in our cities and elsewhere. We need to replace the obsolete ones and to rehabilitate the substandard ones that are salvageable. As I said in the house during the debate on the housing act amendments, the remaining shortage is still too large. The government is particularly concerned about the special plight of the poor, the old and the dependent who endure the main brunt of the suffering that this kind of burden entails.

On the subject of housing for low income people in this country, it is fair to say that the federal government has represented the principal source of funds for virtually all such housing. While we do not deny to the provinces their prerogative of initiating many of these projects, and while they do not deny to themselves a large share of the kudos for this kind of activity, I would remind hon. members that the lion's share of capital costs and operating subsidies is borne by the federal government.

We hope this year in the field of housing for low income people to undertake a program larger than ever before. The scale of this acceleration will be appreciated better if it is put in an historical perspective. To the end of 1968, under the housing act funds had been committed for the provision of 82,000 housing units specifically intended for low income and elderly people. Of these, 34,000 have been sponsored by limited dividend companies and 6,000 by non-profit companies. Federal-provincial partnerships have been responsible for the initiation of 17,000 units. Federal loans to provincial and local housing authorities account for 25,000 units. It has taken 20 years to achieve this total of 82,000 units in the field of low income housing. This year alone we hope to make commitments for

over 20,000 units under these programs, which I am sure you will agree is a serious indication of our purpose in this area.

Closely related to the issue of housing for low income people is the problem of blight that characterizes the areas where many of them live in our cities—the problem of urban renewal. Successive amendments to the National Housing Act have made available generous grants and loans to provinces and municipalities to enable them to tackle the problems of urban blight and functional obsolescence. The availability of federal funds has generated a great deal of interest across Canada in these important questions.

The federal government has made available grants to municipalities for city-wide urban renewal studies. One hundred and eighty municipalities have taken advantage of the 75 per cent federal grants for this purpose and have completed or are in the process of completing such studies. Those municipalities will have available to them information on the social, economic and physical problems related to old neighbourhoods and to those areas of the city where the urban pattern is no longer functional. This program of urban renewal studies has served as more than an instrument of renewal. It has also triggered and been useful in one of the most important, broad urban planning ventures ever undertaken on a national scale.

In addition, the federal government has assisted 132 municipalities to prepare schemes for areas determined and identified as in need of renewal by these city-wide studies. Grants totalling $3.5 million have been committed for this purpose.

Finally, the federal government has committed $168 million to assist municipalities to implement urban renewal schemes.

This program has grown quite rapidly, from relatively insignificant proportions to one of the most important areas of concern, in the short span of the last half a dozen years. Perhaps because of its very rapid growth we find today serious questions being asked from many directions about urban renewal, such as questions about citizen participation. During the last two or three weeks some very interesting delegations have come to see me about this matter. For example, a delegation from Chinese communities across Canada came to see me to express their concern. Here is a kinship group, an ethnic group that looks after its own and stands together. It has cohesive unity and is to be respected. In North America, in the name of urban renewal policies and under other policies, hundreds of so-called Chinatowns have been eliminated to the extent that today there are 16 or less.

In addition, the Kensington market people came to see me four or five weeks ago at a time when I was immersing myself in the jargon of housing, and I was able to recognize the alienation of this group. Nobody has talked to this group or consulted them about bulldozing their home and demolishing this area, the very place where they have felt safe and secure. Surely this sort of feeling among people must be recognized, and certainly it has been put before me. This is one of the dilemmas that is facing me in so many of the urban renewal projects that are put before me for final approval. I want to consult such groups before we move blithely ahead in the name of progress.

Mr. Alexander: Would the minister permit one question in this regard?

Mr. Andras: Yes.

Mr. Alexander: Will the minister advise us whether he is going to make a tour of the 12 cities that happen to be involved in urban renewal before he comes to a decision? Many of us would like to know whether this is the case and it is a suggestion the minister might pursue. Certainly I should like to know whether the minister intends to visit these cities, including Hamilton, before he comes to a decision on federal government involvement.

Mr. Andras: I assure the hon. member I have no program that would deliberately delay action in this respect. I do not think the hon. member would want me to be a rubberstamp.

Mr. Alexander: Oh no.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Andras: I think the hon. member would want me conscientiously to examine the problems and to find out whether I have the whole story from those who are affected. But I assure the hon. member I have no intention of making marks on a map or headlines in a paper. I do not have all the answers today but I think that a systematic tour may perhaps be helpful. I think some of these problems I have alluded to can be resolved fairly quickly. Although the hon. member who proposed this motion labours under pressures, I hope he will support me. I

wish to do a rational job in this field because the implications of first decisions are apt to be far-reaching.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, may I say that when I assumed responsibility for housing at the federal level I felt it was important that we should examine carefully priorities and objectives in the field of urban renewal. We learned much. I learned a great deal from those people I talked to. Nevertheless, we have a lot more to learn about urban renewal. We do not wish to rush ahead with any programs without giving full consideration to those kinds of representations. Some things have already become clear.

As I said a short time ago, the participation of citizens who are affected by urban renewal is essential to the success of that operation. In my opinion that participation must cut in at a very much lower level than it has in many of the urban renewal projects of the past. Careful consideration must be given to the rehabilitation of structures which must be saved. Municipalities should be prepared, surely, to adopt and enforce bylaws of maintenance and occupancy standards. Those bylaws are necessary if we are to get on with the job; otherwise renewed areas may deteriorate and fall back into the condition they were in originally. We will need to introduce new urban renewal programs all over again in that case. May I say that the cities of Toronto and Ottawa have made considerable strides in this field, as have many other centres in Canada.

In recent weeks I have talked to a number of mayors and their officials about their programs. I had the honour to address the mayors of Canada when they were gathered here in conference a few weeks ago and to explain to them the process of the study we have undertaken. All I can say in the face of all questions that have been asked is that I fully recognize the urgent necessity for decisions to be made on urban renewal projects. There have been long periods of planning, and we must act on commitments that have been made over the last few years. We have behind us about 148 plans that have to be acted on pretty quickly. We must bring in decisions on those as quickly as possible. I hope to proceed as quickly as possible to visit actual sites which are slated for renewal. I am sure that hon. members feel that the wisest course for me to follow is for me to visit these sites as quickly as possible. I may undertake another tour and do some on the spot examination of conditions.

There is much more that I could say on the subject but I will limit my remarks since I am sure other hon. members wish to take part in this debate. Much that I have to say would be a repetition of what I said on second reading of Bill C-192. As hon. members know, something has been done about land costs. We have widened the provisions with respect to land assembly to make land available for all housing purposes, and this program is being supported by other and further means of financing. I confess that I know of no simple solution to the complex problem of land costs; neither does anyone else with whom I have discussed this subject so far. It seems to me, however, that some headway can be made if the provinces and municipalities will themselves assume responsibility to a much greater extent than heretofore for the acquisition, planning, subdividing and servicing of residential land. Considerable progress could be made if that responsibility were assumed. After all, the next decade or two will be the decisive period in the planning of Canadian cities and, indeed, of our great urban regions. It has been said before, and I repeat it again, that the building of great cities cannot be measured simply in terms of size or efficiency. There is also the quality of the environment they provide for a healthy and satisfying life for the people.

The challenge of the city will call for the highest degree of co-operation between departments within government, between different levels of government and between all these and the building industry—the lenders, planners, architects, social scientists, as well as between all those and all other interested groups and professions. And more crucial than all this is the participation of the people directly affected. This participation I think will take diverse forms—forms which range from obstruction to zealous support, from special pleading to genuine community involvement and from widespread concurrence to, I suppose, painful conflicts of interest. It is only through the expression—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister but his time has expired.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I shall be finished in a couple of minutes.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the minister unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Alleged Failure to Cope With Urban Growth

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that it is only through the expression and resolution of these creative tensions that the urban artifacts we create will be given authentic vitality. As I have said in the house previously, it is my intention to do all I can to foster this spirit of co-operation which will be so vitally required.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question before he sits down? Officials in Vancouver and various groups have expressed the urgent hope that the minister will visit urban renewal projects in that area. Has he decided to go to Vancouver?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I am very keen to do this because of representations made directly by the Chinese. There are other considerations prompting me to do this having to do with the Strathcona project and the A-1 project. I must consult my time schedule because I do not wish to delay too long. The hon. member's area is one of the areas I should prefer to see before any final decision is made.

Mr. Gilbert: Will the minister permit another question, Mr. Speaker? Can he tell us how many public housing units are to be built in Canada this year and what moneys the government has allocated for this purpose?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not at my fingertips a breakdown of the C.M.H.C. capital budget. I am looking at the combination of that program which we know as "16". There is limited dividend housing under what we know as "16A". There are also non-profit programs and the two direct assistance projects which involve 75 per cent federal and 25 per cent provincial participation. There is also our 35D program with respect to federal loans to provincial housing authorities. Altogether, and I hope the hon. member will bear with me as I look at the figures, current programs for low income housing needs are set at $395 million this year. I shall have to do some addition in order to arrive at more accurate figures. Last year we put into public housing the sum of $149 million. This year I have allocated for that purpose directly the sum of $180 million. It should be remembered in that context that the limited dividend figure for last year was $27 million; for this year it is to be $80 million. For non-profit, 16A housing, the figure in this area last year was $59 million. This year it is to be $80 million. I will obtain a breakdown later on, but these figures indicate that we shall be building 20,000 units.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) for placing the motion we are now discussing on the order paper and for his very excellent introduction of the motion.

I suggest the speech to which we have just listened by the amiable Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing was the very best illustration possible of the fact that he and his colleagues in the government do not even understand the language of the motion and the problems about which most of us are concerned. I was rather surprised to hear him indulge in a kind of sophistry that really was depressing to me, a sophistry that says everything we do has to do with urban people; our manpower programs, hospital commitments, contributions to universities and all these things are helping the urban problem. I was surprised the minister did not mention the fact that our expenditures in the realm of national defence are also for the defence of our cities as well as our countryside. I say to the minister this is not the problem at all.

The minister should not indulge in the kind of sophistry which says the federal government spends money that is of benefit to the Canadian people and since 70 per cent of the Canadian people live in cities, obviously they are beneficiaries of the policies of the federal government. This is not the issue. It is not the problem put before the minister. He has not dealt with the problem at all. He has not even shown that he understands what the problem is about.

The problem in my opinion is as stated by the hon. member for Hamilton West and the Economic Council of Canada. It is precisely because of our constitutional division of power, because the municipalities are the creatures of the provincial legislatures under our constitution, because the authority is divided, and because the municipalities do not have the funds to deal with the problem, that it is essential in all areas of urban concern for the federal government, speaking for all the people of Canada, to take the initiative and leadership in getting the provinces and municipalities to discuss and, if possible, to solve the municipal problems.

No one is arguing with the minister or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about the constitution. Every hon. member in this house,

lawyer, non-lawyer, whether he has been here one year or ten years, knows what is obvious. The minister does not have to spend time underlining the fact that this is the prerogative of the provinces and municipalities and that he does not have the authority to plan municipal growth. We know that.

What the people of Canada, 70 per cent of them living in the urban regions of Canada, are saying to this government is that decades of neglect have resulted in intractable problems in our cities. They say the federal government has a duty to take the initiative in leadership to seek a solution to these problems because if this is not done in time we will have the same kind of violent reaction on the streets of our cities as the United States has had on the streets of its cities. This is the issue to which we want the government to address itself.

The minister does not have to spend time persuading hon. members that no matter what authority they belong to, these problems are difficult and cannot be solved overnight, that there are many differences of opinion as to what should be done about public housing, urban renewal, the size of cities and that many countries of the world have found these problems very difficult and heavy. The minister does not have to waste his time telling us that. Everyone in this house knows this problem will not be solved overnight, but they and all Canadians know the problem will never be solved unless a start is made in organizing the agencies for its solution. This is where the failure of the government comes in.

If one analyses the election of the Prime Minister and this government exactly a year ago, one sees that in no area has the Prime Minister and his government so blatantly betrayed the expectations they raised in the minds of the Canadian people than in their failure to provide leadership toward a solution of the urban problems in Canada today. I watched the election which ended exactly a year ago today. I visited constituents in my riding. I also visited other ridings and spoke in a good many other places. The one thing that struck me about the reaction of the people who said they would support Mr. Trudeau and his colleagues at that time—permit me to use the name of the Prime Minister in this context—was that he gave the impression he had some kind of feel for the fact the urban people were being oppressed by a lack of transportation, crowded streets, lack of recreational facilities for the children, lack of day-care nurseries for the children of working mothers and the alienation of people in apartment houses. They believed this man who led the Liberal party had some sense in dealing with all these problems. They thought he had a feeling for the fact there was change in the community and for the realization that the centre of that change in a modern industrial society was the metropolitan area, necessarily and inevitably. These people voted for this man and his party a year ago today because of the expectation they had that the Prime Minister had some kind of sensitivity about the problems of people living in the large metropolitan areas of Canada as well as the smaller urban communities. How wrong they were!

I say not only as a member of an opposition party but as a Canadian that the Prime Minister, the minister in charge of housing and all the other members of this government ought to look at themselves in the mirror, if they can stand it, to see what they have done to betray the expectations they raised exactly a year ago. There is still time for them to correct the situation.

The issue, as stated by the hon. member for Hamilton West, is where the government should direct its attention and its initiative. I cannot suggest a blueprint in the 20 minutes I am allowed; however, I will make two concrete suggestions in a moment. The Economic Council of Canada in its fourth annual review stated the problem as follows:

> —there has long been widespread concern about the mounting deficiencies of our cities and the heavy backlogs of essential improvements. Shortages and inadequacy of urban housing, traffic and transport problems, air and water pollution, the confused jumble of conflicting land uses, decaying neighbourhoods and monotonous suburbs, urban poverty and social disturbance, steadily rising property tax burdens and the frustrations of municipal administration—these are familiar problems to the average Canadian city dweller today.

We ask the government to direct its attention to these issues outlined by the Economic Council of Canada. In their report they also state these issues have become so important for all the people of Canada that they are national problems requiring national attention and solution.

• (4:50 p.m.)

What the minister has to face is not the fact that he is at last doing a little bit more for public housing, but the criminality of having stopped public housing for most of the past winter. This is what he has to face. He has to face not the excuse that he is at last

doing something about urban redevelopment but the criminality of having frozen those programs, and having raised the freeze on only 12, leaving 148 requests—I think that was the number he gave—waiting for his attention, let alone his action. It is not sufficient for him to boast that he is putting extra money into housing programs. There is the fact that over the years we have dealt so inadequately with housing problems altogether.

Above all, the minister has to explain to the people of Canada what kind of arid, legalistic mind could have thought up the idea that we cannot have a minister of housing and urban affairs but we can have a Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. What kind of arid, legalistic mind could satisfy itself with that kind of interpretation of the constitution, with the result that instead of leaving a department of housing and urban affairs, instead of having adequate staff to deal with the things that I am sure the minister is anxious to deal with, he is hemmed in through lack of adequate staff, not to mention the fact that he takes a cut in his salary, undeservedly, Mr. Speaker? However, I am not offering to negotiate that for him. He ought to do that himself. He ought to refuse to be treated this way. That is his business, not mine. He does not have the department he requires in order to deal with the problems with which I am sure he would like to deal.

The minister has to explain what kind of arid, legalistic mind can refuse to set up a national council for urban affairs, as requested by the Economic Council of Canada, to deal precisely with the kind of problems that the minister has outlined.

The minister quite rightly said, "We in the federal government cannot deal with the size of the cities, the bylaws regarding land use, the problems of where to go, in what direction, and so on. These are provincial-municipal matters that the federal government cannot do anything about by itself." But what the Economic Council indicated, what we suggested a year ago, and what has been suggested many times from this side of the house is that the federal government take the initiative to call the provinces together, and the major municipal regions of Canada, to discuss some of these problems, and not merely to discuss them but to make some kind of plan. But for that is necessary a ministry or department of housing and urban affairs.

They should also discuss the establishment of a national council of urban affairs, on which would be represented not only the federal and provincial governments but also the major municipal regions of Canada, as well as organizations such as the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. It is for the absence of any of these agencies, and it is for its refusal to accept any responsibility for leadership in all of these areas that we condemn the government.

We do not condemn the government for not performing miracles or solving the problems overnight. We know the problems are difficult and will take time to solve. We do not condemn it for not passing municipal bylaws; we know it has no authority to do so. But we do condemn it for its refusal to recognize that its role is not and must not be merely the role of the largest treasury in Canada, making money available for housing or urban renewal, for its refusal to recognize that the role of the central government of Canada must be a deliberate, determined and conscious attempt to find solutions for the urban problems facing Canadians from coast to coast. I say it is a good thing that the federal government—

Mr. Andras: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lewis: Sure.

Mr. Andras: This is purely for contribution to the debate and for clarification. Is the hon. member aware that in December, 1967, and I think subsequently in the spring of 1968 at the federal-provincial housing conference the government did in fact suggest the establishment of a national council almost identical to that referred to by the hon. member, and found a less than enthusiastic response from the provincial governments? Further, I would like the advice of the hon. member as to what action he would take in such a case. Would he ignore the stated objections of the provincial ministers who attended that conference?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the minister's veracity but all I can say in answer to him is that my memory, from watching the conference and reading about it, does not gibe with what he has said. It is my impression that the proposal for a national urban council was not made with very much heat or enthusiasm, that it received some *pro forma* brief discussion and then the matter was let go. I think my memory is right, and if that is what happened then I am not the least bit surprised that the provincial governments

threw out the proposal. This is not the way to give leadership.

The minister's reference to the housing conference reminds me to remind him that all the studies we have indulged in on these problems of housing and urban affairs should have given someone some knowledge about them. In addition to numerous books and articles, there were the Nicholson symposia held right across the country in 1966, and then there was the federal-provincial conference on housing to which the minister has referred. There were the studies by the Economic Council, and then a task force report. Yet despite all these studies the minister stands up and says, "I don't know what to do about urban renewal; I have to study this some more. I don't know what to do about public housing; I have to go back and study it more. I don't know what my policies ought to be in various directions; I still need some more study." This is a farcical excuse.

Since my time is about up, Mr. Speaker, let me add that I am convinced that all this is also the result of the attitude which the Prime Minister takes toward the constitution. I am convinced there are many members on the Liberal side of the house who, even though their language of criticism of the government would necessarily be a great deal more temperate than mine, are just as concerned about the problems to which the hon. member for Hamilton West and I have referred as we are, and are as dissatisfied with the performance of their government as we are.

To them I say, as I say to this house and to the people of Canada, if lack of leadership is still to be seen, in my opinion it is in large measure due to the legalistic, strait-jacketey approach which the Prime Minister takes to the Canadian constitution. It is the concept which he indicated in the working papers which he tabled the other day, and which I have only had a chance to glance through, a concept of an attempt to compartmentalize certain of the powers and of an attempt to make the provinces all-powerful in the exercise of certain other powers. It is this attitude which has resulted in the arid and legalistic nonsense of our not having a minister of housing and urban affairs.

There is nothing in modern society that is as important as the problem of urban living. All the speeches made a year ago by the Prime Minister, by the leaders of other parties, and by members of all parties in this house about the quality of life and improving the quality of life—all that stuff that was talked about during the election campaign a year ago has no meaning and is utterly dishonest unless related to the life of the city dweller in a modern industrial society.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I think I see you, Mr. Speaker, edging to the edge of your seat. I am completing my remarks. It is because of the importance of this problem that I welcome the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton West and say to the minister, with much more sorrow than pleasure, that his defensive mincing kind of excuse was a revelation of his inability and the inability of the government even to appreciate the nature of the problem which faces 70 per cent of the Canadian people today and which will face 80 per cent of the Canadian people in a few years' time.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). I must also concur in some of the remarks made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I do so as a member representing an urban area. While I fully appreciate the problems faced by my colleagues from the rural constituencies of Canada, it is my convinction that the greatest and most urgent problems facing the nation today arise out of the general problem of urban development. I am equally convinced that in no other area has this government so obviously shirked its responsibility or failed so dismally by avoiding meaningful action.

Since taking office a year ago the government has done nothing but talk about the need to do something. We have had promises from ministers and pleas for action from backbenchers on the government side. But the real issue has been obscured in a screen of words. I am sure that a scholarly man such as the Prime Minister is reputed to be will appreciate my borrowing Macbeth's well known words to describe this verbal camouflage: "It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." And "nothing" is the only word to describe what this government has accomplished in finding a solution to Canada's No. 1 continuing crisis.

When we consider that close to three-quarters of our people already live jammed into cites and towns occupying less than one one-hundredth of our total area, we can see something of the size of the problem. In spite of

the minister's remarks, the cities of this country have problems, lots of them. And they will get much worse in the near future unless the federal government stops its constitutional shilly-shallying. The government's hiding behind the British North America Act can have only one result. It means that the people of this country's urban areas will suffer. They will enjoy a much poorer kind of life as a direct result of the government's lack of leadership, its lack of action, its lack of foresight and in fact its absolute lack of almost any kind of common horse sense when it comes to doing something about the problems faced by our cities and their people. It is time the government stopped horsing around with this constitutional bit so far as our cities are concerned. That is all they are doing—horsing around trying to hitch up 19th century horse and buggy ideas to get our jet age cities ready for the 21st century.

Constitutionally the government is involved in the problems of the cities up to its neck. It just will not recognize it. It pays no attention to the good advice and all the startling facts that were laid before it by the Economic Council of Canada in its fourth report. What do we have to do to wake them up? The time of the walled city is gone, Mr. Speaker. There was only one real walled city in Canada—Quebec—and it has long since burst those bonds to expand far beyond its original boundaries, as has virtually every city in my part of Canada. The only walled city left in this country is the walled city of the government's closed mind, the walled city of the limited concepts of the night watchman state which this government uses to try to deal with what is essentially and primarily an urban and urbanizing culture.

We of the big cities need, indeed demand, a constitutional breakthrough. We demand that the government recognize the close connections between all of its policies and the way our cities develop. We insist that it see, that it realize, and that it act on the intimate relationships which bind our cities to our rural areas. Everything the government does for the farmer, everything it does against the farmer too—and here I am speaking as much or more about the modern agricultural industrialist as I am about the family farm—all federal policies relating to wheat surpluses, to the oil and gas industry, to the potash business, all their policies relating to construction, mining exploration, and so on, have very direct and immediate effects on our cities and their people.

[Mr. Paproski.]

The federal government's failure to sell Canadian wheat has meant commercial depression in some of our prairie cities and trading centres. The government's feeble-hearted attempts to persuade inflation to go away are felt with agonizing effects in our cities. Consumers in Edmonton, Calgary, Toronto, Montreal, in fact in all our cities, are completely at the mercy of the booming rise in food prices which the government permits by its inaction. No longer can the government deny its responsibility for our cities and their problems. They like passing the buck to the provinces on this question, but no longer. It is time they stopped trying to pass on these inflated Benson bucks to somebody else and tackled the problems themselves.

It hardly seems necessary to emphasize the rapid growth in our urban areas and the undesirable developments that accompany such unco-ordinated growth. In only five years, from 1961 to 1966, the populations of our large urban centres increased by almost 20 per cent. The smaller towns, with populations between 2,500 and 100,000, increased only 11.4 per cent, and the rural population actually went down. My own province of Alberta, as most of you know, is one of the most rapidly growing. Our capital city, part of which I have the honour to represent, increased in population from 337,500 in 1961 to 400,000 plus in 1966 and is now well over that. Calgary's population is booming as well and the favourite eastern image of our province as a land of farmers must disappear at once if the west and its problems are to be properly understood here. I must confess, however, there seems little hope that the inward-looking, walled city mentality of the present administration will ever make an honest effort to look west to understand us.

If our major cities were already working models of efficiency and high quality living, urban growth of the proportions I have indicated would not tax their existing facilities very much. But our metropolitan areas are conglomerations of mounting deficiencies and heavy backlogs of essential works still to be done. The government has been warned about the problems often enough. The Economic Council of Canada, which it appointed, outlined the situation with great clarity in its fourth report. But let me give a quotation from another government document:

> As each year thousands more Canadians seek city space and service to work and live and play and drive, one must wonder whether the existing

metropolitan structure in some areas at least can even meet the existing pressure, let alone make any noticeable inroads in the backlog of problems confronting it.

This report goes on to state that even in cities where the powers and problems of urbanization are less there is an urgent need for quick, decisive and imaginative action. These quotations, Mr. Speaker, are from the report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, led by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer). In light of this government's indifference to the cities, it is no wonder he felt impelled to resign.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The paradox of modern living in our cities is that while the consumer's money income seems to go up, and sometimes even his standard of living, although that is difficult these days with the inflation the government encourages, the opportunities to enjoy many important features of the good life which we associate with the cities are rapidly disappearing. We know that this government is obsessed with abstract constitutional theorizing, that it cares more about what it can write into dusty legal documents than about the kind of lives real people live. But is it totally unconcerned about the quality of life our people are able to enjoy? It would seem so.

The quality of life in our urban centres depends on many things, but not least on the following in addition to matters economic: housing and slum clearance, safety of the individual in his person and property, attractiveness of the city environment, and the basic hospitality of the neighbourhood. The government can and should be doing something about all of these matters. Let me say something briefly about each.

Let us first take housing and construction. Some time soon the minister responsible may be thawing out the slum deep freeze the government has imposed. But when he does eventually announce approval of urban renewal projects he had better make good and sure he does not discriminate against this country's growth centres again. The blows which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) aimed at the urban centres of my own province and those of British Columbia and Ontario are splendid examples of the government's completely negative approach toward the west and toward the problems of the cities. Urban unconcern of this order is a hallmark of the present administration, and it is time it stopped.

In respect of safety of the individual, we are lucky in this country that organized crime has not really developed very much yet. That only means the government has an opportunity, not a guarantee. Strong and imaginative action by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could do much to inspire the forces of law and order in this country to save our expanding, crowded urban centres from the metropolitan criminal horrors endured by our friends to the south. Will there be leadership and imaginative help by the R.C.M.P? Will the police forces get the assistance they need from the federal government?

Let me refer to a clean environment. We have already belaboured the house with our serious concern about the cleanliness and attractiveness of the environment. I can only repeat my colleagues' remarks of a previous day to emphasize the necessity of the government taking very firm steps and of exerting significant leadership to end the growing pollution of our cities and countryside.

The next subject is hospitality. I prefer the word hospitality but its opposite, the one this government prefers, is alienation. As our urban areas continue to grow, so too does the problem of alienation. Purely and simply this means that too many of our people are becoming detached and uncaring about one another. The problem is a very serious social phenomenon about which action is required.

What can the federal government do? It can help our people take pride in their communities and particularly in their country. This is especially the case with regard to new immigrants to our country, and even with some established members of the non-British and non-French groups. The problem of alienation confronts these people far more than any other. Many immigrants speak neither English nor French. Unable to communicate with others they feel lonely and afraid.

The number of immigrants has increased by nearly 40 per cent since 1961, some 184,000 people last year alone. These people are flooding into our cities and the federal government must go all out to welcome them, to help them identify, to encourage them to take out citizenship with meaningful, heart-stretching steps—in short, to make them feel like real Canadians. The so-called citizenship part of our immigration program is woefully lagging in imagination, in national pride and in human concern.

I have taken enough time. I have not dealt with the necessity of federal development of

a new model for Canadian cities of the 1970's, but this is urgently needed. Many things are urgently needed for the future. There are many problems. Will this government do its share? I doubt it.

I want to refer to one of the special features of life in Canada, the invisible city. You can touch it, walk around it, breathe its polluted air, get caught in its traffic jams, and once upon a time you could even buy a house in it. But so far as this government is concerned, the city does not exist. Most of the people of Canada live in cities but the municipal officials they elect cannot sit in on discussions about the future of the country, and too often cannot get the information they need about programs which directly affect their own development. Most of the problems of Canada are in the cities, but the government refuses to contemplate direct programs.

My colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West, has referred to the constitution as a smokescreen. It is that. No one denies the difficulties which the constitution creates, but they can be overcome. The real problem is that the Prime Minister is not inclined to overcome them. That was the message of the resignation of the hon. member for Trinity. The Liberal government apologists can try to disguise it in any way they want, but the fact stands out that he wanted to act. He wanted to make the cities and their problems visible and the Prime Minister preferred to hide behind the constitution.

This government is committing many crimes against the people who live in the cities. Its basic crime is that it pretends the cities do not exist. That is bad enough in that it provides the government with an excuse for failure to act on distinctive urban problems, but it has another important effect. It hides several major problems which the country cannot continue to hide. One of them is poverty. The fifth annual review of the Economic Council of Canada emphasized the proportions of poverty in Canada and the degree to which it is an urban problem. It pointed out that serious poverty is only "a subway ride away" for residents of our major metropolitan areas.

The problem of the Indian people, of which the minister should be well aware and which was discussed earlier today, has become an urban problem as more and more people from reserves, or with official status under the Indian Act, are moving into the cities, particularly on the prairies. The mayor of Winnipeg, for instance, has said he is the mayor of "The largest Indian reserve in Canada". To a smaller degree a similar kind of thing is happening in Edmonton. The problem is that many native people, out of work, are attracted to the city where they constitute a major expense and problem and there is, as usual, confusion about which level of government is to help them.

The problem of immigration is such that if the government had a policy that policy could not overlook the problem of integration of new Canadians into their communities which in most cases are urban communities. These are serious Canadian problems which we cannot afford to ignore. Yet we are ignoring them now because the federal government continues to treat the cities as though they were invisible. The Prime Minister came to office promising change.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Badanai): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

An hon. Member: All he needs is another minute.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Paproski: There has been a great deal of talk about participatory democracy. But look at the record. Time after time federal and provincial governments discuss major matters which are vital to the plans and expansion of various cities. City officials are not apprised; they are kept in the dark and the progress and plans for their cities are held up. A constitutional conference is held, and municipal officials request the right to attend. The Prime Minister claims that he cleared the way for them to attend. He cleared the way as he usually does, by passing the buck to the provinces. Certainly he did not encourage the attendance or participation of municipal officials.

So far as the cities are concerned, participatory democracy seems to mean the right to protest after something harmful has been done. Any positive steps in terms of solving urban problems in the last year in Canada have been taken by the cities themselves. The Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in particular has shown outstanding initiative and deserves to be recognized. Several of the provinces have also been active. But it is a fact that the contribution of the Trudeau government to urban development in Canada has been entirely negative. They cut back the winter works program;

they imposed, through the recent budget, a freeze on development in major cities; they put forward the pretence that there is no housing crisis in Canada; they have played around with urban renewal so much that nobody, not even the minister, knows what the policy of the government is.

This government, which sits in office because it was able to win seats in the cities, has virtually ignored urban problems in the year it has been in office. There is no indication that they intend to change their practice. We have a right to ask questions and demand answers. What steps is the government taking to follow the lead of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities on the question of urban transport? What studies is the government conducting on urban development projects and related projects in United States' cities and those of other countries? What attention is it giving to the particular urban aspect of problems like poverty, immigration and Indian Affairs? What understanding is the government prepared to give now regarding the involvement of municipal officials, and people informed about the cities, in constitutional and other relevant discussions?

The election was a year ago. The Prime Minister spent a great deal of his time in the cities. Apparently he has had enough of them. If he continues to treat the cities of Canada as invisible, they will soon have had enough of him.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, we have heard this afternoon many spokesmen for the urban areas of Canada. The arguments we heard could be used perfectly well against the further rapid growth of particular areas in Canada which prejudice rural areas and small communities across Canada.

Mr. McCleave: Stamp out Toronto!

Mr. Hopkins: We have heard in the house many arguments advanced about the constitutional conflict. We had a debate all day last Monday in connection with a motion on pollution when we were considering vote No. 1 of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. The committee report was an excellent one. I see that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) is smiling. I am sure he agrees with me on that point.

We cannot overlook the constitutional conflict. The tack taken in many parts of the house is to the effect that we should just bulldoze through in respect of our national programs and forget about the provinces and those people who are supporters of provincial autonomy. Hon. members have been telling the government to go ahead and bulldoze over the top of the provinces.

Mr. Woolliams: What about medicare?

Mr. Hopkins: The other day the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) said that the Ottawa River stinks. That was when I was mentioning the constitutional conflict that exists in connection with that river. I agree with the hon. member but I say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that it does not stink any more than do the motions placed before the house on Monday and today which try to lay the full blame on the federal government for the pollution which exists.

There is an obvious purpose in trying to lay total responsibility on the federal government at a time when the government does not by any means have total constitutional responsibility in this field. Comments were made to the effect that great legislation to combat pollution had been brought forward in the United States. Anyone in the house who makes that kind of comment should visit the United States and look into the problem of pollution they have there. If they did, I do not think they would praise to the extent they have the work that has been done in that country.

I reiterate what I said the other day. If the federal government had exclusive powers in this field, such as the United States government has, it would be giving more direction. I say to members of the opposition that when they make these statements they are in effect demanding more constitutional power for the federal government. I wholeheartedly agree—perhaps I should not go quite that far.

Mr. Woolliams: Oh, go ahead.

Mr. Hopkins: I am very much in agreement with the first prime minister of this country, Sir John A. Macdonald, who wanted the federal government to be strong. We would be in a better position today if we had a strong federal government constitutionally. Then we could go ahead and solve some of the problems facing us. If the federal government defaulted in respect of the work that needed to be done in this area, and had the constitutional power to do it, the government could be blamed. But I ask members of the opposition not to drag in this red herring of bestowing on the federal government all the powers that are jealously guarded by provincial administrations.

If the provincial governments do not want this responsibility, I suggest we should hold one of those very congenial federal-provincial conferences and the provinces should hand over the powers they have in respect of pollution control and economic development. We cannot talk about controlling pollution here, there and everywhere else without realizing that it must go hand in hand with the economic development of this nation.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) introduced a bill which would have the effect of spreading out the economic development of Canada. What must the minister do to see that the program is effectively carried out? He must obtain agreement from the provinces because the hands of the federal government are tied.

I hope many hon. members believe as I do that the day the federal government is given extensive powers in the field of economic development and pollution control we will be able to improve the economic development of this country and create a nation which does not have large areas of poverty and areas of great wealth. When the federal government is given these powers the nation will be pollution free wherever industry is to be found. These things must go hand in hand.

I mentioned the legislation regarding regional development. We are talking today about areas in which there is great industrial development. It is in these areas that we have pollution. If we do not spread out our industries across Canada into the smaller communities—I am not for a moment forgetting the Ottawa Valley, because we have not had enough industry in the Upper Ottawa Valley in the last few years to drive out the mosquitoes that we have in the springtime—

Mr. Gilbert: We have had a Liberal government.

Mr. Hopkins: The hon. member for Broadview says we have had a Liberal government. If the federal government has sole responsibility for the state of our economy, why did the government of Ontario introduce its Ontario Development Corporation to promote industry in other areas? Surely this is an admission that economic development is the responsibility of the provinces. I tell the hon. member for Broadview that so much money has been put into the large, growing industrial complexes in certain areas of the country that rural development has suffered. This is why I want to see greater control exercised at the federal level.

Multilane highways have been built in Toronto. Hon. members have been demanding, and rightly so, urban renewal in certain areas. That this need exists cannot be denied. The problem is there and it has to be solved. But if we continue to let the large urban areas grow we will create more pollution problems for the future. A rural area such as mine does not have good roads into the large urban centres. We do not have enough money for agricultural development in eastern Canada. We hear a great deal about the western farmer. Far too much emphasis has been placed upon the urban areas of Canada. It is time we from the rural areas spoke up at the provincial and federal levels and asked for a square deal for all of Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: What about Toronto and those who come from that city?

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Hopkins: I am not saying anything about voters in Toronto. I heard a comment from the hon. member for—I hope I name him correctly—Calgary East—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Hopkins: Calgary North. I am sure the voters in Toronto want to see a cure for this problem. I do not think they are so greedy that they will demand everything in Canada. I know them better than that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hopkins: I am glad the minister in charge of housing is here. I appreciate the effort and the time he is spending on the development of housing in rural areas. I think it is a great injustice that an area such as mine in Renfrew County or the district of Nipissing must abide by what are in effect urban rules if it is to get housing at all. Towns like Petawawa and Pembroke which are largely dormitory towns. There is little industrial base there by comparison with wealthier cities in this country. The cost of all the services needed for the development of housing in a town like Pembroke rests largely on the shoulders of the residential community, imposing a heavy burden. This again is a matter for the provincial administration, because that is where control of municipal taxation lies.

I hope the minister responsible for housing comes up with a constructive program to include housing in areas which do not have sewer and water lines combined. Laws which

are basically laid down for urban communities are a deterrent to the development of communities in rural areas. For my part, I have faith in the ability of the minister to come up with constructive suggestions in this regard. One suggestion I might make to him is that in areas such as I have mentioned, where services must be supplied and where no industrial base exists to support the necessary taxation, larger grants, additional grants, should be made so as to assist these communities in their development. It would be a good idea to give authority in the bill itself for the minister to consider the situation of these communities and areas on an individual basis, using his own good judgment, rather than letting the legislation become a straitjacket of rules.

A word about the regional development legislation. I hope it will succeed in bringing industry into many areas of slow economic growth, including my own. When a community ceases to grow a certain amount of depression is created and many of the people who live in the area feel discouraged. It is, basically, of great importance that from this day onward we should try to get more and more industry out of the large complexes which already exist and begin to develop smaller regions in an effort to give this country greater depth beyond the borderline between Canada and the United States, as well as to provide employment for people who prefer to live in rural areas.

Many of those living in our cities today face a housing crisis. They would not do so if the federal government had the right to develop this country on an economic basis from coast to coast instead of the responsibility being divided among ten provinces. We cannot afford to continue as we are doing. If we build a New York city around the urban complex in Ontario we shall run into the same problems as New York which is already approaching bankruptcy through its efforts to fight pollution.

It would be far cheaper in the long run to spread industry across this country even if this entailed making amendments to the constitution to give the federal government authority to do so, as well as authority to combat pollution. These debates on pollution, these endeavours to pass the buck, are useless.

Mr. Woolliams: Then why are you talking about it?

Mr. Hopkins: Why was it brought up?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hopkins: We have spent Monday and today debating problems of pollution for which responsibility is divided between the provincial and federal authorities. The field of the federal authority is that of research. What does this amount to, if it is not trying to pass the buck to Ottawa instead of laying it squarely on the shoulders where it belongs? Those provinces which are really concerned with this matter should adopt an aggressive policy toward pollution in Canada or place the responsibility right here where it should be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Hopkins: I would prefer that the hon. member wait until the end.

It would be much cheaper for taxpayers who live in the years to come were we to hold a constitutional conference today, one which faced up to the realization that economic development should be the responsibility of one authority in Canada, namely, the federal government, which would have power to spread this development in order that we might not be called upon to combat pollution in one particular area or in a few areas of this country. Along with that should go extensive measures to control the pollution that is caused by industry wherever industry is sited, in order to see to it that industry toes the line from the beginning. This would mean that we would not all of a sudden be called upon to spend large amounts of the taxpayers' money to combat a problem that would already be well on its way to solution.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I commend these measures to the house and I hope that the legislation being brought in by the Minister of Regional Economic Development will be successful. I also trust that the minister in charge of housing will note my remarks concerning housing in rural areas, small communities or towns that do not have a wealthy industrial base. I trust he will take those remarks into consideration and reimburse those communities for needed services and update those they already have.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I now ask the hon. member for Renfrew North my question? In view of the strong stand he has taken, with which I agree, for greater economic powers for the federal government, may I ask him whether he has

pressed this point upon his Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and called upon the federal government to seek these broader powers?

Mr. Hopkins: He is not just my Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker; he is the Prime Minister of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilbert: Don't brag about it.

Mr. Hopkins: Envy will get you nowhere. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has asked a very pertinent question. May I assure him that we in the Liberal party are liberal thinkers. We have the opportunity of expressing our views to our leader because he is a reasonable man.

May I conclude by saying that if my recommendations are not accepted, then I am not going to go away angry. I am going to come back and fight another day. That is the way democracy should work, and it is the way in which our democratic Prime Minister works.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview has 30 seconds.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speakern it would take me 30 minutes to reply not only to the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins) but also to the speech made by the minister in charge of housing. I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) for the very fine speech he made which underlined the lack of leadership to deal with the problem of urban growth in Canada. I should also like to condemn the weak-kneed speech by the minister in charge of housing on this very important problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to section 10 of Standing Order 58, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings on the motion now before the house and to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the two motions to concur in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, and the supply bill based thereon.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L20 (REVISED), 1969-70

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That vote L20 (revised), Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN MAIN ESTIMATES, 1969-70

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970, except vote L10, Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, and vote L20, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and less the amounts voted in interim supply, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house that the said estimates be concurred in?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Macdonald Rosedale (for Mr. Drury) moved that Bill C-210, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1970, be now read the first time and printed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the second time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Speaker: Now, agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may we have copies of the bill?

Mr. Speaker: I understand that copies are being distributed for the enlightenment of hon. members.

Mr. Macdonald Rosedale (for Mr. Drury) moved that Bill C-210, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1970, be now read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. House in committee of the whole on Bill C-210.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Macdonald Rosedale (for Mr. Drury) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed the following bills, without any amendment: Bill C-192, an act to amend the National Housing Act, 1954; Bill C-201, an act to amend the National Housing Act, 1954; Bill C-191, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, and Bill C-197, an act to amend the Criminal Code.

[*Translation*]

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that the joint committee on the Library of Parliament has tabled a report on the regulations of the library.

[*Editor's Note: The aforementioned committee report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

Is it the wish of the house that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 26, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY HON. MEMBERS OF VOTING RESULT IN MANITOBA

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we proceed further I call on hon. members to have in mind what I said to the house a while ago about the type of demonstration which we have just experienced. I suggest that hon. members should co-operate with the Chair and with the house generally in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I notice, as you have also noted, that the members of the New Democratic party have put flowers on a desk because they won the election in Manitoba.

I should like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that we hold the balance of power in Manitoba.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the flowers ought to be kept on the hon. member's desk. I suggest that they should be removed from the house.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ninth report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence—Mr. Wahn.

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts—Mr. Hales.

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS—CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT

Mr. Philip G. Givens (York West) presented the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency) presented the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, in French and in English, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

TABLING OF REVISED REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION—STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1968, I indicated to the house that the government hoped it would be possible to make public an expurgated version of the report of the Royal Commission on Security. I also expressed the hope that whatever expurgated version was published would have the certification of the commissioners themselves that any deletions from the original report made by the government had been made in the interest of national security only, and for no other reason.

Despite the length of time which has been taken for the detailed study required to prepare such an abridged version, I am very pleased indeed to table copies of the revised report, in both official languages, bearing the certification of the commissioners as follows:

> "The report of the Royal Commission on Security as originally submitted to the Governor in Council in October, 1968, included some material which in this published version has been omitted or amended in the interest of national security. These changes are of small significance in the context of the report as a whole, and the royal commissioners agree that they do not affect the substance of the report or its recommendations."

I might add that copies of the revised report were sent yesterday to the leaders of the opposition parties, to the Right Honourable member for Prince Albert, as a Privy Councillor and a former prime minister, and as well to former prime ministers Pearson and St. Laurent.

Statement by Prime Minister on Security

The government of Canada is grateful to the members of the royal commission, Mr. M. W. Mackenzie, M. Yves Pratte and the Honourable M. J. Coldwell, P.C., for having undertaken the heavy burden of making a full and confidential inquiry into the operation of Canadian security methods and procedures, and for having reported thereon within two years. The views expressed in the report are, of course, those of the commissioners themselves. Their recommendations and the arguments underlying them are under serious study by the government and indeed some of them have already been put into effect in some degree. While it is reasonably clear from study thus far that not all of their recommendations will be accepted, and that not all of those accepted will be implemented immediately in whole or in part, a substantial number will be both accepted and implemented. Apart altogether from such specific action, however, it is our conviction that the report as a whole will serve as a most useful and stimulating basis for public discussion and for a better understanding of the problems of security.

It seems to us particularly important that Canadians at this time in their history be enabled to participate in full and informed discussion of security matters, an area of public administration which all too often in the past has been the subject of misunderstanding and misconception, and has thus come to be regarded, both in this house and among the media and the public at large, with excessive and unwarranted drama and mystery.

There will of course always be matters which governments must keep privy to themselves in order that the public interest may be best served, even in the freest and most open of societies. As the commissioners have stated, and I quote:

> Canada remains the target of subversive or potentially subversive activities, attempts at infiltration and penetration, and espionage operations—

and they emphasize that:

> —the duty of the state to protect its secrets from espionage, its information from unauthorized disclosure, its institutions from subversion and its policies from clandestine influence is indisputable; what are matters for dispute are the organizations and procedures established by the State to meet this responsibility in an area which can touch closely upon the fundamental freedoms of the individual.

The government fully agrees with this view, and also agrees that "effective security arrangements must have a firm basis in public awareness and understanding". We are also grateful to the commissioners for having prepared their report in such a manner that the bulk of it can be made available for thoughtful consideration by Canadians generally.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, as you and hon. members will note, the royal commissioners have expressed dissatisfaction with several security methods and procedures, and have recommended certain organizational changes and improvements. The most significant of these is for the establishment of a new civilian non-police agency to perform the functions of a security service in Canada. The commissioners suggest that this agency would eventually be quite separate from the R.C.M.P., and would not have law enforcement powers, although it would operate in close liaison with the R.C.M.P. and other police forces.

They base their proposal in large part on their conclusion that there are wide differences between police and security duties, and that these differences "should be reflected in recruiting methods, in training and career patterns, and in organizational structures." They also concluded that, although it was almost impossible to measure the effectiveness of a security service, particularly in the important fields of counter-espionage and counter-subversion, the effectiveness of procedures for the security investigation of persons appeared to be capable of improvement.

Further, the commissioners considered that the association of the security function with the police role tended to make the work of the security authorities more difficult, and that "inquiries by civilians in connection with the security clearance of personnel would be regarded with more understanding than are inquiries by policemen."

After careful study of the considerations put forward by the commissioners in support of their recommendation, we have come to the conclusion that current and foreseeable security problems in Canada can be better dealt with within the R.C.M.P. through appropriate modifications in their existing structure than by attempting to create a wholly new and separate service.

We are keenly aware that the R.C.M.P. are one of the most honoured and respected of Canadian institutions. The force has come to be recognized as one of the finest national police forces in the world, whose members, as the commissioners rightly state, are "carefully selected, highly motivated, and of great

integrity." The government also recognizes that no organization is perfect, and that there is some validity in the view of the royal commissioners that some basic differences do exist between police and security duties, by their very nature.

It is therefore the government's intention, with the full understanding of the R.C.M.P., to ensure that the Directorate of Security and Intelligence will grow and develop as a distinct and identifiable element within the basic structure of the force, and will be more responsive, in its composition and character, to the national security requirements described by the commissioners. The basic aim will be to develop the security service so as to draw on the police services for personnel of suitable qualifications and character, and to retain administrative, research, documentation and other services in common with them. The security service, under the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P., will be increasingly separate in structure and civilian in nature.

• (2:20 p.m.)

New and more flexible policies in relation to recruiting, training, career planning and operations will be calculated to ensure that Canada's security service will be capable of dealing fairly and effectively with the new and complex security problems which we will undoubtedly face in the future, and also to ensure that it clearly reflects the nature of our cultural heritage. Under the new arrangements it will be possible, for example, for an increasing number of university graduates from all parts of Canada to join the Directorate in a civilian capacity and to aspire to positions at the top of that organization, thereby making the kind of contribution referred to by the commissioners. Nothing in the proposed changes will unfairly prejudice the career expectations of people already in the service.

Some of the comments in the report which refer to the R.C.M.P. are more properly directed at aspects of government policy. We intend to keep under review our basic policies and procedures in relation to security, as the commissioners have recommended. The establishment of the Department of the Solicitor General in 1966 was a major step in this direction. Further advances have been made since that time in improving the efficiency of the R.C.M.P., even though they have not been overly publicized. I do not propose to describe these advances in detail, except to say that they represent a careful and methodical build-up of modern technical facilities directed toward the detection and prevention of large scale organized crime, as well as the provision of information which the government requires in order to ensure the security and integrity of the state. This latter is one of the major and most difficult duties of any democratic government. It is one which, perhaps more than any other, requires public reassurance that the measures taken in its discharge are not of a character which could infringe the basic rights of individuals or be damaging to their careers and reputations.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the government, after careful consideration, has decided to accept the commissioners' recommendation for the establishment of a Security Review Board. Full details of the scope, character and operation of the board are still under consideration and these may differ in some respects from the commission's recommendations. Hon. members will recall that in 1967 provision was made, by amendments to the Financial Administration Act, for public employees subject to dismissal on security grounds to be given an opportunity to be heard by an independent person at a formal inquiry. The commissioners suggest a broader system of review of the decisions of departments, which would—

> —preserve the requirement for governmental responsibility and decision, give adequate protection to sensitive information and sources, yet provide a reasonably effective safeguard against arbitrary, hasty or ill-considered judgments, and perhaps also avoid the necessity of ad hoc inquiries into individual cases.

It is their opinion that such a system of review might be required in the three areas of employment, immigration and citizenship. The three basic principles which they would apply are: first, that the individuals concerned be given as many details as possible of the factors which have entered into the decisions; second, that the decisions of the Review Board could only be advisory; and third, that the importance of expertise and understanding in security matters is such that the same board should review contentious decisions in all of the three areas.

With these basic principles the government agrees. They were, in fact, the guiding principles in the establishment of review procedures for dismissals on security grounds devised by the government under Prime Minister Pearson, and announced in this house on October 25, 1963. I must say that those procedures appear to have worked well

in the intervening years, not because they have been often called upon, but because their very existence has caused departments and agencies of government to examine with much greater care those cases in which dismissal on security grounds might have seemed desirable, to have taken the subject into their confidence to a much greater degree than in the past, and on the whole to have been able to resolve such cases to the satisfaction of both employer and employee.

Nevertheless, the members of the Royal Commission on Security have recommended a broader, and somewhat more formal, system of review of cases involving not only possible dismissal on security grounds, but also transfers, denial of promotion, apparent inhibition of career prospects, refusal to admit sponsored or nominated immigrants to Canada, or the refusal of applicants for Canadian citizenship, all on security grounds. The advice of the board in any given case together with its recommendations or comments, would be given to the Governor in Council and the minister concerned. By implication, the final decision would remain with the Governor in Council or the minister concerned. A brief record of the board's "decision" would also be communicated to the individual concerned.

As I have said, the government is carefully considering the details of this proposal, not only in relation to the further safeguarding of the rights of individual Canadians, but also in the context of existing legislation which was intended to provide similar safeguards. It is also being considered in relation to one of the concepts most basic to our form of government, that of ministerial responsibility. When these studies have been completed, it is my intention to make quite clear to parliament and to the public the form of review procedures which will be adopted in line with the three principles set out by the commissioners, and taking into account the legislation which has been passed by this parliament to provide assurances of fair treatment for the individual members of our society.

The commissioners also proposed that the Security Review Board receive and consider annual or semi-annual reports from the head of the security service, and have authority to draw to the direct attention of the Prime Minister any matters it considers appropriate. The government does not find itself in agreement with this proposal.

On the subject of industrial security, the government has noted the suggestion of the commissioners that the function might be allocated to the Department of National Defence or, if that were considered impracticable, the Department of Defence Production—now the Department of Supply and Services—should continue to take steps to improve the performance of this important function. Many such steps have been taken in recent months, and it is the considered view of both departments concerned, and that of the government generally, that this task should continue to be the responsibility of the organization most directly affected, the Department of Supply and Services.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to indicate at this time what the government's response to the many other recommendations of the royal commission will be, except to say that they will all be closely and positively studied with a view to continuous improvement of our security methods and procedures. The views of hon. members and of the public generally on the report of the royal commission will be of great interest and assistance to us in arriving at sound and acceptable decisions in this difficult field. It is our intention to consult with the leaders of the opposition parties to determine how the report might best be made the subject of parliamentary debate during the next session.

In conclusion I should like to say that the royal commissioners have pointed up, and have helpfully recommended upon, a number of apparent inadequacies in our past and present security methods and procedures. I am reassured, as I am sure most Canadians will be, that they have not found any evidence that, since the revelations of 1945, Canada has been responsible for any serious loss of her own or allied security information. I trust that this report, and the fact of its publication in such detail, will be regarded as an earnest of our continued determination to grow as a strong and free country committed to democratic principles.

[*English*]

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in case you are nervous, I assure you I will not be as long as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) but I do want to thank him for a very full statement in connection with this report, for which we have all waited quite a long time. I want to thank him also for his courtesy in letting me have a copy of his statement and an abridged report in advance.

I look forward with the Prime Minister to an opportunity at the next session for a more full discussion of the recommendations of the royal commission. I join him in expressing our appreciation to the commissioners for working so conscientiously and so well in such a difficult area as this area of security.

The Prime Minister has not indicated what the attitude of the government will be towards all the recommendations of the royal commission, and on several important recommendations he has indicated the government has substantial reservations. For example, it is clear that the government does not accept the proposal that there is to be established a new non-police agency to perform the functions of a security service in Canada. The Prime Minister hopes to realize the advantages the royal commission sees in this proposal by making appropriate modifications to the structure of the R.C.M.P. I might have some doubts as to whether the mounted police, as it is presently constituted and organized, lends itself very readily to the sort of modifications to which the Prime Minister refers.

• (2:30 p.m.)

My initial reaction might be that we are more interested in considering the proposal for a special agency, though I can see certain difficulties in this regard. But I look forward to hearing a further explanation in the house by the government when we have our discussion, presumably in the fall. In the meantime, there will be an opportunity for further consideration and discussion throughout the country.

Another recommendation is that the Security Review Board receive and consider periodic reports from the head of the security service and have authority to draw to the direct attention of the Prime Minister any matters it considers appropriate. The government in effect seems to reject this proposal. Personally, I would be inclined to favour the recommendation that would require the head of the security service to report periodically to the review board. However, this is also something that can be discussed further.

I gather that the government has also withheld judgment on the proposal that a quite wide variety of decisions, including transfers, denial of promotion, and citizenship and immigration decisions made for security reasons, be made subject to review by the proposed review board. I think this is a quite important recommendation. I can appreciate that it requires extensive study to work out a practical method to give effect to it. I should have liked to hear the Prime Minister endorse it, at least in principle, today. I hope he will deal with it more fully when we next have an opportunity to discuss it.

It is interesting to recall that what gave rise to the appointment of the Royal Commission several years ago was not any evidence that our security apparatus as such was inadequate or ineffective, but it was an incident which raised questions as to how surely the rights of Canadians are safeguarded in the process. At one point in his statement the Prime Minister mentioned "one of the concepts most basic to our form of government, that of ministerial responsibility". The fact is that on matters relating to our national security, parliament has always accepted some considerable limit on its right to demand information and full disclosure by the government. So far as any of us know, the security apparatus and procedures of our country over the years—at least since 1945—have been effective. The Prime Minister referred to this today. The Royal Commission has not found any evidence to the contrary.

We all have an interest in maintaining the effectiveness of the security operation at a high level. At the same time, parliament will want to insist on assurances that the security operation, much of which must be carried on outside the purview of parliament, is conducted with extreme care for fairness and common sense. We would therefore, at this stage at least, welcome the Security Review Board, the clarification of security regulations and other initiatives that would strengthen the security of the state and reinforce the protection of the individual.

I am sure that members of parliament accept the necessity that much of the security operation is conducted outside our purview. What would be cause for grave concern would be any thought that much of the operation is beyond the ken of the ministry or the Prime Minister; that there are not ministers, elective and responsible members of government, to whom the entire security operation is an open book, who have continuing access to everything that is going on in that area, and who give proper, responsible, political, civilian direction to the operation on a continuing basis. None of us would want to see a security operation in this country running under its own steam and answerable only to itself—a government, so to speak, within the government. The very decision as to what affects security and what does not, what must

be secret and what public, is finally a matter of political decision and judgment. The effective supremacy of the civilian authority must never be compromised in this matter.

I welcome the spirit as expressed in the statement of the Prime Minister. I assure him and the house that we share the sense of importance that he attaches to all questions of national security and individual rights raised by the presentation of this report. I look forward to giving fuller and further consideration to the report, and to a more detailed consideration of it when we next have an opportunity to do so, presumably in the fall.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my thanks to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for his courtesy in making a copy of his statement and a copy of the abridged report of the Royal Commission on Security available to me. I have not had a chance to study it in great detail, because some interesting events have intervened which have taken my mind off the report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): But I have had an opportunity to examine the recommendations contained in the report. I commend the government for deciding to make the report public, even in its abridged form. I think there would have been a good deal of misunderstanding and even some suspicion had the government not made the report public. I believe they made a wise decision in the action they have taken.

We all recognize that dealing with the matter of security is a very difficult one indeed because there are two basic principles which must be reconciled. The task of parliament, and certainly the task of the government, is to find a balance between these two principles. The first principle, of course, is that the government is charged with the responsibility of maintaining the security and integrity of the state against subversion, and any efforts on the part of those who seek to change our society by resorting to force. We all recognize that if the democratic process is to survive we must take steps to prevent any person or group of persons in our country, or any who are sent from outside the country, trying to bring about changes in our society by resorting to violence. But against that lies another fundamental principle, that we must guarantee the rights of the individual so that under the guise of security no person can receive unfair treatment, can be tried by Star Chamber methods or be labelled as a security risk without an adequate opportunity to defend himself or herself. They must know the charges against them and have the due process of law applied to their particular case.

Certainly no one in this parliament wants to see any individual adversely affected on the basis of idle gossip or malicious reports that are completely unfounded, and have all of this done under the mask of national security. Of course, it was because instances like this did arise that the government agreed to set up the commission. I think the report has dealt very adequately with the situation.

There are a number of recommendations in the report. I am certainly not going to deal with them all and shall mention only two of them. First of all I refer to the recommendation of the royal commission that there be a civilian, non-police agency because, as they point out, there is a wide difference between police and security duties. Without any reflection whatsoever on the very excellent service the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have performed, there is a great difference between law enforcement and the carrying out of the duties of a security service. There is a difference in the type of training required, the form of recruitment and the structure of a police force, on the one hand, and a security agency on the other.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I submit that it takes a certain degree of training and sophistication to recognize the difference between honest dissent and a desire to subvert our democratic form of society. Therefore, I think that the recommendation of the royal commission for the setting up of a civilian non-police agency has a great deal of merit, and I am extremely disappointed that the government has rejected this proposal out of hand. I hope that when discussions take place later the Prime Minister will give the reasons why this recommendation has been rejected. I would even venture to hope that the government might reconsider this decision because I think there is much to be said for having the kind of non-police agency which was recommended by the commission.

The second major recommendation is the setting up of a Security Review Board, and I cannot agree with the Prime Minister when he says that the present procedure has worked satisfactorily. I do not think it has

worked satisfactorily, because we know nothing about it. Persons who have appealed to it have not been able to have any access, other than to a committee of civil servants who are dealing with problems that have to do with other civil servants. Certainly the idea of having a Security Review Board outside the civil service and completely unbiased is, in my opinion, almost the only way that we can guarantee that those who are affected by these security measures will have adequate protection. Much will depend upon the personnel appointed, and much will depend upon the procedures which are set up by the government. It seems to me that those procedures have to include the right to counsel, and the right to know all the facts that have been gathered in condemnation of the person affected. They have the right to face their accusers and hear the accusations against them, and I submit that such a board of review should have what the commission recommended, namely the right to receive the annual reports of the intelligence and security branch of the R.C.M.P. and, above all, the right to draw any matter which disturbs them to the attention of the Prime Minister.

I am totally at a loss to understand why the Prime Minister rejected this proposal. It seems to me that if a Security Review Board is to have any value at all, it must have the right, when it comes across a circumstance which in the opinion of its members contravenes the right of an individual, to take that matter directly to the highest officer, the first minister of the Crown. I hope that the government will reconsider this matter.

In conclusion I should like to say that I hope the government will give particular consideration to the recommendations that are made with respect to immigration. There has been too much of an aura of secrecy cast around the whole question of immigration, and the reasons why some applicants have been rejected. The only reasons we have been given were that they are refused admission to Canada on security grounds. In many cases this has not been substantiated, and in some cases the grounds advanced seemed to be very weak indeed. I think that the recommendations of the royal commission in this regard are worthy of implementation, and I hope the government will see fit to do so.

We have looked forward to the discussion on this whole question which will take place in the next session, and we hope that as a result of the report of the royal commission we shall be able to establish in Canada procedures whereby, while retaining the security and integrity of the state, we fully safeguard the rights of every Canadian citizen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for his courtesy in letting us have a copy of the report of the Royal Commission on Security, so that we could look into it. We have not had a chance to study this abridged version thoroughly, but it is fitting, I think, to congratulate the commissioners, Messrs. Mackenzie, Pratte and Coldwell, for the magnificent job they did in inquiring into the security of the state.

The Prime Minister indicated that "not all of the recommendations will be accepted, and that not all of these accepted will be implemented immediately, in whole or in part." That means that even if we discussed the Prime Minister's statement all afternoon, that would change nothing to the present situation. However, I deem it advisable to recall these remarks of the commissioners quoted by the Prime Minister:

> "Canada remains the target of subversive or potentially subversive activities, attempts at infiltration and penetration, and espionage operations", and they emphasize that
>
> "the duty of the state to protect its secrets from espionage, its information from unauthorized disclosure, its institutions from subversion and its policies from clandestine influence is indisputable; what are matters for dispute are the organizations and procedures established by the state to meet this responsibility in an area which can touch closely upon the fundamental freedoms of the individual."

Mr. Speaker, this report is quite useful to the people in general and to parliament in particular, since it leads to a better understanding of the security problems which come up both in the public service and in Canadian industry which have classified information. However, I was particularly struck by the lines I have just quoted:

> —from clandestine influence . . .; what are matters for dispute are the organizations and procedures established—

Mr. Speaker, we must look at the situation as it is today. Having seen on TV what happened in the province of Quebec on St. Jean Baptiste Day, we wonder whether or not these people who more or less caused the St. Jean Baptiste Day celebrations to be a complete failure—and St. Jean Baptiste is the patron saint of all the French-Canadians—and those who were responsible for the cancellation of the invitations and for the unfortunate

incidents, respect the right of others. I wonder whether or not these people have been fair to those who were entitled to celebrate St. Jean Baptiste Day, in the province of Quebec in particular. Why is there such a climate in the Province of Quebec? It is because neither the federal nor the provincial government has taken any steps to prevent this situation.

When, supposedly to protect freedom of expression, everybody must listen to everybody else, when we open our doors to guys like Carmichael who came from the United States to foster revolution, or others from Europe with the same things in mind, we should not be surprised to see events take such a turn.

I believe it is time the government realized how important it is to stop those trouble makers and those who go to Cuba to get trained as revolutionaries, for instance Michel Chartrand, of Montreal, from entering Canada.

Mr. Speaker, according to the report, it is the duty of the government to ensure law and order. There is law, yes, but there is also order. The government must take its responsibilities so that order will prevail. We do not know what amendments to the report the government will make. We must wait. As soon as they are proposed, or a part of the report is submitted, we will examine them, not from a partisan point of view or for only a part of Canada, but keeping in mind the welfare of the entire Canadian population.

Mr. Speaker, order and security are threatened, as stated in the report, by a system which perhaps denies freedom and security to the citizens. We are living in a certain context where this year only 10 per cent of our young students will get a job, while 90 per cent will have no security of employment. Young people of 22 will have to ask their father, who is not too well off already, for 50 cents to buy cigarettes or tobacco.

In my opinion, those economic conditions must be improved if we want to improve the economic climate and the security of the Canadian people throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying to the Prime Minister and to the government that reforms must be made to protect Canada against the intrusion of subersive ideologies. There is a way to fight efficiently against the partisans of such ideologies. Even if we were to use every police force in Canada—the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Quebec Provincial Police—if we have an economic climate in which people are uneasy or cannot survive, that will not change anything.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Speaker, we are convinced that we have to bring forward basic economic reforms if we sincerely wish to establish in this country a climate of mutual confidence, in which young and old will be able to trust each other and to prevent subversion as we know it today in Canada.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we as parliamentarians will have saved the unity of Canada, and we will have given the world the example of a country which stands up and can generate understanding and agreement.

• (2:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

DESIGNATION OF OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE, PURSUANT TO S.O. 60 (2)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 60, subsection (2), I should like to ask that an order of the day be designated for the consideration tomorrow of the ways and means motions tabled by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) on June 3, 1969.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

AGREEMENT ON EASTERN TRIP BY STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, further to the discussions which have taken place between the activists on the transport committee, and following yesterday's inquiries, I wonder whether the following might be made an order of the house:

That for the purpose of completing its inquiries into the problems of transportation in the Atlantic provinces, the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications be empowered to adjourn from place to place within eastern Canada, and the clerks and the necessary supporting staff be authorized to accompany the standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

AGREEMENT TO REFER TO STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT ON WORK OF CANADIAN PENSION COMMISSION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we could again have to try at No. 93

under government orders, which is the resolution that the report of the committee appointed September 8, 1965, to survey the organization and work of the Canadian Pension Commission, tabled on March 26, 1968, be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. If there is unanimous agreement in the house I wonder if this could be made an order of the house.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

COMMUNICATIONS

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF CANADIAN OVERSEAS TELECOMMUNICATION CORPORATION

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41, section (2), I wish to table the nineteenth annual report of the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation, including its accounts and financial statements certified by the Auditor General, for the year ended March 31, 1969, pursuant to sections 22 and 23 (1) of the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Act, chapter 42, and sections 85 (3) and 87 (3) of the Financial Administration Act, chapter 116, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952.

PRIVILEGE

MR. McCLEAVE—ALLEGED IRREGULARITY IN INDICATING DISSENT FROM HOUSE DECISIONS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I make a correction in *Hansard*. It concerns the motion for concurrence in the main estimates for 1969-70. Throughout the brief report of the proceedings one member is reported as saying "On division", and that member is named. I think the house and the country should know that there were a great number of us who said "on division", at all stages of that proceeding.

MR. DIEFENBAKER—ALLEGED FAILURE TO SUPPLY COMPLETE INFORMATION IN ANSWER TO WRITTEN QUESTION

Mr. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of an answer given yesterday, as reported at page 10592, to question 2,379. The question asked for information on the expenditures that were made for storage of wheat in all the facilities for storage, month by month, since January 1, 1967. The answer given was that in the year 1966-67 the total amount was $29,583,000; the storage in 1967-68 cost $44,389,000. No answers was supplied in regard to the year 1968-69, although ten months of the year had passed.

I suggest that this question should be put back on the order paper, for the answer given by the Wheat Board is most evasive, to say the least. Indeed, one wonders whether the answer was given in that way in order to conceal the fabulous increase in storage during the last year owing to the loss of markets and other reasons.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, could I draw attention to the final sentence of the answer, which reads:

> The amount of storage costs incurred by the board on wheat in the 1968/69 crop year is not yet available.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I answer that immediately. The question was asked on May 27. I did not ask about the entire crop; I asked for the amount for this year, as of that date. The hon. gentleman's attempt to cover up the answer which was given does not help us to arrive at accurate figures.

• (3:00 p.m.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSULTATIONS ON TRANSFER TO PROVINCES OF CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES—TIME TABLE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER—VIEWS OF BROTHERHOOD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development concerning the statement issued yesterday. Were the provinces or the Indian people asked in advance for their views on the specific proposal to transfer constitutional responsibility for Indian programs and services to the provinces? I am asking the minister about that specific proposal and about the degree to which agreement was sought before the proposal was made.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, our consultations with the Indian people

lasted for a whole year. We presented these proposals as part of a framework within which we believe that in the future the Indian people will be able to solve their problems with the assistance of the whole Canadian people.

This is a working document which was tabled so that it may be considered by the Indians and the federal as well as provincial governments.

We intend to undertake long discussions with the people concerned so as to find the procedure most appropriate under the circumstances.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it then that this is just a working proposal made for the purpose of discussion?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, this is the direction the government wants to give the new policy concerning our first citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government a deadline with regard to the proposal to move out of the field of the provision of services to the Indian people? Has the minister been in official communication with the provincial governments about the proposed transfer, or has a date been set for a conference at which it might be possible to discuss the proposed transfer? Also, can the minister advise the house as to the date of such conference and whether representatives of the Indian people will be invited to attend?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday it was our intention to discuss those proposals with the Indian people and with the provinces.

We intend, during the coming weeks, to meet with the provincial governments' representatives and with the Indian organizations' leaders in every province. I have already met some Indian people here and I will meet some others this afternoon.

[*English*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since great concern has been expressed by the National Indian Brotherhood and since members of the brotherhood may wish to have their minds put at ease on the question, may I ask the minister what his intended timetable is? Is it the intention of the government to settle, first, treaty rights and land claims before abrogating its responsibility for Indians and turning those matters over to the provincial governments? It seems to me that this matter has been of concern to the Indian people. If the minister could give some assurance that the entire question of land claims and treaty rights will be dealt with first, and settled, I think the minds of the Indian people would be greatly set at ease.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we intend to appoint at an early date, a commissioner who will work in co-operation with the Indians in order to analyze the various claims, classify them and recommend to the government appropriate means of solving them. At the same time, we shall continue our consultations with the Indian people as well as with the provincial governments' representatives, so as to find an appropriate formula to extend provincial services to the Indians as well as to the other citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to consult the Indians about the appointment of this commissioner and commission, so that they may have a commission which is working for their interests and not merely seeking their approval? May I also ask the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The first part of the hon. member's question was in order and I think the hon. member should not be allowed to launch into a consecutive question until the minister has had a chance to reply to the first question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, of course it is obvious that I shall broach the subject with the leaders of the Indian associations of Canada, but the appointment of a commissioner rests solely with the government which alone is authorized to appoint one.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the leaders of the National Indian Brotherhood have expressed the fear that this legislation, if implemented, will lead to Indian cultural

genocide, is the minister prepared to adopt a flexible approach to treaty rights and other controversial aspects of this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, in the document we tabled yesterday in the house, it is clearly established that we want to allow the Indians to integrate socially and economically in our society, that we want to help them preserve their cultural heritage, which is part of the Canadian heritage.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister undertake to meet immediately the executive of the Indian Association of Alberta which claims that this proposal was written in isolation from the Indian people?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I said that I intended to meet in coming weeks the various provincial authorities to discuss those proposals, and the province of Alberta is included in my itinerary.

[*English*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In those cases where Indian people prefer not to change the present system, will they be allowed to continue living under present conditions, pending further consultation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that the Indians want to be first class citizens in our society, and we are going to discuss the most appropriate means to make that possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary or related question to direct to the minister. Does the statement which terms aboriginal claims to land as being unrealistic and not capable of being dealt with specifically represent a fixed government policy, or is this merely an idea which has been put forward for discussion and negotiation with the Indian people?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, this proposal has become part of the government's policy. The government acknowledges the legal rights of the Indians and the rights derived from legal documents. As for the other rights, they are the same as those of the Canadian citizens.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN CANADIAN AND U.S. MINISTERS ON SUBJECTS OF MUTUAL INTEREST

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Would he tell the house why or for what purpose the government decided to send such important Canadian officials and members of the government, to the twelfth Canada-U.S. meeting? What is the purpose of that numerous delegation?

The Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when I met President Nixon, a few months ago, we agreed to hold these meetings where several matters under the jurisdiction of several ministers and departments would be discussed. This is why there are, I understand, three ministers as well as the officials who assist them.

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister assure the house that either the minister leading the delegation in Washington or one of the ministers with him will report to the house on the conversations now taking place when they return tomorrow?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs is leading the delegation. I will consult him to see whether he has anything to report which will have the approval of the opposition.

Mr. Lewis: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Prime Minister inform the house now about the agenda of items being discussed? What subjects are our Canadian ministers talking about with members of the United States cabinet?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the general subjects were indicated by me to the house at the time I saw President Nixon a few months ago. They cover such general areas as trade, economic relations, certain specific commodities and so on. It will be up to the minister to decide how much of the discussions it is in the interests of the house to hear in his report. It will be up to the opposition to indicate once again if the trip was worth while.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has indicated he will ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to consider whether he has anything to report which will meet with the approval of the opposition. Will the Prime Minister also ask the minister to consider whether he has anything to report which will not meet with the approval of the opposition, which is more important?

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Were the following subjects on the agenda: the withdrawal of our forces from NATO, acceptance of deserters by Canada and the recognition of communist China?

Mr. Trudeau: We did not propose any of those subjects, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member's friends in the United States demand that they be put on the agenda, of course we will be willing to discuss them.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As these meetings have always been held to smooth out possible rough spots between the two countries, would it not have been an excellent opportunity to explain our rather weak position on these matters to our confreres in the United States?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL CAPITAL

POLLUTION OF AREA WATERWAYS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion as the minister responsible for affairs in the national capital area. Having in mind the reported closure of certain waterways in the national capital area as the result of water pollution, will the minister try to expedite the correction of this condition as he outlined in his plans for the national capital area a week or two ago?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): This is something we are looking into, Mr. Speaker.

GRAIN

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO ACCEPTANCE BY CANADA OF LOWER INTERNATIONAL PRICE

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture, is it convenient for the Prime Minister to inform the house whether Canada is considering agreeing to lower the international price of wheat?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Responding for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, let me say that today is not a convenient day. However, I shall take note of this question, which will be answered at the earliest possible opportunity.

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

DOMINION DAY—ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING HOUSE OBSERVANCE

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, following the enunciation of the program for the house for today and tomorrow, which would indicate we are going into next week, what is the government's attitude on whether the house will sit on Dominion Day?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Dominion Day is not only a holiday for all Canadians but a holiday under the rules of the house. We intend to abide by the rules of the house.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BEEF—PASSING ON OF LOWER PRICE RECEIVED BY PRODUCER

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that prices for finished steers have dropped 5 cents a pound or $5 a hundredweight on the live cattle market in western Canada, can the minister tell the house whether this reduction in price to the farmer has been reflected in prices to the consumer?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member the question as asked is argumentative.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

CURTAILMENT OF SATURDAY WICKET SERVICE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Postmaster General. Has he had time to study the very much criticized curtailment of Saturday wicket service in post offices across Canada? Is the minister now in a position to inform the house whether complete service will be restored?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): No, Mr.

Speaker. As soon as a decision is made, I will be glad to inform the house.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

CALL FOR SERVICES OF MEDICAL DOCTORS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the alarming statement by the minister that 72 per cent of the people of Canada needing medical care do not see a doctor, what provisions has he in mind to deal with this situation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that the question is too wide in scope to be asked in this way during the question period. It might be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Rynard: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MEDICARE—CHANGE IN POLICY RESPECTING INSURANCE COMPANIES PARTICIPATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the importance of the recent decision of the government of Ontario to enter the national medicare plan, can the minister indicate whether there has been a change in federal government policy regarding the participation of insurance companies as carriers in the medicare plan?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking for a statement of policy which in my view is normally made on motions.

OLD AGE SECURITY

DRUGS—FREE DISTRIBUTION TO RECIPIENTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister planning to introduce a supplementary estimate or whatever procedure is necessary to provide free drugs to those receiving the old age security supplement?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker. There is provision under the Canada Assistance Plan for such assistance to those who need it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How many provinces have come under the Canada Assistance Plan?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INDIAN AFFAIRS

TRANSFER TO COMMISSION OF MATTERS UNDER JURISDICTION OF EXCHEQUER COURT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Certain cases are now being started in the Exchequer Court which have been pending for years because the Indians had neither the money nor counsel to prove their claims in relation to treaties and other land rights. Will those cases now be transferred to the commission which the minister is setting up and will the Indians have counsel to enable them to set out their rights properly?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can do about the Indians' own decisions. We will set up a commission to which they can, if they so desire, submit their representations. There will also be the sub-committee the Indians established in April which we trust will assist them in preparing the essential document to be presented on behalf of the Indians of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will there be provision giving Indians the right to transfer those cases from the Exchequer Court, where they cannot afford to litigate, so that their rights will be protected?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the commission will not be a court. It will be an investigating body, working jointly with the Indian National Committee on the rights and treaties of the Indians.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Can the minister assure the house that a check will be made on the amount of fees charged when the government is paying them on behalf of the Indians?

PENSIONS

ACTION TO ASSURE ADEQUATE BENEFITS FOR ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs or the acting minister. In view of the appeal received from

the Naval Officers Association of Canada, what immediate steps can the government take to update to an adequate level the pension benefits of long service pensioners in Canada's fighting forces, and their wives and children?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): As acting minister, I will take note of the question and have an answer at the earliest possible opportunity.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING MODIFICATION OF OPERATION

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Has the minister under formulation a statement of government policy or intention with respect to modification of the operation of unemployment insurance, which he might be able to give to the house prior to the recess? Also, would it assist the minister in such formulation if I were to send him two documents with 40 pages of signatures from the people of Campbell River expressing their dissatisfaction?

HOUSING

APPROVAL OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. It arises from his statement to a committee of the other place that he will announce by mid-July whether certain urban renewal projects are to be approved. Does the minister intend to follow the selective anti-inflationary policy of the budget involving 22 cities in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario in making his decisions?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the question as asked is argumentative. If he is seeking information, the question might be asked in other terms.

[*Later:*]

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase my question to the minister in charge of housing. Will the urban renewal programs now being examined by him be affected by the recent budget proposals?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will not specifically exclude or include them, but I will want to look at all relevant factors in making my decision.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

FISHERIES

LOWER PRICES ON FRESHWATER CATCH

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) from Saskatoon I direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries. What action is the government considering, in view of the lower prices being paid for fish in Alberta under the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, my information is that the prices are higher this year, rather than lower.

TRADE

WHEAT—EFFORTS TO SELL TO ARGENTINA

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce I direct this question to the Prime Minister. Is he aware that Argentina has oversold its available wheat and is now in the market to purchase over seven million bushels? Further, is Canada making an effort to sell this amount of wheat to Argentina?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take notice of this question on behalf of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR GRANT BY BLACK UNITED FRONT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare or the Secretary of State. Is either gentleman in a position to advise the house what decision the government has arrived at respecting a grant to the Black United Front in Nova Scotia?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that the matter is under consideration by the government at the present time.

Mr. Forrestall: Can the minister say whether a decision will be reached before the summer is over?

Mr. Munro: Hopefully before the summer is over, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

CHANGE IN DESIGNATION AND TIMING OF DOMINION DAY

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Will he give serious consideration to bringing in legislation changing Dominion Day to Canada Day and celebrating that day on the first Monday prior to July 1?

Some hon. Members: Never.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION OF THE VATICAN

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister.

From now until the end of the session can we hope that the Prime Minister will make a statement showing the progress made by the government in establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican?

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

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BEEF—PASSING ON OF LOWER PRICE RECEIVED BY PRODUCER

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, arising out of the question asked earlier by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will his department investigate the drop in the price being paid for feeder cattle and determine why this reduction has not been passed on to the consumers?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I made clear to the house previously, the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act watches all significant price movements, and naturally he will take note of this question.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the drop that has taken place in beef prices will the minister withdraw his support for a boycott on the purchasing of beef?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is to try to have aware and alert consumers through the provision of information and educational programs. I have urged consumers to exercise care in their purchases. If there are any items they think are too expensive, such as expensive cuts of steak, automobiles, clothing or furniture, my advice is that they should desist from buying them.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—CHANGE IN POLICY RESPECTING INSURANCE COMPANIES PARTICIPATION

[*Later:*]

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): With respect, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether you misheard my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I was not asking for a statement of policy. I was asking the minister whether there has been a change in policy.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in policy. I believe that the carriers to whom the hon. member is referring have to report directly to and are under the supervision of the public authority in the province.

Mr. Broadbent: As a supplementary question, would the minister consider tabling all the correspondence that took place between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario on the introduction of the Ontario medicare scheme?

Mr. Munro: I will be glad to look into the matter but so far as I am aware there has been no correspondence. The Ontario government is well aware of the terms of the federal medicare legislation, and through discussions that our officials have had with Ontario officials we are fully satisfied that the Ontario act comes within the terms of the federal legislation.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether any different interpretation of the section of the act regarding carriers from that accorded to Alberta and the other provinces has been accorded to Ontario?

Mr. Munro: No, Mr. Speaker, no different interpretation.

Inquiries of the Ministry

POWER

MINAS BASIN—DISPOSITION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Will the house be advised before the summer recess on the feasibility study of Minas Basin tidal power, or will this not be done until the fall?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister on his return.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

USE OF FUND IN RETIREMENT PLAN

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Is he aware of the illegal use to which Devco is putting the U.I.C. fund?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any illegality.

Mr. MacInnis: As a supplementary question, would the minister take a good close look at what is being done by Devco so he may realize that what Devco is doing is denied the individual, and therefore it is illegal for them to use the fund in this way?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation to the minister—

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: I had not quite finished my sentence. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to add—which the hon. member must assume has been noted by the Minister.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am trying to obtain information in this house in some way, shape or form in order that the miners in Cape Breton who have been forcibly retired by a Crown company will get justice from a fund into which they have been paying, some of them for as many as 29 years. That Crown company is illegally using the fund. If the fund is not being illegally used, why is it that individuals are being denied the same use of the fund?

[Mr. Munro.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, if the miners are of such an opinion and if what is being done is illegal, they certainly have a right of appeal before the courts.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, does the minister consider it part of the just society that a miner who is forced out of work cannot afford to go to the courts, especially with the way things are under the government? Big deal—go to the courts!

HOUSING

STEPS TO ASSURE STEADY FLOW OF MORTGAGE MONEY

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of housing. In view of housing statistics indicating a drop of 31.7 per cent in housing investment by non-banking lenders, what steps does the minister intend to take to ensure a steady flow of mortgage moneys?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, we are encouraged by the reaction of the lenders in putting more money into residential mortgages. In the same light I am glad to direct the attention of the house to the fact that housing starts are very much up over the same period last year.

DRUGS

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL ON COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO NON-MEDICAL USE

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It is based on the type of distinguished men who will make up the committee which is to be established to obtain accurate information on the drug problem. Only one of these gentlemen is an experienced specialist in drug addiction. Has the minister given any consideration to adding specialists in drug addiction to this committee?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been listening when the announcement was made he would have realized it was made quite clear that the people on this committee would represent the various disciplines such as psychiatry, sociology, psychology, the legal profession and so on. This is not only a medical problem. It was with that in mind that the committee was set

up to obtain ideas in respect of the whole problem. Also, if the hon. member had looked at the terms of reference he would know that the inquiry has been empowered to go outside in order to obtain special research in all these areas.

Mr. Rynard: I am glad they have this power because certainly one member of the committee which has been set up by the minister is a specialist in drug addiction.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the President of the Privy Council, who seems all prepared to answer, what he is going to do tomorrow and, in view of the solicitations of his friends on the government back benches, what are his plans for next week?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As hon. members know, today we will be starting with Bill C-202, the area development incentives bill. If we complete the report stage of that bill we will continue with Bill C-207 which deals with Atlantic transportation assistance. Tomorrow, as was indicated by my request for a designation on the Order Paper, it would be our proposal to call first the two ways and means motions. As hon. members know, they are not subject to debate at that time. This will be for the purpose of giving first reading to the two bills to follow those motions.

We will then call as the next item of business Bill C-202, in respect of area development incentives. This will be followed by Bill C-120 respecting the official languages. As I indicated to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), Tuesday of next week will be a holiday. The house will sit on Monday and Wednesday and the remaining days for the purpose of finishing those legislative items and then for giving attention to a motion to deal with the question of time allocation.

I might indicate that I plan to give notice later today of a motion dealing with the question of time allocation in conformity with the decision of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I should like to be able to explain the purpose of the proposed motion in more detail, but it will be out of order for me to do so at this time. I mention this notice of motion at this time because the present plan is that this motion will be the item of business to be called as soon as the several legislative items I already have mentioned have been dealt with by the house.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, may I ask why we went on staggered hours when the house leader knew all the time he was going to bring in this last minute business about the rules?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member seems to be suffering from a staggered memory because I made it clear at all times that these four items had to be dealt with before the summer adjournment.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—REPORT STAGE

The house proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As hon. members will have noted, there are a number of motions relating to Bill C-202 which is now before us. As has been done on similar occasions in the past the Chair, with the assistance of its learned advisers, has looked at these amendments. Before they are put to the house I should like to suggest to hon. members it might be convenient, when we open discussion on the first motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, to debate and consider at the same time the proposed motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Egmont.

The motion proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby is perhaps more general than the motion proposed by the hon. member for Egmont. It would be extremely difficult to limit the discussion to the motion proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby without allowing hon. members to discuss the motion which stands as No. 2 on

the list of motions before us. Therefore I would suggest that both motions be discussed at the same time. My suggestion would be that all motions be withheld until the last and if we are to have votes on them that all the votes be taken together on all the motions.

I might add that I have serious reservations about the last motion, No. 8. If hon. members are prepared at this time to indicate to the Chair their views about this proposed motion I would be pleased to hear from them in this regard. My view is that perhaps this proposed motion introduces a financial provision into the bill which is not covered by the recommendation of the Crown. I would have a tendency not to put that motion to the house after we have concluded debate on the first seven motions.

Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising to speak to the point of order in respect of motion No. 8?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was hesitating for a moment to see whether the hon. member for Regina East might return to his place. Speaking for those of us in this party who have looked at these motions, I think I can say that our general view is that your approach to these eight motions is a very proper one. If it is the judgment of the Chair that motion No. 1 and motion No. 2 should be combined for debate and that No. 8 should not be considered because of the expenditure question we would be inclined to agree with that ruling. Rather than take the time of the house to argue the matter we would accept the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the hon. member's comments we will proceed to the consideration of the first motion, it being understood that motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be considered at the same time for purposes of debate.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I ask for clarification? When it comes to putting the motions in respect of these amendments will it be the plan to take the motion on amendment No. 1 first and then, depending on what happens to the first motion, the motion in respect of the second amendment would be put?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. We would put the motions consecutively before the house starting with the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby) moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions in Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting in clause 2, section (f), all the words after the word "of" in line 13 of page 2, and by substituting therefor the words: "all forms of industrial activity."

He said: In speaking on this motion, Mr. Speaker, I should first of all point out that if one reads at the outset the purpose of this bill he will see that it is described as an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment. This is a very broad conceptual description of the purpose of this bill. Members of this party are in full agreement with this broad description.

If one turns to clause 2(f), however, which I shall not read at this point, it will be found that what the government has in mind in effect is not really to provide funds for industrial expansion in the sense that term is now used by most modern economists and most people concerned with regional development, but in fact is concerned with manufacturing centres. So the central concept of the government in designating a certain area as being a growth centre, for example, really means a manufacturing centre. Therefore we in this party think there is a very important restriction right at the outset in this bill. We believe it is the kind of restriction which should be removed because, as I pointed out, we are in sympathy with the broader purpose of the bill as stated in its title.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Therefore my amendment to the bill restores what has already been stated to be its purpose at the outset, namely, to deal with regional economic disparity by providing incentives for industrial expansion, not just manufacturing expansion. That kind of thinking, as I tried to point out when the bill was at the committee stage, is really outmoded in my judgment and certainly in the judgment of many professional people concerned with the question of regional development.

Let me quote one source in this regard. In an article written recently by two economists on the subject of regional development they

referred to a number of misconceptions on this question and said:

—many misconceptions are still very popular. The propensity to search for a development base only in secondary manufacturing is maybe the most popular and the most pernicious of these misconceptions.

The very point I make, and the point made by authorities in North America and Europe, is that industrial activity should not be seen to be simply manufacturing activity. This concept should also include the tourist industry, for example, and the service industry. These are two very important sectors of a modern economy. My amendment would remove the restriction and provide the legal possibility of making funds available to many sections of this large and expanding economic base through the development of either tourist or service industries.

The minister indicated very clearly at the committee stage of the bill that it would relate entirely to the manufacturing industry in a given area. But it could be made to help expand the tourist potential in Prince Edward Island, certain parts of Quebec and Ontario, or in fact in certain parts of any province in this country. We have a tourist potential. In certain areas we have a capacity for serious academic research centres to be developed if we want to provide the funds. I refer to such centres as revealed in the recent history of the eastern part of the United States. If money is poured in at the outset and the intellectual and technical capacity of a region is developed, secondary industry in fact can grow out of that potential rather than the other way round.

One further bit of professional feeling about the notion of expanding the concept of industrial development to include other industries than manufacturing comes from the report of the economic development committee, which was released recently. I should like to read from that report to show once again that professional opinion is by no means in accord with the minister's view on this subject. Let me read from pages 78 and 79 of that report:

The availability of services locally is very important for industry. Not only are services increasingly forming a larger share of industry outputs but it is probably more important for industry to have services on the spot than other inputs like material and semi-finished products, in as far as many service inputs cannot be stored and have a high frequency of purchase.

I could read a number of paragraphs from this report, but the point made there is that even if you are concerned with the development of secondary industry in a particular part of the country, it is very important to provide funds for the development of related service industries in the same area.

In short, this bill, especially the clause I wish to amend, is unnecessarily restrictive. We have an excellent opportunity through this bill, which is otherwise very good, to provide for meaningful growth in many parts of Canada which badly need that growth. There is no point in the late 1960's in going back to the essentially primitive economic notion of relying exclusively on the development of the manufacturing sector of the economy.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting paragraph (f) of clause 2 and substituting therefor:

(f) "facility" means the structures, machinery and equipment that constitute the necessary components of

(i) a manufacturing operation;

(ii) a tourist operation;

(iii) a service operation;

(iv) a processing operation other than an initial processing operation in a resource-based industry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, after your ruling perhaps it would be appropriate at this point to deal not only with my own amendment but the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). As you correctly advised the house, these amendments are similar in many ways. The reason both amendments are here, as I am sure the minister is well aware, is that there could be a real distinction drawn in the implementation of this legislation in that if either of these measures were to carry there might be a different effect in that implementation.

Let me say first of all that this bill is an important piece of legislation. I believe the minister feels it is important inasmuch as it outlines certain steps to be taken to improve and alter substantially in some places the previous industrial incentives legislation. It attempts in the same way to attract new industry to areas of unemployment or underutilization and, hopefully, to create in those areas greater employment opportunities.

When we discussed this bill in the committee we discovered that the former provisions have been expanded in almost every part.

The amount of money available has been doubled. It is clearly spelled out that the regions are to be greatly expanded, and even the minimums are not what we would think of as normal minimums, whether we think of the 10,000 square miles first advanced by the department or the amended version, 5,000 square miles. In various ways this legislation has been extended to cover a great deal more by way of implementation and by way of dealing with realistic opportunities that will arise. Therefore it is most surprising that we should find that the minister and his officials took a very restrictive attitude in respect of the heart of the bill.

The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has already referred to the fact that the preamble to the legislation spells out very clearly that social as well as economic aspects are to be taken into account in an attempt to really get at unemployment problems. This measure is not just some kind of gratuity available to industry, or something to make it attractive for industry to move into somewhat unattractive areas and thus benefit the more or less marginal areas of economic disparity without really dealing with the areas of greatest economic disparity. I refer particularly to those areas in the eastern part of this country, in the west and in the northern region. Therefore I have the feeling that those of us who have moved these amendments and will support them have very strong grounds for arguing that the very narrow interpretation of industry by the minister is not easily acceptable to hon. members.

It was not entirely clear in the minister's speech on second reading when he introduced the legislation whether or not he was in fact taking a very restricted view of industry. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) spoke on second reading he spoke hopefully about the inclusion under this legislation of service and tourist industries, because these obviously are very much a part of our concern when we think of areas of economic disparity. It was only during the hearings of the standing committee that it became very clear—it seemed to me that the minister's position hardened as we dealt with these two amendments—that there was to be no inclusion for the purposes of this bill of either the tourist or service industries.

The important question to be raised at this point is, what are the regions and what are the regions like which are going to be basically in need of the kind of assistance the minister is proposing under this legislation? I think they would be the areas about which

the minister himself has spoken. Perhaps I may mention, as an example the one I know best, eastern Canada or Atlantic Canada. This is an area with regard to which the minister presumably has some priorities. It is the area in which he is hopeful that much of the money allocated under the legislation will be spent in the development of new industries, thus providing new employment opportunities.

• (3:50 p.m.)

In regard to this area what are the industries that have the greatest potential, to put it another way, in spite of the difficulties these provinces have had economically, what are the areas of the economy that have grown most quickly? I answer: the tourist industry, particularly in my own province. It has one of the most exciting potentials for the people of Prince Edward Island. I am sure the minister would agree with me because he has visited the province and knows its potential for the tourist industry. I suppose that in rebuttal the minister would say: This is what we have taken into account in introducing our comprehensive development plan. The minister may not have used those words, but I have used them for him.

Whatever arguments he uses in relation to Prince Edward Island or any other part of the Atlantic region, he cannot escape the fact that the provincial premiers of the five eastern provinces will be thinking very seriously of what they can do to increase the tourist potential in order to increase employment opportunities in their provinces. The fact that industry has been willingly ignored in the legislation now before us will not go down very well with the provincial administrations in that region.

It seems to me—in fact, this became increasingly clear in the committee hearings—that the interpretation of "industry" in this bill is very narrow. I was going to say that it is an economist's view of the situation, but I shall not say that because if you have 12 economists together in a room you will obtain at least 12 different points of view. I think we have in the bill one economist's view of what constitutes an industrial base for a community or area. If this is the attitude that has been adopted, we are putting ourselves very much behind the 8-ball in hoping to develop a successful program for regions of potential development. This approach says something, too, for the rigid adherence that the minister, up to now at

least, has adopted in this regard. We are getting an unhealthy dose of the old medicine, "Ottawa knows best". I do not believe this has worked in the past. I do not believe it is possible for the minister or his officials, no matter how competent they may be as individuals, to sit down and on each and every occasion say: We know that industrial development programs, whether they be for eastern Canada, northern Ontario or the northern part of the prairie provinces, must automatically exclude tourism and service industries. Up to this point I have not dealt with service industries, but it seems to me this is an almost theoretical approach to the question of industrial development.

I am neither an industrialist nor an economist, but I have enough practical experience in regard to the attraction of new industry to difficult or underdeveloped regions to know that you cannot talk about one segment of the economy in isolation from every other. It seems to me that the minister is attempting to talk specifically about a manufacturing base, resource or industry, and is automatically ignoring what must, in my opinion, go hand in glove with it—the service industries.

You can argue what must come first, whether you must have primary or secondary industry, or whether without sufficient services in existence it will not be attractive for new industry to be set up in an area. I think this is a philosopher's argument that has nothing to do with the facts. We are faced with a real situation which says to me, and obviously to other parties in the house, that when you are seeking to attract industry to an area you must consider the question from the broadest possible viewpoint which takes into account manufacturing, tourism and service industries. You should not attempt to exclude in any way the possibilities that may be resident in an area.

I shall now comment specifically on the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. I do not wish to appear contentious in this regard, but there are two problems which I believe place my amendment above that of the hon. member. He knows one of them because I mentioned it in committee. I believe that all forms of industrial activity could, without too much difficulty, encompass tourism. There may be considerable problems in this regard, and I have spoken to lawyers who agree with me. When you talk about service industries it is not entirely clear what is meant, and we might become involved in all kinds of legal actions that could arise in this respect. I refer to whether or not service industries could be included under the term "all forms of industrial activity". This fear would haunt me if we were to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, but it could be easily dispelled if the amendment we have advanced were adopted.

The second problem in connection with the hon. member's amendment I was advised of at a later date. It concerns the implementation of the amendment. The amendment of the hon. member does not include any provision for clause 4 of the bill covering the authorization of incentives which would make the program more workable. There is no provision, particularly in respect of subclause (b), which would in fact make service industries eligible for special grants. In view of the fact that this is a very important part of the new program, I think we would be going only half way in our efforts in this regard. If subclause (b) were adopted without the addition of the words I have proposed in the consequent amendment, we would greatly weaken the important and useful attempts being made by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby with regard to the bill.

I therefore suggest that in these aspects the amendment does not fully satisfy the concerns we have about two of the basic industrial activities that we feel very strongly should be encompassed in the scope and command of the legislation.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) is to be commended for moving this amendment because it provides a very important approach to the legislation and brings to the attention of the house a point with regard to which a decision should be rendered by the house. It seems to me that when considering the motion moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby we should keep in mind the basic purpose of the bill. I believe I can set out the basic purpose of the bill, as it is understood by those in this part of the house, no better than by reciting its full title, which is:

> An act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment.

There was in committee a good deal of discussion on this matter. I must say I was not fully satisfied with the answers provided by the minister at that time. The minister came forward with the concept that manufacturing activity within designated regions

should be of the type that could be promoted, encouraged and assisted by the government. I have no objection to the principle involved in assisting manufacturing activity and the development of manufacturing activity in these regions. However, it seems to me that if the bill is to accomplish the purposes set out for it, it will be necessary to give it somewhat broader scope than that provided at the present time.

I believe that when dealing with the development of a region we must consider not only secondary manufacturing activity but all forms of economic and industrial activity. The fact is that prior to secondary manufacturing processes and activity it is necessary to have primary economic production. This, of course, can take many forms—agriculture, fishing, mining, and so on. During the committee stage the minister made a valid point, namely, that some forms of primary economic and industrial activity would not qualify for a grant under this legislation because they would not be established unless they were already capable of standing completely on their own feet in economic terms.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It seems to me that it is possible to visualize a number of areas of primary economic activity for which it would be very desirable and necessary to provide financial assistance under the terms of this bill. For instance, I can think of some aspects of the forestry industry that might not be developed if they are left solely to the type of rationale that might be brought to them by a commercial firm. However, with some financial assistance which may be made possible under this bill I think we could find regions in this country where it would and could be determined that it would be a worth-while expenditure of public money to encourage this type of activity.

I believe it is important that assistance rendered in connection with the development of the designated regions specified in the bill should be brought within the scope of the bill. It is fine for the minister to say that other assistance could be given through the establishment of the department itself. However, it seems to me it would be a much more rational, logical and desirable form of organization to provide for this financial assistance under the terms of the bill.

The same comments may be applied to service industries which I think are essential in terms of the over-all economic development of a region. There have been many sad examples where either primary or secondary industrial activities have been developed in a particular region of the country, following which it has been found that the service industries associated with the development of a community and with its economic life are very much lacking. I can give some examples which have taken place in recent years in my own province where a number of communities have had mushroom growth as a result of the development of the potash industry. In some cases the potash mines were located near relatively small centres in the province and the only form of development that made sense in terms of the community was for people to live relatively near to the mine.

There are a number of such examples in Saskatchewan where service facilities and community development have not taken place on a scale adequate for the needs of the people who have moved into the area and who have found a new form of making a living as a result of the development of the potash industry, which is basically a primary form of economic activity. Thus it seems to me that if we are going to obtain balanced economic development which will serve the full needs of communities in designated regions within this country it would be desirable to adopt the motion proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), which provides that financial assistance be made available for all forms of industrial activity.

Mention has also been made of the tourist industry. I believe it would be very useful and important to provide assistance to the tourist industry under this bill. It has been noted by some people, of course, that the tourist industry is seasonal for the most part, that it is not a year-round economic activity. However, the very fact that it is seasonal in nature in most parts of the country makes it that much more important that assistance be provided to the industry within the framework of the economic plan developed for the entire region under the bill before us.

I hope that the government will give serious consideration to the proposal that has been placed before the house. I hope we will find some responsiveness on the part of the government, and that the bill as it is finally passed by the house will be fully comprehensive in nature and capable of carrying out what in fact are very laudable objectives and purposes as set out in the title and as described by the minister and the government

on a number of occasions. Therefore, I commend this motion to the house and I hope it receive support from all parties.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my gratitude to the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) for moving an amendment on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party to include tourist and service operations under the Regional Development Incentives Act. No matter how hard we try, we cannot seem to get the government to recognize the importance of the tourist and service industries to the Canadian economy. The Small Businesses Loans Act has been allowed to wither away, partly, I believe, because it was Progressive Conservative legislation, partly because of the rapid increase in interest rates which makes the banks unwilling to lend under that act, and partly as a result of apparent indifference. The effort of a few years ago to give assistance to the tourist industry has not been continued.

The other source of assistance to which the tourist and service industries were looking was from the Industrial Development Bank. Here again the former Progressive Conservative government extended loans under the Industrial Development Bank to the tourist and service industries. The I.D.B. is still giving loans to tourist operators under this act, for which I am sure we are all grateful.

May I point out to the Minister that under the Industrial Development Bank Act the tourist industry is recognized as an industry, as are service industries, and it is very difficult to understand why, when it is recognized under that act, a different interpretation is put on the word "industry" in the present bill, in which the minister is ostensibly trying to increase the economic viability of different parts of the country. Many of the regions that particularly need help are best suited to the tourist and service industries. Many of them are in more remote areas where in some cases industry hesitates to go because of the distances for transportation, a shortage of trained manpower, and so forth. But in these areas the tourist industry could very well act as a real boon to the local economy. It seems that the tourist and service industries would carry out the real intent of the act if they were included. However, although the Industrial Development Bank makes loans it does not give any grants to those people who are involved in the service industry. Also, we find that the I.D.B. is so concerned about getting its money back and about making money that it even demands a prepayment premium on funds which are repaid earlier than the mortgage calls for. I think this is a terrible travesty on the intent of government assistance.

I have recently had to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to a case where the I.D.B. forced a company to sell a major part of its capital assets in order to make a payment on its loan, and after the capital assets had been sold, the I.D.B. required a payment of over $1,000 as a penalty. This again seems to be a terrible travesty on any government intention to assist an industry. They are certainly not assisting when they are demanding a premium on repayment of their money.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I have wandered a little far afield simply to point out to the minister that the tourist industry has not had sufficient government assistance over the years despite it being an essential part of the Canadian economy. I am not going to repeat today the many speeches I have made on the importance of the tourist industry and allied service industries to the Canadian economy. In the first place, the tourist industry is a major producer of foreign funds: it brings money into Canada and that money stays. The tourist industry provides a vast source of employment for Canadians and has a major economic influence on any community where two or three major tourist establishments are located. It is as much of a boon to the area as would be the establishment of another kind of industry.

So far as employment is concerned, I should like to point out to the minister that with advancing technology and automation manpower requirements for the operation of large industrial plants are diminishing. I was present when an announcement was made not long ago of a large industrial plant which was to be constructed at a cost of $23 million to specifications that met the latest technological advances. Yet the plant was going to employ only 90 people. This number might well be employed by tourist operators in a community on a financial base of half a million dollars. Such an operation has not only direct payroll benefits but also indirectly benefits the local community by increasing economic activity in the area and requiring the support of many local services. The tourist industry is also largely Canadian owned and operated, in contrast to many industrial enterprises.

I could go on and on on this subject but I will not do so. I do not want in any way to

suggest that we should not promote industrial expansion and build new factories in this country. I am merely pointing out that these are but one part of the economic picture. If the minister really wants to broaden this bill and benefit a lot of industries that really require assistance by expanding and providing employment opportunities, and consequently improving living conditions, then the tourist industry would be the best example of need that I can think of.

I do not want to speak at any length. Suffice it to say that the bill as introduced appears to provide for the type of business to which I have referred. The title has already been referred to in full. I shall not refer to it again, except to say that its intent is to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures. This objective does not exclude the tourist and service industries; in fact, they appear to be included. I would say the bill describes perfectly the impact that improved and expanded tourist facilities would make in any part of Canada. I hope the government sees fit to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), and recognizes the problems of the tourist and service industries as well as the importance of these industries to the Canadian economy.

I have often stood in this house and made speeches in this vein and wondered whether I was wasting my time. Today I wonder who is listening and what the government is going to do. I have the feeling that the government is going to do nothing, that the decision has already been made. I wonder what purpose is served by my standing up in the house and making a speech. All I can hope for is that if the minister has already hardened his heart against the tourist and service industries and is going to reject this amendment, he will urge his colleagues to do something else for those industries because they badly need help.

If the minister is going to reject this amendment, then I hope he will speak to his colleague the Minister of Finance about trying to get the Industrial Development Bank to loosen up a little and assist the tourist and service industries in times of difficulty instead of merely making loans to them, the first priority of which is to get their money back with interest. This is not the type of benefit that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) is trying to bestow on other industries under the terms of this bill.

Therefore I plead with the minister to keep in mind that this type of industry can certainly be of benefit to many regions. It may be that, having considered this amendment, the minister will accept it. I certainly hope this is the case. However, if this is not the case we can only hope that without delay he will consult his colleagues to see whether something else can be done for the tourist and service industries to enable them to compete with the new and enlarged facilities that are being established on the other side of the border in an effort to keep United States tourists at home. The tourist and service industries need this assistance, and they need it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the minister for introducing this legislation which, in my view, will bring about some improvements specially in areas such as the one I am representing here in the house.

The people of Bellechasse and I welcome this opportunity to benefit finally from legislation designed to bring about industrial development in our area.

The prime purpose of this measure is to establish industries in order to provide productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures.

In my area, special measures are necessary. Many of the workers now unemployed are on welfare; that does not contribute much to the development of the country. I do not blame those people because special circumstances prevent them from bringing their contribution.

Now legislation will promote the development of an existing industry and the establishment of new ones which will enable these healthy people to contribute by their work to the development which is necessary.

Through that legislation, some solution could be applied to another exceedingly serious problem. In fact, many farmers and small contractors have to reduce or give up their operations on account of difficult economic conditions and the government policy.

In that case, as the government decides whether the operations are profitable or not, it happens that a large number of farmers and small contractors become unemployed and I feel that the government, in co-operation with the Department of Agriculture,

should act as quickly as possible in that respect.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Each week one sees farmers quitting the farming industry. It would be imperative to proceed as quickly as possible with industrial development, in order that those farmers be diverted to other industries.

Bill C-202 will indeed be of interest to a good many contractors who were wishing to expand their industry in order to solve at least in part the unemployment problem, and make possible that change which relates to both the farming and the manufacturing industries.

An amendment has been moved to this bill so that it would apply to all kinds of industrial activity.

The previous speaker dwelt at lenght on the tourist industry. The minister will probably tell us whether the bill in its original form contains provisions designed to stimulate the development of tourism, which would make the amendment useless. But at any rate, if this is not provided for, it would be desirable, and even necessary to pass the amendment, in order to allow this development in the areas where it is possible.

I was thinking in particular of the area of Île-aux-Grues, where tourist resources are many, but their normal development is seriously hindered. I have already called the minister's attention to the problem of the ferry service which links Île-aux-Grues to the mainland, and which delays the agricultural and tourist development of that area.

I thank the minister for having given serious consideration to the request I made on behalf of my constituents. I am confident that such a study will go on and that this bill will permit practical and concrete realizations in this field so that the tourist industry may improve in that area.

Numerous requests are regularly made to us. Intermediate organization are interested and, as I have already said in the house, it is impossible for the federal government to do everything, unless the provincial and municipal authorities as well as the public become interested in a serious and positive way in the matter.

The people are sufficiently aware of the problem and have considered the matter thoroughly enough to be in a position to assure their co-operation to the government, in order to attain the objective sought by all hon. members, that is the possibility of finding adequate solutions, because the Canadian workers are dissatisfied since they are unable to work to the full extent of their powers.

I can assure the government I will fully co-operate to help the officials of the department in their work to promote industry and tourism, so that Bill C-202 may be really effective, provided however—and there is always the same problem—the minister can get the necessary credits. I would not like if, at some point, the minister were obliged to answer too often: The program is good, the project satisfactory, but we lack the necessary funds, we have no money.

Considering the nature and the importance of this department and of the projects of the minister, I hope the cabinet members will make funds available to achieve this goal but also to bring about the solution we have been awaiting so long.

[*English*]

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the motion moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). I feel that the bill should include in its coverage several key industries which are now omitted. I do not see why the minister and the government cannot accept this very modest amendment. The direction of the department in question is in the minister's hands and exclusions can be made later when the area incentives program comes before the department to be scrutinized.

The consequences of accepting the amendment before the house could be vital not only to my riding of Kootenay West but to many other proposed incentive areas of Canada. For all these areas the amendment has important implications. For instance, the amendment, if accepted, will make certain that the service industries, the tourist industry and certain research projects come under the legislation. They will therefore be eligible for grants.

I point out to hon. members that the title of Bill C-202 is, "An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment." That is the full title of the bill we are now debating. I submit that anyone looking at the title would come to the conclusion that assistance in the incentive areas to be set up will be rather broadly based. But when we look at clause 2 and at subclause (f) in particular we find that the definitions in

the bill are far more restrictive than one would imagine them to be from reading the title. Clause 2(f) defines the facilities for which grants may be made:

"facility" means the structures, machinery and equipment that constitute the necessary components of a manufacturing or processing operation, other than an initial processing operation in a resource-based industry;

The amendment offered by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby would amend the clause so that it would read:

"facility" means the structures, machinery and equipment that constitute the necessary components of all forms of industrial activity.

The words of the amendment are, "all forms of industrial activity". Such activity would include the service, tourist and research industries, which in my opinion are vital to the success of this program in many incentive areas. I feel that the term "growth potential" should be used in a much broader sense than that outlined in the definition. The bill now before us would restrict the areas that could benefit those with a potential manufacturing growth and would exclude other very important potential growth factors to be found in the service, tourist and research industries.

I note in the minutes of the committee that the minister indicated that under the act establishing his department assistance could be granted to the tourist industry, provided that industry was the sole activity that could be developed in the region being considered. He also indicated that at certain times and in certain areas it might be a sensible economic move to develop the service industry. In view of the minister's statements before the committee, I see no reason why they should not be included in the bill. It will still be up to the department to decide whether grants will be made available to the various facilities wishing to establish in the incentive areas set up. For this reason I see no logical explanation why this all-inclusive amendment should not be accepted by the government.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This legislation sets out the guidelines for development in the incentive areas. The various committees working in these areas to bring in secondary industry and other facilities to build up their growth potential must be given clear-cut directives as to who will be eligible for grants in their areas. This is necessary if proper planning is to be done. It is not good enough to let a committee know that tourism may come under the department but is not included in the act. I see no reason why this important amendment should not be written into the statute.

I certainly agree that secondary manufacturing or processing industries are vital to the regional development envisioned by the bill. This type of industry, however, tends to concentrate in the more industrial parts of these regions for obvious reasons. I feel it is desirable that every section of these incentive areas should be entitled to the economic stimulant which we hope will come from this bill, and in many sections of these areas the best possible incentive would be assistance to the tourist and service industries.

There is one point that must be crystal clear to everyone. In the tourist industry we are not providing facilities which will be based on an expendable resource. We can sell scenery and other tourist attractions ten thousand times without depleting their potential, and this is something we certainly should not forget when dealing with this problem. I feel that the government is restricting itself much too narrowly in a modern economy by merely accepting the concept of manufacturing growth. There could well be other types of industrial activity much more suitable to an area than manufacturing. I hope the minister will see the matter in this light and accept the amendment now before the house.

The whole of the Kootenay West region could be classed as a slow growth area. It has tremendous potential. Some of it is in the manufacturing field, but certainly one of the greatest undeveloped potentials where assistance is needed is in the field of tourism and in the service industries. I trust that this great potential, which is to be found in many other areas of Canada where natural resources are not too abundant, will not be ignored by the minister and the department through failure to include it in this legislation. The minister, after all, is the servant of the house, and those interested in regional development should press for this important economic aspect to be included in the present legislation.

I urge the minister to take a second look at the legislation. I read the committee reports. I have gone over the arguments very carefully which the minister raised against the inclusion of such amendments. The minister should not be alarmed at something like this being included in the legislation because it is his department which will make the final decision in allocating funds for projects in

incentive areas all over Canada. I urge the minister, the government and all hon. members to make certain that we do not exclude one of the most vital industries in Canada, one that is prevalent in many of the underdeveloped areas, and we will be excluding it if we do not include it in the legislation. This bill is an attempt to do away with regional disparity; yet one of the major industries, tourism, is ostensibly being excluded. I urge the minister to include it and make certain that people all over Canada can plan on it as one of the industries that can be developed within the incentive areas.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I will spend only a couple of moments on this amendment. In supporting it I wish to mention one example where the tourist industry would be very beneficial.

The minister admits there are vital problems in Newfoundland with regard to regional development. I feel it would be helpful, in an area recognized by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), to create a second national park. This would be very beneficial to Newfoundland and would have far-reaching effects. Development of a national park would create ancillary employment which is so vital in an area which has the highest unemployment rate in Canada. The ancillary tourist industry of a national park would be very beneficial. The secondary industry and commercial enterprises that would flow from a national park would do much to uplift the economy by the creation of additional employment. I ask the minister to take this into consideration when considering the particular problems in the province of Newfoundland to which he himself has referred.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to discuss several times the amendment proposed to the house. I do not think the government is showing bad faith by not satisfying that request.

We should not consider this industrial incentives act as a wholesale development legislation, since it does not include every instrument the government intends to use to insure economic and even regional development.

As had been mentioned, the general legislation establishing the department contains the necessary provisions to assist provinces and municipalities to develop the internal structures required for industrial development.

Under the act establishing the department, we can grant subsidies, lend money and guarantee loans, and do practically everything that can be done for industrial development after consultation with the provinces as to the needs to be met.

The bill now before us is only a part of a whole. Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not replace the Industrial Development Bank, nor the Department of Agriculture, nor the Department of Fisheries and Forestry but it has very specific objectives: an attempt to foster industrial development in slow-growth areas.

• (4:40 p.m.)

If we succeed in this field—which is rather limited, I admit—if we manage to induce industries to settle in the above-mentioned areas, it will mean that other activities will move in on their own.

For instance, in the field of service industries, one can be sure that where there is industrial development, service industries will develop naturally because there will be a local market. When people have work, and money, they want services; that means that service industries will develop as subsidiaries of secondary industry; service industries do not develop on their own they always result from another economic activity.

We feel that primary industry does not settle in a given area because of the extent of its economic activity. A primary industry is developed in a given area because of its natural resources. The idea of providing incentives to primary industry may prove successful in some particular cases, but it is not a determining factor in the location of an industry.

It may be suggested that this legislation probably has certain limitations but this has to be, in order to prevent any misuse of public funds or the provision of incentives to an industry which would settle in those areas just the same. The only justification for providing incentives to private undertaking is that without such incentives, they would not go and settle where we think they should for the common good.

We have no moral authority to give millions of dollars to a business which in any case would settle in a given area. By what right do we do so? Our only moral justification for spending public funds is to tell businessmen who can choose to settle in Mont-

real, Quebec, Gaspé or elsewhere: If we give you a certain amount of money, are you ready to move into a region which is not developing and needs to be developed?

As for the service industry, it does not need, in general, to stimulate primary industry since, as I mentioned earlier, if there is a mine somewhere, it is not the provision of an incentive that will induce this business to settle there, but the mere fact that the mine is located at that place.

Forestry resources are also to be found in very definite places, as well as water resources. So there is no need to provide incentives in order to induce those businessmen to settle in a particular area, because other factors prompt them to do so.

But the secondary industries themselves—

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister permit a question?

[*Translation*]

Pardon me. Do you allow me a question?

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): O.K. I will try to answer.

Mr. Broadbent: I did not get the latter part of the minister's remarks because I was trying to get his attention, but he has just claimed that primary industry would normally need subsidization in order to be attracted into an area, and with this I am in complete agreement. But as the bill now stands the minister has broad discretionary powers in any case, and so it is not a matter of granting money to all mining firms that come to him wanting money. He has the discretionary power to decide whether or not in a given situation a grant should be provided. Would he not be agreeable to broadening the terms of the bill to provide for such grants in isolated cases?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I mentioned before the standing committee that it is possible to do that under the law establishing the department. On an ad hoc basis we can do so if in one particular region this is the only activity that can be developed, but the purpose of this particular piece of legislation is to encourage secondary industry to move into slow growth regions in order to create employment, and if that is done service industries will develop anyway. Service industry does not need our help if there is economic activity in secondary industry.

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can do all the things which have been suggested by the hon. members who spoke before me. We can do it, not necessarily under this legislation but under the bill establishing the department. There is no reason why this legislation, whose main purpose is to create employment through development of the manufacturing industries, should deal with other activities.

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a few questions from the minister, mainly with regard to the previous legislation.

Will the new legislation supersede the previous one? For instance, under the old legislation, the Canadian government paid a third of the cost of industrial development, a third of the cost of the construction of buildings and machinery. Will this new legislation take away these advantages provided under the former legislation?

Furthermore, I should like to get some explanation concerning the security for the loans. Will the new legislation back up the loans in the case of a non exporting industry? If a Canadian industry disposes of its products only on the Canadian market, will it be entitled to the same benefits or will they be only the privilege of an exporting industry?

I put those two questions to the minister because they are related to something that does not seem too clear to me. I should like the minister to throw light on the matter.

With regard to the amendment and the development of tourism, I think it would be a good thing if it were possible to include this amendment in the act. It strikes me as fairly logical. It, seems to me the minister could incorporate it in the bill. If the bill says otherwise that the tourist industry is entitled to certain advantages, I fail to see why this could not be spelled out very clearly, so as to specify what benefits the industry could derive from the new act.

I am quite pleased with the bill and all the happier because the minister is introducing a new incentive for industry. The industry is in dire need of it because we are now in an industrialized country which must be developed from that point of view. We therefore need every possible government assistance, not merely to create new industries but also to sell what industry produces.

The main problem in industry today is that of marketing products. Several industries have a high rate of production and have

accumulated their products; they are now finding it difficult to sell them. Industry operates, progresses and forges ahead economically provided it sells its goods.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The department will have to intervene, if possible, to oil in some way the industrial mechanism for the disposal of the production. It should be rather easy to dispose in this country of every thing possible if purchasing power were available. After that, we can start thinking about exports.

There are many products we could export. I am sure the government has already taken the necessary steps in that direction and that all will work well.

If we create industries without finding ways and means of disposing of the products, dreadful problems would ensue, causing serious problems that will become so complicated that it will be necessary to close several of those new industries which will have been created in our country.

Therefore, I ask the minister to clarify that. Would he be kind enough to explain the difference between the old legislation and the new one in connection with the grants made by the government, when it was paying one third of the cost for machinery and buildings.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the minister wishes to speak again he can do so only with unanimous consent. If there is to be questioning of the minister after his remarks, it should be brief and to the point. I think the hon. member for Compton made a contribution to the debate. If the minister is to answer the questions posed by the hon. member for Compton, I suggest there should be unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief.

As for the destination of the products manufactured by plants or industries which will receive government grants, there is no set limitation. Whether they be export industries or industries serving a local market, it does not matter.

As for explaining to the house, Mr. Speaker, all the differences between the present legislation and the measure before the house, I think this would take some time. There are indications in the bill about the amounts of money to be granted.

Regulations for the distribution of industrial incentives will be approved only after the legislation itself has been passed, and at that time I might be able to give the hon. member all the explanations he may require.

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the minister's remarks concerning the proposed amendment in relation to the development of natural resources and the effect this legislation will have on these areas by dealing with one area in one manner and another area in another manner, taking into consideration the different conditions which exist. I suggest, however, that there is need for some concern about the natural resources in that large band of Canada stretching from Labrador to northern British Columbia situated 200 miles north of Toronto and Montreal. This is an area where all successful resource development must be based on the natural resources.

My area was designated for some time under the previous incentive legislation. The development which took place in that area was in the lumbering industry. It is a basic resource area but it is interesting to note that the money put into the industry under the previous incentive program was used not only in respect of the basic products of lumber but also in the new system of forest harvesting by which much better utilization is made of the product. So in my opinion the incentive, taking into consideration the availability of the resource, made that resource much more valuable in terms of production in the area, and all the region benefited from the technical advantage that this type of development provided.

In the area of Timmins where the incentive program provided a very large United States corporation with smelter facilities, again in this case it was being operated on the basis of a natural resource. I believe that when dealing with growth areas it will be necessary to take into consideration the natural resources. While I am in total agreement that this company ought not to have been given any assistance under the previous program, this is the only kind of carrot that could have been held out to them. It is obvious that other legislation should have been brought into play. We might use the example of a very large nickel deposit in that northern area of Ontario, which probably will not be developed for a great number of years. It is likely that any

resource development will take into consideration the needs of International Nickel and the nickel cartel in respect of producing more nickel, and whatever else is most useful in their eyes rather than the needs of the community.

I suggest that the minister should accept the first amendment which includes the words "all forms of industrial activity" in place of the restriction against an initial processing operation in a resource-based industry because in most cases with which I have had any connection the development has hinged on the natural resource-based industry. It is really an adjunct which flows out of it.

I suggest that all industry in that band across Canada which is a resource area now eventually will have an industrial potential. If we are to pick centres there for growth, that growth must naturally be based on the natural resources. This is how the towns became established in the first place. The towns will be the primary consideration, but if we are to accomplish anything it will have to be done on the industrial base.

I suggest that if we had effective direction and incentives we would be processing the material being produced in the Gulf Sulphur area of Timmins. This is a much greater area than was contemplated under the assistance provided under the previous legislation. This is the type of material which can produce a large diversity of industries because of the by-products of the natural resource. If we did this there would be immense development in that area. We have never really imposed any restriction against the exportation of the industrial potential but have on occasion, as in the case of the previous legislation, provided an incentive that was large enough to make the company take advantage of our proposal rather than one they might have had as an alternative.

When we speak of industrial activity in some of the natural resource areas we speak of a very large complex. Even in the forest-based industry this is true. In my area, as a by-product chips are being produced to the extent of half the production of that pulp and paper mill. So the accompanying benefits which can flow are on the industrial side.

In relation to Timmins there was a grant of $5 million and then another $1½ million, and it is interesting to note it is expected that the Ontario government will be providing an incentive to the tune of $80 million a year over a ten-year period, or $800 million. So our figure of $6½ million, even if that figure is half correct, will be rather insignificant in the development of that area.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills, public bills.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to proceeding with private members' business I might be allowed to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate have passed Bill C-184, to establish a Canadian corporation for telecommunication by satellite, without amendment.

A message has also been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate have passed Bill S-17, respecting investment companies, to which the concurrence of this house is desired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before proceeding with private members' business, perhaps I might also inform the house that the questions to be raised at the hour of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—Old Age Security—reduction of guaranteed income supplement upon receipt of pension by spouse; the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles)—National Revenue—Port Dover, Ontario—failure of U.S. pleasure craft to report to customs officer; the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell)—Harbours—Toronto—federal participation in construction of port.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

INDIAN AFFAIRS

"LOCAL GOVERNMENT ON INDIAN RESERVES"

The house resumed, from Thursday, January 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Howard:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of a document entitled "Local Government on

Indian Reserves" prepared by the policy and planning directorate of the Indian Affairs Branch, dated August 4, 1967.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Howard) which was negatived on the following division:

• (5:10 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Carter
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Dumont
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Latulippe
Lewis
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Noble
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Rynard
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—83.

NAYS

Messrs:

Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Beer
Blair
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Comtois
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Orange
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Roberts
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—98.

Judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada

• (5:20 p.m.)

NATIONAL PARKS

LEASE BETWEEN MOUNTAINEER MOTEL COMPANY LIMITED AND DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

On the order:

Notices of motions (papers).

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the agreement (lease agreement) between the Mountaineer Motel Company Limited and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which said agreement was disclosed in and referred to in answer to question No. 1,271.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of hon. members may I withdraw this motion because I am sure the government wants to keep its word that we will adjourn on June 27 or 30. I do not want to take the time of the house, so I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (5:30 p.m.)

JUDGMENTS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

The house resumed, from Thursday, April 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Fortin:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a return showing, since the Supreme Court of Canada was instituted (a) the number of judgments rendered by judges whose mother tongue was French and, of those, the number of judgments rendered (i) in French (ii) in English; (b) of the judgments rendered in English by judges whose mother tongue is French, the number of judgments respecting Quebec; (c) the number of judgments rendered in French by judges whose mother tongue is English.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, we have 50 minutes left for debate and I should like to follow the example of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). But the matter has such importance at a time when we are discussing national unity and the languages bill that I think it is my duty to pursue the debate on this notice of motion for production of papers.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court question, as we said then, was an Anglo-Saxon ivory tower on which—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must draw the attention of the hon. member for Lotbinière as well as of the others on the fact that the member has already participated to this debate and that if he talks now he will close it.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I was then saying that the Supreme Court, since its establishment, was an Anglo-Saxon ivory tower discriminating against French-speaking people. Then, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) had risen and replied that the publication of a certain document on the national capital and its institutions would provide the explanations asked in my motion for papers and consequently that the motion was useless, since the information would appear in that document.

I am pleased to see that the document is published and that the discussion follows its publication. When one reads that document published and ordered by the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, one is aware that the Supreme Court has been forgotten and that the information requested is not included. This is a very good report, but it does not tell us how to make of the Supreme Court an agency in the real image of Canada, nor to what extent it is guilty of injustice and discrimination.

I used to believe the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, but not anymore, because I have read this report.

Thus, we are right back where we were at the beginning of the discussion, that is to say we have never determined with certainty whether the Supreme Court which is a fundamental institution and in a way the cornerstone of the present Canadian Confederation, from the constitutional viewpoint, was a body that discriminates against French Canadians.

The speech I made at that time contained several references to substantiate that claim. In view of those references, the government was unable to give any proof to the contrary and the minister could only beat around the bush as he does more often than not.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take uselessly the time of the house, but I should like to remind hon. members that if we truly want a bilingual Canada, if we truly want the official languages bill to become law, if we truly want to give French-Canadians their own place in Canada, and not somebody else's, if we want them to be an integral part of the Canadian Confederation, the Supreme Court, one of the most important bodies, must be an image of Canada. Only then would we be able to hold on to national unity.

Once more, Mr. Speaker, I want to call upon the hon. members and solicit their support. The government must approve the motion I have humbly submitted, in order to throw some light on an obscure matter which has always not only been left aside but seems to be taboo with hon. members. It seems essential to me that every one of us should take an interest in this matter of administrative tribunals and the Supreme Court to make them worthy of the Canada we dream of bringing about.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we wish to repeat again, because I really believe some of our ministers still do not understand it, that we are asking for a vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I must interrupt the hon. member as his allotted time has expired.

Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Fortin) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett
Beaudoin
Dionne
Dumont
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Laprise
Latulippe
Peters
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Skoberg
Tétrault—14.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Anderson
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Beer
Bell
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Broadbent
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Carter
Chappell
Code
Comeau
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Crouse
Cullen
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Gendron
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Gundlock
Haidasz
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hogarth
Hopkins
Horner
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howe
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McBride
McCleave
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Morison
Munro
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nowlan
O'Connell
Orange
Otto
Ouellet
Paproski
Peddle
Pelletier
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stanbury
Stanfield
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Woolliams—144.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a point of order. Under notices of motions for papers there are still on the order paper three notices of motion in the name of Mr. Schreyer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Who's he?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Does someone ask, who is he? He is the premier designate of Manitoba; that's who.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I ask leave of the house to have transferred to my name motions Nos. 121, 122 and 123 that appear on the order paper under his name.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADIAN TERRITORIAL AND INLAND WATERS

REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF MAP

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West) moved:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of a map of Canada showing both territorial waters and inland waters claimed by Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on April 30 when this motion was first before the house, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) indicated that a map showing the territorial waters of Canada would not be issued by the government. I wish to read the minister's reply to the house and speak very briefly on the motion. I quote from page 8164 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, the government intends in the near future to issue maps illustrating additional straight base lines which will be drawn along Canada's coasts. It is also intended to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act to permit the establishment of fisheries lines in certain areas without affecting the limits of Canada's internal waters and territorial sea. It would not be in the Canadian interest for the government to issue further maps of Canada's possible maritime claims at this time. On this basis I ask the hon. member if he will agree to withdrawing his motion.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, why it is not in Canada's interest to show the territorial waters we feel should be under Canada's jurisdiction. This was not explained by the minister in his reply. Frankly, in 1969 we should be in a position to indicate very clearly what claims Canada makes on the east, west and north as far as territorial waters are concerned.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (5:50 p.m.)

I feel the motion is extremely important in this sense, that I am referring to all the territorial waters and more specifically to the Arctic. We have had some extremely interesting developments within the Arctic-area within the past few years. There is no doubt about it, we have here potential oil reserves of immense wealth. I, personally, feel it would be in the interests of Canada and Canadians to set out what we consider to be the jurisdictional area so far as our nation is concerned. I was rather interested in the remarks that it would not be in Canada's interests. Surely, some minister of the government should be able to give us clearcut, definite reasons for not wanting to put Canada's claims on a map.

I wish to make one or two references to other nations. Last fall I had an opportunity to go to the United Nations for a couple of weeks where they were discussing the seabed. There were discussions respecting territorial claims of various nations. I understand the little nation of Chile on the southern tip of South America has staked a claim 200 miles out from the shore. I do not think there is too much conflict with other nations in this regard. I do not know whether a claim of this nature could be upheld under international jurisprudence, but Chile has staked it out.

Other nations are in the same category. I am not going to enumerate them. I wish to point out very clearly that recently there was a huge oil find in the Arctic in the Prudhoe Bay area. An estimate from one of the government's departments is that the area likely contains somewhere between 5 billion and 10 billion barrels of oil. Another estimate, given by representatives of oil companies who appeared before the Standing Committee on National Resources, indicated that the reserve was somewhere between 10 billion and 50 billion barrels of oil. Our position is that Canada should have her claims staked out. We should know if we will be in a position to move in and develop any oil resources there may be in this area. Personally, I feel it is of vital interest to all Canadians to make certain that claims are made. There might be a dispute as to the drawing of lines, but our department should have these claims staked out in a manner which will enable all Canadians to know exactly what we claim as Canada's inland waters and territorial waters. Our

claim could be of vital concern, even in terms of the oil find which I have just mentioned, because it could affect, billions of dollars in revenue.

This is no time for the Secretary of State for External Affair to tell us it is not in the interests of Canada to stake out these claims. I am not suggesting for one second that we should get something which could not rightfully be classed as Canadian territory. There is no doubt that explorations are going on in the east, west and north, and it is time a map was issued to show the area in which we consider Canadians have the right to carry out explorations, fishing and so on.

It is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development, and motion no. 1, Mr. Broadbent.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at five o'clock to consider other business I was suggesting to the minister that there are really two kinds of areas to which the bill is directed. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), in my view, seems to apply to a large segment of the area that will be industrially oriented, based on resources. The assistance here will be considerably different from that provided to the Maritimes and areas near Montreal, Quebec City, Toronto, Hamilton and Windsor where local industry fits into a different category.

I believe the minister is correct in saying that we should not put money directly into the development of the basic resource but rather into the industrial complex that can and should be built around it. We have had little success in providing employment through most resource based industries. I give the example of one iron ore mine in my own area that years ago would have employed several thousand people but now, because of modern technology, employs only about 400 workers. The same is true with respect to sawmills. A sawmill that used to employ 200 people now employs only 20 or 30 when it is highly automated.

However, this employment ratio does not apply to ancillary industry. The flake board industry, based on a by-product of sawmills, provides a large amount of employment. Mining and lumbering are the two basic resources upon which most industrial development will be built, and as the years go by industrial complexes built on these resources will move further north from present industrialized areas. I suggest that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby could lead to the provision of the greatest amount of employment.

In a 200 mile wide stretch, reaching from coast to coast, we are training industrial personnel capable of handling the normal industrial growth that will take place. We are also, however, exporting highly trained and skilled people from this area because the better trained and more highly skilled they are the less job opportunities they have. No growth centre concept will work unless we are able to provide jobs for the skilled people we are training.

In Canada we also have a problem with foreign owned industries. In many cases they enjoy major advantages when operating in this country. Our laws which apply to domestic companies do not necessarily apply to American owned industries. Again, I cite the example of a mine in my area. The price for the ore pellets which it produces is established by the parent company in the United States and does not necessarily bear a close relationship to the cost of production or to the normal selling price of the product. We, ourselves, do not have the ability to make a proper assessment of what the end product should cost, yet we assist this company through provincial transportation grants and other incentives. The type of production that must be encouraged by the federal government is that which has the largest employment factor.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I suggest that the things which have been said concerning the second motion in respect of the tourist and service operations will flow from the establishment of a viable growth centre, if it is based on a viable economy in that area.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): In accordance with the procedure established earlier today, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont) seconded by Mr. Hales moves that Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives—

Mr. Peters: That is the wrong amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): The two amendments are to be combined and voted on at a later date.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, did the Chair not advise that the two amendments would be discussed collectively, but would be voted on separately? This was my understanding.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): It was the understanding of the Chair they would be voted on together, but since hon. members have a different understanding the Chair will put each amendment in order that a separate vote may be taken.

The question is on motion No. (1) (Mr. Broadbent). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 75 this vote will be deferred.

[Mr. Peters.]

The question now is on motion No. (2) (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): All those in favour of the proposed motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): According to the Standing Order, this vote is deferred.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting paragraph (b) of clause 4 and substituting therefor:

(b) In the case of a proposal to establish a new facility or to expand an existing facility to enable the manufacturing or processing of a product not previously manufactured or processed in the operation or to expand an existing tourist or service operation, a secondary development incentive by way of additional financial assistance to the applicant for the establishment of the new facility or the expansion of the existing facility for that purpose.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to speak only briefly on this motion because it is a consequential amendment having to do with the other amendment which we have not yet determined. I would certainly be within my rights, if for no other reason, in speaking briefly on this amendment. As I remarked in dealing with the second motion on the order paper today, if we are to give full weight to the important matter of including under the scope of this legislation the tourist and service industries it seems to me we must take into account how we deal with clause 4, the authorization of incentives. We should pay particular attention to the subclause which defines the availability of assistance to industries that are applying for the secondary grant for the enlargement into a new operation of an existing industry or the establish-

ment of a brand new industry. These grants are related to the number of people to be employed in the industry.

Here again, if only to emphasize the fact, I wish to say it is important to realize that in the areas into which we will be injecting a good deal of this fresh capital to assist new industry, we will have the option, depending on the attitude of the government, of assisting the various service and tourist industries. I recall that the argument was advanced by the minister, in considering the advisability of making this kind of assistance available to the tourist industry, that in many cases this industry offers only part time employment. I would reply simply that part time employment is certainly better than no employment at all. This summer we are faced with the problem of many thousands of university students and others who cannot find employment. They would certainly be most anxious to obtain the kind of employment that would be provided through any enlargement of tourist facilities that might exist in any of the underdeveloped parts of the country. Employment obtained in this area would greatly aid the economy and, ease the burden of the government in respect of its manpower department which, unfortunately I think, has not had any great success.

It seems to me it is important if we are to give full weight to this legislation—and it is certainly my intent and that of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to give such weight to it in respect of the tourist and service industries—that there must be not only available the primary grant but also secondary grants as set out under this bill. The amendment provides for assistance to existing tourist or service operations or the establishment of new such centres where the opportunity exists. This is really a consequent amendment following upon the earlier one in respect of the redefinition of "facility".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Pursuant to section 1 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East) moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by including in clause 7, subclause 1, the following new paragraph:

(c) the establishment of a Crown corporation in consultation with provincial authorities would make a more significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within the designated region.

He said: Mr. Speaker, clause 7 of the bill as it reads now imposes certain limitations on the powers granted to the minister. This clause reads:

No development incentive may be authorized under this act for the establishment, expansion or modernization of any facility if, in the opinion of the minister,

(a) it is probable that the facility would be established, expanded or modernized without the provision of such an incentive; or

(b) the establishment, expansion or modernization of the facility would not make a significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within the designated region.

• (8:20 p.m.)

It is desirable that some limitations be placed on the powers of the minister granted under this act. He has admitted himself that he has been granted some rather far reaching powers, and he seems to be quite willing to accept the responsibilities and the problems that go with the powers being granted to him. Nevertheless, I think this clause, as it is worded now, does impose two limitations on the powers of the minister which apparently meet with the approval of the government.

The amendment I have proposed on behalf of the New Democratic Party would provide a new subclause (c). Subclause (c), read in conjunction with the preamble, would then read as follows:

No development incentive may be authorized under this act for the establishment, expansion or modernization of any facility if, in the opinion of the minister,

(c) the establishment of a Crown corporation in consultation with provincial authorities would make a more significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within the designated region.

I think this would be a very desirable and useful addition to the bill. It should be noted that most of the assistance which will be provided by the government under this act will be given to private industry. The minister has noted in the committee during discussion on this bill that it will be possible to provide assistance to Crown corporations. In other words, they would qualify for a grant just the same as a private industry.

I can see that this may be a very useful device if it were decided that such assistance should be provided to a totally provincial Crown corporation. However, it seems to me that this clause works against Crown corporations in terms of possible federal involvement in action dealing with some of our economic problems which we face in the areas of the country to which this measure shall apply. It seems to me that the concept and role of a Crown corporation really does not get a fair shake. It seems to me there are political and structural factors that work against a Crown corporation, and this amendment would give a federal or joint federal-provincial Crown corporation a fair opportunity to show what it might be able to do in dealing with some of the problems that will arise.

It is recognized that public investment is required in dealing with some of our regional economic problems and for providing for regional economic development. The chief means by which the government proposes to make this public investment under the terms of this bill is through financial assistance, and most of this financial assistance will, of course, go to private industry.

It seems to me this, then, leaves the question of what happens to Crown corporations, or what proposals a Crown corporation might make of a particular type at a particular time. As I suggested, it seems to me that Crown corporations are really placed at a disadvantage under the terms of the bill, and that we do need to give a full opportunity for a rational decision on the point of whether or not a particular development or a particular project should be a public project in the form of a Crown corporation, or a private project.

[Mr. Burton.]

When I make these statements I am not taking a dogmatic stand in respect of public versus private ownership. I am simply suggesting that what we do require is an objective assessment of the relative merits of public versus private ownership and operation in a given situation. It seems to me if it is decided that a Crown corporations involving the federal government either as the sole owner, or as a joint owner with a provincial government is the best possible and most efficient means of carrying out a particular development, then there are other means of financing open to the government. These means would not involve the use of the grant structure provided in this measure because the corporation would not need a grant in that sense.

What happens then, is that this amendment forces the minister to make a judgment and an assessment prior to making a decision as to the relative merits of public versus private operation. The fact is that the minister could not make a grant for a particular purpose if he had an assessment before him stating that a publicly owned project or development would be preferable and would serve the public interest better than a private operation. Of course, the government has various tools of analysis available to it. According to some of the discussions that took place before the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, some departments do not seem to be too familiar with such techniques as cost benefit analysis and other more refined techniques, but it seems to me these are available and an objective assessment could be made to determine whether in fact a project should be carried out as a public or privately owned operation.

Making use of cost benefit analysis really enables the government to take into account all the factors affecting the public interest rather than using just a profit and loss basis for judging an operation. It seems to me what is required in dealing with this situation is that the minister be given powers to make such a decision. He, in fact, would be forced into the position of making a meaningful decision on this particular point. I give the minister credit for his ability, his intelligence and his motivation, and it seems to me he certainly would not make a judgment unless he had adequate information before him. What we do want to see is decisions taken that are purposeful and meaningful and that are not accidental or circumstantial. Thus, I commend this motion to the house and sug-

gest that in effect a fair shake be given for once to the possibilities that do exist for Crown corporations, to carry out particular aspects of our economic development.

As I stated before, this in no way prejudges the relative merits of one or more types of operation in any given situation. It really leaves the situation open so that an objective assessment can be made and the government might be enabled to take a decision in the best interests of the Canadian nation and the Canadian people. Thus, I hope the government and all members of this house will support this motion in order that we can better enable the government to carry out the purpose and intent of this legislation.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support this proposal very strongly. We are all aware of the few times the move toward Crown Corporations has been successful in the past. Some on the other side might want to point out that such Crown corporations have been unsuccessful in the past on a number of occasions. Anyone who has any knowledge of the Polymer corporation, which was established in an area where industry would not normally be interested, will realize that it has become a very large employer and a very valuable tool in the substitute rubber industry. We must realize that the amount of money the federal government spent on this particular Crown corporation has been well repaid and that the rewards which have been reaped have been tremendous.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I am sure the minister is aware that a great deal of assistance will have to be provided in the far north in relation to the oil development program in that area. It seems to me that a crown corporation owning and operating a pipe line might be the most effective way of using money and directing the economic development of the whole Mackenzie River delta, considering the number of oil outlets that are likely to be available in the near future. I believe this developement would be along the lines of the government's thinking. The money spent in this manner would eventually be available for further redistribution, whereas if it were given to industry it would not be as readily available or identifiable at a later time.

I am thinking of a project that for many years has been considered in my area of northern Ontario, namely, the development of a lignite industry. This would involve considerable expenditure and private industry has not been particularly interested in it. For this reason, efforts to develop the industry have not been very successful. If the government established a crown corporation to develop the lignite, it is likely that the industries surrounding such a development would be almost certain of success. The difference would be that the industry would be developed when the government saw fit to establish a crown corporation for that purpose. If the development is left to private industry, it may not take place for many years and may be spasmodic and limited, as it has been for the past 20 or 30 years.

I am sure there are many areas in which a crown corporation would be advantageous. I can mention one that has been referred to over the last few years by many members of the house. I refer to our transportation problem. Because Canada is serviced mainly by air lines which fly from east to west rather than from north to south, there is an inability on the part of air lines to provide the type of service that is necessary. If money were available for amalgamating existing feeder lines through a crown corporation, using the facilities of the crown corporation of Air Canada—without necessarily amalgamating these lines into strictly one unit—there could be a reduction in cost and a betterment of the service. It seems to me that the benefits which would accrue to the general public through the establishment of a crown corporation which would bring together the hundreds of existing feeder lines would be well worth investigation by the Minister. In this way the feeder lines would be able to operate closely with our major east-west carriers and could provide an adequate service.

I hope the minister will consider this suggestion. I know that over the years many people in the house have been opposed to Crown corporations on the basis that some other body could better handle these matters. There has been the suggestion that some of our Crown corporations will be sold to private enterprise. Even if this proves to be so and it is advantageous, I am sure few people would say that most of the Crown corporations established by the federal government have not served a useful purpose or, that the reasons for which they were established would, not be applicable in a number of other fields with some anticipation of success.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in

speaking to this amendment. I rise at this point because I think the minister might come around somewhat to our way of thinking. As he knows, we considered these arguments at some length in committee. In connection with the discussion of another amendment which we shall reach shortly, the minister and I exchanged comments in the committee on the question of public ownership. At one point I expressed the view that I thought it was a very fine thing. The minister replied in these words, and I quote from the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Regional Development, Volume No. 16, page 389:

Yes, I would agree with you if we were discussing general legislation applying to the whole Canadian economy.

There was a discussion of the principle of foreign ownership, the problems connected with it, and more particularly the means of dealing with it, and the establishment of crown corporations. I was very pleased that the minister lent his support to the principle of public ownership. I wonder if between the time of that committee meeting and today's sitting he has come around to our view. I look forward to the minister's comments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

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

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby) moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, in clause 7 by including therein the following new subclause:

"(3) No development incentive may be authorized under this act for the establishment, expansion, or modernization of any facility if the applicant firm or company is non-resident owned or controlled."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think the principle of this amendment should be obvious to all members of the house; indeed, it was obvious to all government members on the committee when we discussed it a few weeks ago. My main objection to the bill as it now stands, and as I argued in committee, is that if it is passed we will be using public funds to subsidize the further takeover by foreigners of the Canadian economy. This seems to me to be the paramount issue in Canadian society at the present time. This issue has been raised many times in the house. It has been raised even by the odd member of the Liberal party—odd in two senses of that word. It was raised by the Hon. Walter Gordon and subsequently in the report of the Watkins Committee, which body was established by the Liberal government. It was raised and discussed at length in a debate in the house on May 29, and it seemed to be very important to the minister.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Again, I should like to quote the minister who had some very favourable things to say about the importance of restricting foreign ownership of the Canadian economy. I will quote from the proceedings of the meeting on June 16 of this year of the Standing Committee on Regional Development. In discussing the amendment that we now have before us the minister said:

Mr. Chairman, if we were discussing a piece of legislation applying to the whole Canadian economy, I would be in agreement with most of what you are saying.

The point is that the minister does seem to realize the very serious political consequences for Canadians of the very extensive ownership of our economy by foreigners, and this means in particular by Americans. He has supported the notion that some meaningful restrictions should be established in our country, particularly with regard to the ownership of equity in our Canadian economy. However, he refused to support the amendment in the committee on rather serious grounds. The

argument put forward by the minister was that he would be in favour of setting up meaningful controls of foreign ownership—I certainly wish he went across the country talking about this general situation since there are not many people in the cabinet willing to say this—and that he was personally committed to some kind of action which would regain Canadian control of our economy. However, he pointed out that if we applied such action through this piece of legislation only, the effects would be discriminatory. It would mean, in effect, that a foreign owned company would be encouraged to invest in those parts of Canada which are already prosperous and the very areas that need the least help would be aided greatly. If we prohibited the kind of subsidization that this bill provides from applying to foreign owned corporations, instead of locating in certain parts of the maritime provinces, certain parts of Quebec or indeed in certain parts of Ontario, these firms would locate in the Toronto-Hamilton area, for example, or some analogous parts of Canada that need no assistance.

This argument is a serious one, and I do not deny it at all. But if we, as Canadians, are seriously concerned about dealing with foreign ownership and the resulting political and social consequences—and I have no intention of boring the house with repeated arguments that have been made many times before in the house and elsewhere on that question—this would have been a good starting place to establish the principle that we will not use public funds to subsidize a foreign take-over of the Canadian economy. The implicit assumption made by the minister is that the major part of the industry which we will encourage to locate in those areas of Canada where we think it should be located will be foreign owned. This may or may not be the case; it seems to me to be an open question. It might turn out to be the case, especially if meaningful and persuasive political action dealing with Canadian owned companies were taken and some appeal to Canadian capitalists were explicitly made, along with financial incentives provided in this bill, to locate industry in Canadian areas which need development.

We might not have to rely on foreign ownership if leadership were given by this government to the business investing community. It might well turn out that we could entice a sufficient amount of capital generated in Canada to locate in the areas that need it and therefore not have to rely on foreign capital for this growth. It seems to me to be a remarkable failure of leadership in advance for the minister to suggest, as he does in effect in this bill and as he did in the committee, that there would be no hope for the meaningful implementation of this bill if we did not rely on the clause as it exists which maintains the principle of foreign ownership in this country. If this is the case, it is an extremely serious situation and it recalls to my mind the statement made in the Watkins report that we have only 10 or 15 years left in which to save Canada. If we do not do something soon, it will be too late. This may be the case. I suggest that it will not hurt the government one bit to try for a few years to develop this country on classical capitalist principles using Canadian capital, providing financial incentives for that capital but restricting anything over 51 per cent of foreign control. This is what we should do, instead of providing public funds to further subsidize the acquisition of very important economic resources in Canada. If it turned out after a few years that this amendment, if adopted, led to a substantial failure of the program, then perhaps it would have to be reassessed. I am suggesting that the minister's acknowledged failure in advance seems to reflect, not a deliberate indifference to Canadian needs, but an unconscious thinking that has prevailed in Liberal governments in this country for many years that somehow we just cannot get by without allowing capital to enter in the form of ownership. I am not arguing against any form of foreign investment—that would be ludicrous—but, as the minister knows, many countries including so-called socialist countries, Yugoslavia being an example, have allowed foreign capital up to the 49 per cent level and yet retained control of their own countries.

What I am urging the government to do by this amendment is to show a little leadership to the Canadian people and to try, at least in this small way in this bill, to preserve Canada for Canadians.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I would just like to say a few words in support of what is described as being the position of the minister with regard to this matter. I do not wish to use language that is too strong, but I do not see how anybody can possibly put forward an amendment of this sort if he has any interest in doing something to develop the under-developed

regions of Canada. I say this sincerely and without in any way trying to be offensive. Anybody with any experience at all in connection with the task that the minister has would not try to tie at least one hand behind his back before starting. If someone wants to advocate a measure in the house with regard to the control of Canadian industry by Canadians, this is the last place to start. If someone wants to start in Oshawa, that is all right, but he should not start in northern Ontario or in some other section of the country such as the Atlantic provinces where it has been proven that Canadian industry is not particularly interested in trying out something new and where, in fact, much of the development that has taken place has been as a result of foreign enterprise.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Secondly, I think this amendment is misconceived. I assume that the approach of the minister will be not to assist industry as such by providing a hand-out that will benefit the owners but to provide assistance to equalize the advantage of industry locating in one region as compared with another region that is more highly developed. The purpose of the minister's program is not to give a benefit to the owners of a particular industry but rather to make it sufficiently worth while, and no more than sufficiently worth while, for industry to go into an underdeveloped area. The minister also has to satisfy himself that the benefit derived from taking such a step is in some way commensurate with the assistance offered.

I hope there is no misunderstanding that the assistance granted by the minister is designed to fatten the profits of foreign or Canadian capitalists. I hope the program will be administered in such a way as to assist development of certain areas and help equalize to some extent the attractiveness of underdeveloped areas with other regions.

I would oppose, and I hope that every member in the house would oppose, any attempt to restrict this program or—and here I agree with the minister—effectively to kill the program by tying into it some concept of countering foreign ownership. Surely, the minister can administer the program in such a way that it does not assist takeovers or provide unnecessary windfalls to industry.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Are you sure of that?

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Stanfield: No, I am not sure. I assume that is the purpose of the program of the minister. Sometimes the minister may mistakenly be a little more generous, in which case his colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will get a good deal of the money back before long in any event.

I want to make two points. Firstly, that in my view this amendment is based on a misconception, namely that the act will provide assistance to the owners of industry, whereas in fact it is designed to provide assistance to industry to locate in underdeveloped areas of Canada. Secondly, regardless of what one may think about foreign ownership and so on, I think this amendment would very seriously handicap the minister's efforts to assist the establishment of industry in underdeveloped areas. If the government wants to initiate a program to bring Canadian industry home or to ensure that new industry is controlled by Canadians, then the last place to try to achieve this would be in underdeveloped areas of Canada. If the minister started in Oshawa or some place, it might be more appropriate. Without particularizing in this regard, suffice it to say I could not oppose too vigorously this amendment, which I think would really frustrate to a very significant extent the whole purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this amendment. I completely disagree with the last speaker's interpretation of the use to which the funds should be put, and I endorse the amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). It seems to me that we have to start somewhere in Canada to control foreign ownership.

I have gone through the minutes of the committee proceedings, and on June 16, as reported at page 393, I noticed that the minister indicated to the committee he was very much in favour of our doing something to aid the development of Canada by Canadians. I should just like to place his remarks on *Hansard*. Incidentally, may I say I completely agree with what the minister said. However, he did qualify his statement and said, as did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), that he felt we should not make a start in this connection under this particular program. The minister said:

> I believe that we should promote industrial development by Canadian capital in Canada. I am not ready to support the thesis which wants us to buy Canada back overnight or in five or ten years,

but I think that we should. The only way to become more independent economically is to develop Canadian industry owned and controlled by Canadians. There is no doubt.

However, there will be no discrimination in the implementation of this law. This is a matter of general policy and this we are ready to follow.

The minister is indicating there would be no discrimination under this act.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I have no objection to having my remarks read, but the hon. member has read only part of what I said. I said that this amendment would involve the worst kind of discrimination against slow growth regions in Canada.

Mr. Harding: I do not mind the minister adding that. I indicated that the minister had said he did not wish to include this amendment in the act, and I will frankly admit that was his statement.

This is the position which we are in today. We had the Watkins report presented some time ago. This report informed the government and all Canadians what was happening to Canadian industry and urged that some steps be taken to correct the situation. What I should like to know is when this government is going to start to take action to solve the problem of controlling Canadian ownership of industry, and where the government is going to make this move. Let no one in this house kid himself. Once we lose control of our economy, then along with it also goes political control. This we are seeing today in Canada. We have asked the government, as well as the other parties in this house, to give a great deal of thought as to what has been happening in this country in so far as control and ownership of Canadian industries and companies is concerned.

We would be very unwise to use the Canadian taxpayers' money to further such control. I am suggesting, as my hon. friend has suggested, that there are other types of control that can be built into legislation of this type. The government may not have to accept this particular amendment now before the house, but surely top priority should be given to assisting Canadian companies to establish industry in these so-called designated areas. I should like to point out that foreign capital in Canada is usually invested in areas where there is a real chance it will yield a profit. Many of the areas that we are talking about at the moment are marginal areas, which is one of the reasons they have not been developed to date.

I do not want to spend too long discussing this amendment but I should just like to say something else about foreign ownership in Canada. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has very clearly pointed out that other countries in the world have taken measures to ensure that control of industry has not passed from their hands into others. We could establish controls of that nature relating to moneys which would be used for the establishment of industries in those areas. Should outside interests decide to move in, they would also be affected. This is what we are asking the minister to do. We want him to look at legislation of this type and we hope he will give some thought to it. Even though the minister may be unhappy with our proposal and unwilling to implement it, I hope he will give us the assurance that top priority will be given to any Canadian company or group of companies that may wish to enter these areas and establish industries as a result of the subsidies which are to be paid with respect to these incentive areas. I do not think that is asking too much.

• (9:00 p.m.)

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have talked for years about a Canada development corporation. We should be setting up such a corporation. We have plenty of money in this nation for that purpose and we should have set up a Canada development corporation years ago. It could have been at work in the incentive areas mentioned in this bill. The various regions suffering from disparities could have been built up. Industry could have been built in those areas and the standard of living of all Canadians could have been raised.

I hope the minister will take my brief remarks into consideration. At some appropriate time I hope he brings in the necessary amendments to this legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? The hon. member for Regina East.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to hon. members. I was about to recognize the Minister of Transport, but since he seemed uncertain and did not give the appearance of wanting to speak I recognized the hon. member for Regina East. I recognize the Minister of Transport.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe there was unanimous agreement that at this point the house would suspend what was before it and deal with Bill No. C-207 for the remaining time today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the proper procedure is for the Minister of Transport to move a motion to adjourn debate. If that is agreeable to the house we could, after the motion has been agreed to, proceed to the next item of business. Do hon. members agree that we proceed in that manner?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Jamieson: I so move.

On motion of Mr. Jamieson the debate was adjourned.

ATLANTIC REGIONAL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMPLIFY RATES LEGISLATION, TO REMOVE CERTAIN STATUTORY REDUCTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

The house resumed from Thursday, June 19, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-207, to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic region—Mr. Jamieson—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: Order, please. When the committee rose on Thursday, June 19, clause 5 was under consideration.

On clause 5—*Power to vary or remove rates.*

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Chairman, when debate on this bill was suspended on Thursday I indicated that we, on this side of the house, were prepared to accept this legislation on the strict understanding that it is an interim measure and on the firm guarantee given to us by the minister that he would be introducing much more comprehensive legislation in the coming session. I also said that although we agreed with most provisions of the bill, we were unhappy about clause 5(1), the clause we were discussing when debate on the bill was adjourned. We feel that this is an undesirable provision to include in the bill. I think the minister more or less agreed that this was not the most desirable way to handle what is intended, and I had the impression after listening to him that he might bring in some changes in this area. I will, therefore, ask the minister if he has anything to announce in this regard which may allay the fears and suspicions some of us harbour with respect to this piece of legislation.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, in reply to my hon. friend, may I say that I have read with a good deal of care the transcript of the proceedings that took place in the house on the occasion when this bill was discussed initially. I have tried to take into account the representations of hon. members opposite and to bear in mind what I think was their general theme. They intimated that they wanted this bill to be passed and to be passed quickly, so that its benefits could be extended to the Atlantic region. At the same time, they expressed reservations about certain of its clauses.

I said when introducing the bill that it was not a complete measure and that I would be quite prepared to see how it might be amended in some way in order to accommodate the views of representatives of the parties opposite. It seemed to me, on re-reading the proceedings, that the key point of hon. members' remarks revolved around clause 5 which has to do with the power of the governor in council relating to intra subsidies. That is the subsidy which is recommended now at the rate of 20 per cent within the specified region and which it is proposed will be subject to a review by a federal-provincial committee. It is hoped that the committee will apply this subsidy in a more beneficial way to the transport problems of the Atlantic region.

I am sure that hon. members understand that clause 5 was included in this bill because it was necessary for us to move on a progressive basis in order to implement this change. I think hon. members were unanimous in agreeing that they did not want to await the completion of the report. The completion of the report of the committee might take some considerable time and they did not want to wait for that before some of the provisions of the bill could be introduced. What I suggested at that time was that we wanted to be in a position from which, if the committee made a specific recommendation having to do with a particular commodity or group of commodities, we could move in order to implement that committee recommendation. Hence, we included clause 5 in the bill.

I understand the concern of hon. members opposite about clause 5 and about the fact that it gives authority to the governor in

council to make certain changes. While I assured the house then, and I assure the house again now, that it was not our intention nor is it our intention to emasculate the Maritime Freight Rates Act, yet there is good reason, and as a representative of an Atlantic province I understand this reason, for protecting the general charter of transportation of that region. May I therefore say to hon. members that I would be prepared to move an amendment which would eliminate what I believe is the legitimate concern of hon. members opposite.

The basis of this amendment is that when a recommendation is made by the federal-provincial committee to which I have referred, and when that recommendation is accepted and acted upon, it will become a matter of public record. If this hon. house happens to be sitting at that time or will sit within 15 days of the day of the order, any ten hon. members of this house or of the other place may require that the subject matter of the order be debated within this chamber. If, as a result of that debate, the order in question is annulled, the order shall stand annulled and have no effect. The effect of this amendment will be to return to parliament the right to pass judgment on any change in the intra subsidy under the Maritime Freight Rates Act. I hope hon. members will agree that this amendment meets the objections they have raised during the previous discussions on this matter. I may say that we have considered the proposal to simply introduce clause 5 on a one year, limited basis. While this proposal had a good deal to recommend it and could have solved the problem in the interim, it is conceivable the work of this committee may well extend beyond the 12-month period in which case it would be necessary for us to extend its activities at an important point and reintroduce legislation. I hope through this amendment, copies of which I believe have now been circulated to all hon. members, we have met the objections raised with regard to clause 5.

• (9:10 p.m.)

There were two other matters raised by hon. members opposite to which I gave attention. One had to do with the wish for an assurance that the current level of subsidies paid on an intra basis, that is the total sum of money now applied to maritime freight rate subsidies in the Atlantic provinces, would not be lessened in any way by the decisions of the federal-provincial committee. In other words, we would be obliged and obligated to ensure that the moneys transferred to other purposes on the recommendation of the committee would equal the sum that was being paid under the 20 per cent subsidy arrangement.

I told hon. members that was our intention, but to ensure that this met with their approval, I had the draftsmen prepare an amendment which is also in the hands of hon. members opposite. It reads.

That Bill C-207 be amended by striking out clause 6(2) at page 4 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(2) The total amount of assistance paid under this section shall at no time exceed the total of the amounts certified to the minister under subsection (2) of section 5 as the estimated savings to the Consolidated Revenue Fund in respect of those calendar years, including any part of such a year, for which amounts have been so certified to the minister."

The intent of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure, in an orderly fashion, that the exact sum of dollars will be in the aggregate transfer to programs. I am sure hon. members will agree it is not practical to transfer the precise sum of dollars removed from any one portion of the program to some alternative program. Through this amendment we will see that the total sum is provided so that it can be moved, not necessarily program for program, but over the whole spectrum of projects as the federal-provincial committee may suggest.

The third and final point with regard to amendments was that there was nothing in the bill of a definitive nature to indicate the precise time at which we would introduce the subsidy for truckers. I have now proposed an amendment at page 6, line 66 of the bill indicating that it will come into force on the 15th day of July, 1969. That is in the current year.

Mr. Lewis: That 1st day of July.

Mr. Jamieson: I am sorry, that is a typographical error. If hon. members will be good enough to change it, it ought to be the 15th and I will move at the appropriate moment that it be the 15th. I thank the hon. member for calling it to my attention.

The fourth objection raised to this measure with which I would like to deal briefly has to do with the possible inclusion of Labrador in the benefits or application of the Maritime Freight Rates Act. I have given a good deal of study to this since the previous day of the

debate. Of course, the reasons Labrador was not included in the first instance are fairly obvious. In 1949 they were negotiating the terms of the union and the application of the Maritime Freight Rates Act to Newfoundland. It was considered at that time more appropriate to confine it to the Island of Newfoundland. Conditions in Labrador have changed very dramatically since that time. There is no question in my mind, nor is there the slightest reservation, that we should move in this direction. Labrador must be the beneficiary of some form of transportation assistance. I feel that the form of transportation assistance to be provided to Labrador deserves study and consideration by the federal-provincial committee.

One hon. member suggested it would be appropriate to simply substitute the word "Labrador" or the words "the province of Newfoundland" for the words "the island of Newfoundland". I suggest that under this piece of legislation no real benefit would accrue under that particular arrangement. Indeed, the problem would be that the Maritime Freight Rates Act would then of necessity have to apply to a very large amount of iron ore being moved by the companies from Labrador out of the select region.

I suggest that is not the intent of this legislation, nor do I believe the hon. member is in the least interested in providing some sort of gratuitous benefit of this kind to the iron ore companies of Labrador which would do nothing for the people of Labrador and which would in many respects be an unreasonable burden on the Maritime Freight Rates Act which was not intended and, I emphasize, which we do not intend in this legislation. Therefore, to accept a proposal that would include Labrador within this particular bill would, I suggest, do nothing for the Labrador region or for the people of Labrador. It would impose an unreasonable burden on the Maritime Freight Rates Act which it was not and is not now intended it should bear.

As an alternative I suggest to the hon. members that the wisest course is to give as a priority recommendation to this federal-provincial committee, on which the province of Newfoundland will be represented, that they examine practical means whereby operation of the so-called intra subsidy can be applied to Labrador. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that is the appropriate way in which to proceed. In other words, the committee can examine whether a portion of the intra subsidy should be assigned to rail routes into Labrador or within Labrador. It can examine, and this I suggest is a key point with regard to Labrador, whether the subsidy ought to be applied. I believe it should be applied in some form or assistance ought to be given with regard to air shipments and also in some respects to shipments by sea.

I am prepared to defend the proposition that the mere inclusion of Labrador in this bill would have no significant benefits to the people of the Labrador region but would require us, unless the entire Maritime Freight Rates Act structure was changed, to apply a 30 per cent subsidy on the entire outgoing shipments of iron ore from Labrador, and particularly and most assuredly, on those destined for use in other parts of Canada.

In the days which have intervened since the first discussion of this bill, I believe I have made sincere efforts to accommodate the representations of members opposite. I believe their representations have been reasonable and fair, and I have answered them in the amendments which I am proposing to make at the appropriate time tonight. I simply say the result of any delay in this measure is going to be that the trucking industry in the Atlantic provinces, which has been operating under a most severe and unreasonable penalty for a very long time, will have to continue to do so. I say it will have a double penalty because we will of necessity have to maintain the so-called freeze which results in the trucking industry being inhibited on two different counts.

Hon. members have stated emphatically throughout this debate that they are most anxious to see this legislation passed. I am prepared to concede this is only part of the package. It does not do the whole job. I say we can move in this direction now. We can, in fact, help significantly through this measure to improve the transportation problems of the Atlantic provinces and I commend the measure to hon. members.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister for his remarks which go part way to answering some of the questions debated when this matter was last before the house. We are anxious to expedite the passage of this bill. We thank the minister not only for listening to the previous debate but also for paying attention to consultation we have had outside the house on the possibility of putting some curb on the wide discretionary power outlined in clause 5 which gives the cabinet virtual authority to emasculate

the Maritime Freight Rates Act so far as intra-traffic is concerned.

The minister's proposal, whereby ten members can provoke a debate on an order made under clause 5, will give the house an opportunity to debate any reduction of rates under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, although I would point out that this provision already exists in the law. Now, we will maintain some type of control, and will have a forum in which to discuss this type of change.

• (9:20 p.m.)

So far as the other two amendments are concerned, with respect to the amount of assistance I still hope that we do not get into a situation where the amount saved is a decreasing amount, so that three or four years from now there may not be any savings made on one section to be used in a supplemental way as suggested by the minister. We suggested a one year time limit, and in fact I submitted a draft to this effect to the minister. It is essential that the minister continue to show the initiative in bringing this matter up to date and preparing comprehensive plans for legislation on Atlantic transportation.

On the basis that this bill must be passed to eliminate the discrimination that now exists against truckers, we on this side are prepared to agree to these amendments. I believe the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador wishes to make some further comment on the question of the island of Newfoundland versus the province of Newfoundland, but so far as this party is concerned we hope that this legislation will be passed tonight.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Chairman, we in this party are now much more ready to accept this particular amendment. It will mean that we in parliament will still have some control. So far as the situation in Labrador is concerned, our position has always been that any assistance given under the Maritime Freight Rates Act should directly assist the user of a facility.

Mr. Peddle: Mr. Chairman, on the previous occasion that this bill was before committee of the whole I expressed my concern that, while it is entitled an act to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic region, it specifically excludes the Labrador part of the province of Newfoundland. Clause 2(c) provides that any consideration under the act so far as Newfoundland is concerned applies only to the island of Newfoundland. The other three Atlantic provinces, Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and New Brunswick are included in their entirety, and the portion of Quebec which I suppose can be considered as an Atlantic region is also included. I might say I have been given to understand that in the new bill the portion of Quebec stipulated is considerably larger than that taken into consideration in the Maritime Freight Rates Act, as printed in the revised statutes of Canada, 1952.

Approximately 110,000 square miles of my province, incidentally all in my riding, are deliberately excluded from the provisions of this legislation. The minister answered my objection by making reference to the terms of union between Newfoundland and Canada. I cannot see the relevancy of that argument. The terms of union state:

> For the purpose of railway rate regulation the Island of Newfoundland will be included in the Maritime region of Canada—
>
> All legislation of the Parliament of Canada providing for special rates on traffic moving within, into, or out of, the Maritime region will, as far as appropriate, be made applicable to the Island of Newfoundland.

But, Mr. Chairman, the terms of union also clearly define the province of Newfoundland, as follows:

> The Province of Newfoundland shall comprise the same territory as at the date of Union, that is to say, the Island of Newfoundland and the Islands adjacent thereto, the coast of Labrador as delimited in the report delivered by the Judicial Committee ... on the first day of March, 1927—

I do not really want to delay the minister's legislation but as the elected representative of the riding of Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador I cannot come into this chamber and see legislation, purporting to assist transportation in the Atlantic region, go through when the area of Labrador I represent is specifically excluded from the terms of that legislation.

The biggest problems in Labrador are transportation and communications. Transportation is the only real problem in the industrialized areas of Labrador. Therefore, I cannot buy a bill such as this which excludes Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I know there are no roads in Labrador right now, but in one of my first speeches in this chamber I supported the idea of the provision of a road system in Labrador. When roads are provided, the subsidy available through this bill could be an incentive to develop Labrador.

I know the minister is trying to be co-operative but I still cannot help but feel that Labrador is being treated as an orphan, to which a few crumbs may be thrown. I cannot

accept that. The minister says he feels Labrador must be the beneficiary of some form of assistance. If this bill is for the assistance of transportation in the Atlantic region, let it cover the entire Atlantic region. If trucking facilities are not presently available in Labrador no harm will be done, but the provisions of this bill could be used as an incentive to the introduction of such facilities.

• (9:30 p.m.)

As I said I do not wish to delay this legislation. I heard the remarks of the minister concerning the subsidies that would have to be paid in respect of iron ore shipments, and that seems to be a rather strange reason for keeping assistance out of an area. That does not ring right to my ear. As a representative of the area, and despite the minister's remarks, I must propose the following amendment to Bill C-207. I move:

That clause 2(c) be amended by deleting the words "Island of Newfoundland" and substituting therefor the words "the Province of Newfoundland".

The Chairman: Clause 2 has been stood. Therefore, we will proceed through the bill and then return to clause 2, at which time the hon. member's amendment may be put.

Mr. Lang: I move:

That Bill C-207 be amended by adding thereto, immediately after line 17 on page 4 thereof, the following subsections:

Tabling — (3) An order of the Governor in Council made under subsection (1) to vary or remove any reduction in tariffs shall be laid before Parliament not later that fifteen days after its issue, or, if Parliament is not then sitting, within the first fifteen days next thereafter that Parliament is sitting and, subject to subsection (5), the order shall come into force thirty sitting days after it is so tabled.

Opportunity for debate — (4) Where an order has been laid before Parliament pursuant to subsection (3), a notice of Motion in either House signed by ten members thereof and made in accordance with the rules of that House within fifteen days of the day the order was laid before Parliament, praying that the order be annulled, shall be debated in that House at the first convenient opportunity within the ten sitting days next after the day the motion in that House was made.

Annulling order — (5) If either House of Parliament resolves that the order be annulled, the order shall stand annulled and have no effect.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Peddle.]

Amendment (Mr. Lang) agreed to.

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

On clause 6—*Assistance authorized*

Mr. Lang: I move:

That Bill C-207 be amended by striking out clause 6(2) at page 4 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

Limit on assistance — (2) The total amount of assistance paid under this section shall at no time exceed the total of the amounts certified to the Minister under subsection (2) of section 5 as the estimated savings to the Consolidated Revenue Fund in respect of those calendar years, including any part of such a year, for which amounts have been so certified to the Minister.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Lang) agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 10—*Coming into force*

Mr. Lang: I move:

That Bill C-207 be amended by striking out line 33 on page 6 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

10. Section 3 shall come into force on the 1st day of July, 1969, sections 5 and 6 shall come into

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Lang) agreed to.

Clause 10 as amended agreed to.

The Chairman: The committee will revert to clause 2 and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador that clause 2(c) be amended by deleting the words "Island of Newfoundland" and substituting therefor the words "the Province of Newfoundland".

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Chairman, on this amendment may I say I am in complete sympathy with the intention of the hon. member. There is no argument about the propriety of his plan and we wish to ensure that Labrador is taken care of. I simply say to him and hon. members, through you Mr. Chairman, that the effect of this amendment is to give the large iron mining companies operating in Labrador a very, very significant and unnecessary subsidy which they do not need and which they have not sought. This is the only possible result of this amendment. The solution I have undertaken to bring about,

and which I now say we will do, is to have the committee find an effective means of assisting transportation in the Labrador area of the province of Newfoundland and within the Atlantic provinces. For these reasons I cannot accept this amendment.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Chairman, I believe I put forward our position a short while ago. I believe we find ourselves supporting the minister's position on this proposed amendment. Today in the house it was agreed that the Standing Committee on Transportation would continue its tour, which no doubt will include Labrador. At the same time, the minister has suggested Labrador should receive consideration for assistance and that the federal-provincial committee no doubt will be looking into this. What bothers me is that the committee may go on a junket to Labrador, come back and then make a recommendation for assistance which would be of little value. I am sure all members of my party would like to support this amendment, but unfortunately the large iron ore companies would be the only real beneficiaries. I am very sincere when I say there must be some assistance given to the people of Labrador in respect of transportation in this area, but I do not think this amendment will accomplish that objective.

I suggest we must look for other means. I hope the minister is sincere when he states he will see that action is taken in respect of Labrador as soon as possible, and that some legislation will be brought forward to benefit the people of that area. I do not think the way to do it, however, is by helping the great iron ore works to the detriment of the people who should benefit.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the minister concerning grants.

This amendment would provide for a grant to be paid to Labrador which would help in the first place the company that serves Schefferville, which is owned by American interests. But the greatest danger involved in passing this amendment is that the province of Quebec has never recognized that Labrador belongs to Newfoundland. That is why we object to this amendment, because we are convinced that even if Mr. Smallwood has decided to take up arms to stop the people of Quebec from going to Labrador, we must keep this bill as it is. There is enough disagreement in the house without confusing the issues even more.

[*English*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, if the amendment proposed by my colleague the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador were accepted, would it be possible for the minister by regulation to exclude the companies which produce iron ore from any subsidy? Could it be done in that way?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Chairman; it is the precise opposite. If the bill goes through and the federal-provincial committee is empowered to make recommendations, we can look at those industries which do not need this kind of support with a view to the provincial representatives saying we should exclude a particular industry. At this time, the intention is to benefit those people who need the benefit most, and the reverse would be the case if this amendment were to carry now.

• (9:40 p.m.)

It would simply mean that we would have to apply the Maritime Freight Rates Act, and the 30 per cent westbound subsidy would have to apply to the very heavy and enormously costly shipments of iron ore out of Labrador. This is why I said the appropriate means of dealing with this is to have the committee look into it. We could exclude this group by designation, and we could do that under the legislation we are being asked to pass tonight. Without this legislation we cannot do it, and we particularly cannot do it if this amendment were to carry in the way my hon. friend has proposed it.

The Chairman: The committee has heard the amendment. Shall the amendment to clause 2 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment to clause—

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please rise.

An hon. Member: There was no opposition to the amendment; it was passed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order, please. All those in favour of the amendment will please rise. All those opposed will please rise.

An hon. Member: That's twice you voted on the one issue.

The Chairman: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Why don't you wake up?

The Chairman: Order, please.

An hon. Member: How often are you allowed to vote?

The Chairman: Could we have order in the committee, please.

An hon. Member: Just like Pearson; you lost one vote so you try again.

The Chairman: Order, please. I declare the amendment negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Peddle) negatived: Yeas, 24; Nays, 75.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause 1 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Title agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Leave is not required, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Aiken: Certainly it is, there have been amendments.

Mr. Jamieson moved the third reading of the bill.

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

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development, and motion No. 5 Mr. Broadbent.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on motion No. 5; Mr. Broadbent, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it, and I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 5, Mr. Broadbent, negatived on division.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East) moved:

That Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended in clause 13, section 2, by adding after the word "made" in line 23 on page 10, the words:

"or the 31st day of December, 1976, whichever is earlier.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the amendment which has been proposed to this clause of the bill, I believe there has been a slight error in the drafting of it. I should like at this time to read the amendment that we wish to put. It is as follows:

That the motion be amended by deleting therefrom the word "earlier" and substituting therefor the word "later".

I am sure the minister realizes there was some discussion in the Committee as to the application of the amount of loans that industry would be allowed. It was thought that the reason for providing incentives for industries to move into an area was related to a benefit to the people who were unemployed. Good corporate citizenship is expected of any

industry that moves into an area to take advantage of incentives. In looking at this particular clause with this in mind, our idea was to have a very close relationshhip between this department and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. We are of the opinion that this particular clause of the bill should indicate that those industries taking advantage of the incentives provisions should keep in contact with the department throughout the entire time this act is in force.

As was pointed out by the minister at the committee hearings, all of the incentive provisions of the act should not have been applied by 1976. We suggest that changing the word "earlier" to "later" would mean that all the provisions of the act not satisfied at that time would be satisfactorily covered.

• (9:50 p.m.)

It is our position that there must be very close working relationship among departments to ensure that the purpose of the bill is fulfilled to the greatest extent possible. We have experienced too many situations wherein industries have come into an area, taken advantage of concessions granted to them and have then moved out without regard to the unemployment situation created by the removal of their facilities. We hope that under the provisions of the bill, and because of the remarks of the minister, industry will cooperate to the greatest extent and keep itself advised with regard to employment opportunities. As the bill suggests, industry should "discuss with the department the long term plans of the applicant for the recruitment and training of employees in the designated region".

We believe that the amendment we have proposed is in order and should be acceptable to the minister. I see no reason why he should suggest that the amendment would really make two classes of citizens as far as corporations are concerned. I appreciate that this provision concerning employment opportunities should apply to all industry in a growth centre. Industry says it is doing the area a service; at the same time, it is moving in for a specific purpose under the bill and should provide the necessary data to the Department of Manpower and Immigration to ensure that there is available a complete, up-to-date analysis of the employment picture in the area.

I hope the minister will accept the amendment. I do not think it detracts from the bill in any way. It will provide for a much closer working relationship between departments, and the figures made available would enable one to see whether the purpose of the bill is being carried out to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister to accept the amendment.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for only a minute or two on the amendment and to add my voice to that of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) in asking the minister to give the suggestion very careful consideration. As I read the clause with which we are dealing, it provides that as a condition of the incentives to be paid the firm receiving them, the firm has a duty to keep in touch with the department with regard to its labour force, manpower vacancies and requirements. The firm will also have a duty to discuss with the department the long term plans of the applicants for the recruitment and training of employees in the designate region, and to participate in and co-operate with the department in respect of any programs of the department related to employment counselling, placement and manpower adjustment, mobility and training.

All the requirements laid down are to end, according to subclause 2 of clause 13, when the final payment is made in connection with the development incentives. I have studied this clause with my colleagues and do not see why the minister should consider that it would be a discrimination for the law to say that any firm which benefits from the program and obtains the payments provided under the bill has a duty to inform the department and keep in touch with it with respect to the firm's manpower requirements and training, so long as the law is in force.

This law is to remain in force until December 31, 1967. All we are saying to the minister is that the payment of large amounts of money from the public treasury to private firms and investors should require their co-operation in terms of personnel requirements and training. We say that this requirement should continue beyond the time the last payment is made, if that payment occurs before the end of the period during which the law is to remain in force. This seems to me not only a reasonable but a most desirable situation.

One thinks of Canadian Vickers, for example. True enough, Canadian Vickers was not assisted under a scheme such as the one contained in this bill. But that firm was the recipient of a great deal of federal funds because of the work it performed. Then, it

had an agreement with the government—I am speaking from memory, but I think I am right—that for five years certain things were to obtain. On the very day the five-year period elapsed, boom, Canadian Vickers said: No more; we are closing our doors. This happens frequently with private corporations which are functioning for the purpose for which they are in existence, that is, meeting the demands of their shareholders and the profit demands of those participating in them. As sure as we are in this chamber, when the final payment under this incentive program is made to any corporation in that situation, it will say: We will have no more contact with the department.

If the situation warrants it from the point of view of the profitability of the corporation, all the co-operation will end at that point. I do not see why the minister should feel at all hesitant about this amendment. I appeal to him, not in any partisan way but appreciating the genuine concern he has that this measure is to work for the benefit of people in the disadvantaged areas who need help, to accept the amendment. I really do not see why he should hesitate to do so. The suggestion is that the obligation of the corporation under clause 13 shall continue for the life of this law, not merely for the life of the payment of the incentives to the corporation. There is a minute left before ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I invite the minister to rise and say he accepts the amendment. I would very much like to hear him use the remaining minute to say this, rather than speak myself until ten o'clock.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the second amendment, but I have some reservation with regard to the amendment proposed by the committee. This amendment, in French, reads:

[*Translation*]

That the motion be amended by deleting therefrom the word "earlier" and substituting therefor the word "later".

[*English*]

I have no objection to that; it was only a mistake. I regret that I do not have time to deal with the other amendment, because there are only 30 seconds left. It is ten o'clock.

[Mr. Lewis.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

OLD AGE SECURITY—REDUCTION OF GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT UPON RECEIPT OF PENSION BY SPOUSE

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) for asking me to postpone from Monday until this evening my remarks in this regard. The minister is not in the house, but his parliamentary secretary is. I hope he can give what his office described as "a good reply" to my question. I am certain that we are looking forward to this. I apologize if any inconvenience has been caused to the Speaker's office or hon. members because of this postponement. My question of June 4, which I repeat now, was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the government considering amending the old age security legislation to overcome the injustice whereby the old age security supplement is reduced for a complete year if the spouse of the recipient receives the old age pension for even a single month in that calendar year?

• (10:00 p.m.)

The question was prompted by a letter which I received from a constitutent of mine who was docked some $14 from his pension cheque last February because his wife was slated to receive the basic old age security pension this September. It might be well for us to examine the annual income of this family of two elderly citizens from whom $14 was "recovered" last February according to our Canadian laws. Hon. members will suspect that their income was very low or else they would not have been receiving the supplement in the first place. For the benefit of the house and the country I would like to add up the income that this family can expect in 1969. Let us see how very little it really is. Because the basic pension is only $936, the supplement for the 12 months is $17.20 per month, which amounts to $206.40. The basic pension for the wife plus her supplement for four months from September to December amounts to $380.80. The total amounts to $1,523.20. This man is fortunate; he has a small pension which brings him another $694. But the grand total amounts to $2,217.20 on which this family is required to live for one year.

Members of the house will agree with me that this is hardly a princely sum. The fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada described the poverty in our country as appalling and involving millions of people. At page 105 the council, in discussing the inability of statistics to adequately describe the destruction of spirit that accompanies poverty, reported as follows:

> Much more serious and more widespread is the kind of low-income situation that carries with it a sense of entrapment and hopelessness. Even the best statistics can only hint at this. They cannot capture the sour atmosphere of poor health and bad housing—the accumulated defeat, alienation and despair which often so tragically are inherited by the next and succeeding generations.

Here is an example of real poverty right in my own riding, and there are hundreds of others. The Economic Council of Canada report states that any couple receiving less than $2,500 a year is "existing below the poverty line", not living. I submit that even if our current legislation had not docked my constituent $14 per month for 18 months, this couple would still have an annual income of only $2,329.20. This is hardly a magnificent sum on which to live for a year, and I certainly hope that this kind of stingy treatment that we are according to our senior citizens does not stifle their initiative. They are still well below the poverty line of $2,500 per year. If it were not for the meagre pension which this particular man has, I am sure he would be a good deal worse off.

In reply to my question the minister stated that the issue I raise relates to one of a number of "anomalies" in the pension legislation. I say it is not just an anomaly, it is a tragedy which allows citizens of a country as rich as Canada to exist on this kind of income and to take no part in the increased standard of living that is available to other Canadians who are organized and articulate. People like veterans and pensioners are unorganized; there is no one to speak for them; they are mute and inarticulate, and therefore they get the rough end of the stick. As the minister said in reply to me on June 14, the government is looking into a number of anomalies in the legislation. I hope this is so because I have much faith in the minister, and I hope he can convince his leader and his cabinet colleagues that this is an important issue with which they should deal immediately.

While we are speaking of anomalies, let me say that there are a number of others, and in the time remaining I would like to outline at least two of them. Some of these anomalies solve themselves. These old pensioners die. They cannot wait, and this is why the problem needs urgent consideration. The 2 per cent maximum cost of living adjustment on the pension during a period of inflation is a crime. These people are getting behind about 2 per cent per year. They are losing in terms of real income. The situation in which a pensioner's income ceases part way through the year is another anomaly. There is no adjustment possible unless he remarries, which is unlikely, or perhaps retires during that period.

There are a number of things that need to be corrected and I am certain the minister is working on them. I am sure that all members of the house are aware of many anomalies that require urgent attention. The members of this party, and I am sure the members of other parties, are looking forward with great hope to some words from the minister that indicate the government is really serious about solving this completely unnecessary but tragic problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) says, the minister is fully aware of the problems he raises, and he has already stated that there are certain anomalies which have become apparent in the guaranteed income supplement legislation.

One of the areas which the government has under consideration is the situation where the spouse of a recipient receives the old age security pension for only part of a particular year, perhaps for only one month.

A further word of explanation might be in order. If a recipient or his spouse, maybe both of them, has income from other sources, it is correct that he would receive a different rate of supplement in a year in which his spouse was a pensioner from that he received in the previous year when his spouse was not a pensioner at any time.

However, if neither has any income, the rate would not change, since the maximum supplement would be payable in both years. Even where there is outside income, in which case the supplement of a recipient might be lower than in the earlier year, the receipt by the spouse of pension and supplement might mean that their overall income for the year is greater than in the year before. This is not always the case, however, depending on individual circumstances, and it is here that

we have recognized a problem and are attempting to find a satisfactory solution.

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE—PORT DOVER, ONT.—FAILURE OF U.S. PLEASURE CRAFT TO REPORT TO CUSTOMS OFFICER

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed to find that the Minister of National Revenue is not in his seat tonight. We had made a mutual arrangement whereby he would be here to listen to my explanation of this problem and would give me an answer. I trust he will still do so having read my representations as recorded in *Hansard*.

In order to set this problem properly before you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the question that I presented to the house on Monday last, as reported at page 10538:

> In view of the fact that on Saturday last at Port Dover, Ontario, out of seven United States pleasure boats from Erie, Pennsylvania, bringing United States dollars and good will to Canada two were fined $10 and all were ordered to get out of Canada because they had not reported to the customs officer who was not available, will the minister devise some means of clearing our United States visitors through customs on weekends through the three summer months, which is the only time that most of the United States boats can visit Canada?

To give some indication of the importance of this issue, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell you that the port of Port Dover is located on the north shore of Lake Erie midway along the shoreline and in the shelter of Long Point Bay. It is directly across Lake Erie from Erie, Pennsylvania, a distance of approximately 45 miles. The town of Port Dover, approximately 3,000 in population, relies for its summer revenue mainly on the tourist industry.

A rapidly expanding hobby which promotes and supplements the tourist industry is that of pleasure boating. The number of pleasure boats that cruise the shores of Lake Erie and cross the lake is increasing annually. Port Dover has a yacht club boasting a registration of about 250 boats, all capable of crossing the lake so their owners can visit their United States brothers across the way. In the past few years the federal government has spent over $750,000 in providing harbour facilities for commercial and pleasure craft. There are two marinas in the town which are capable of servicing any pleasure craft likely to call in. They are capable of giving it a complete overhaul.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I wish to draw the minister's attention to the brief presented by the town of Port Dover. Time will not permit me to go into very great detail. In order to inform hon. members what was behind all the hubbub and furore among the residents of Port Dover, it might be well if I referred to a letter sent out from the customs office in Hamilton to the Port Dover Yacht Club. The letter first of all sets out the hours during which the customs office will be open, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. from Monday through Friday and from 9 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturday. The letter ends with this sentence: "There will be no service available to small boat operators at Port Dover beyond the hours indicated above."

One cannot blame customs officials too much for this directive. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we need to give local customs officials new directives and instructions. Our local officer ought to be given sufficient discretion to permit him to carry out his duties at the office wisely. Press reports of this unfortunate mishap at Port Dover indicate that the district customs officer said that visitors made no attempt to register when they came to Port Dover. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that this report is entirely at variance with the facts because United States boats endeavoured to clear customs with the assistance of some local yacht owners. Telephone calls were made to the office, but it was closed. Attempts were made to call the official's residence, but I understand that his telephone number is unlisted at the present time. One United States boat owner hired a taxi and was driven to the home of the customs officer, but was given no satisfaction and obtained no clearance. Many reliable witnesses will attest to the accuracy of these facts. If the minister entertains any shadow of doubt about the accuracy of what I have said I invite him to set up an independent inquiry to examine the charges made and ascertain facts. The minister should not rely entirely on the word of supervisors in the immediate area.

The United States boat owners, having failed to obtain clearance, were met at the scene by the R.C.M.P. patrol boat which arrived there a few hours later, as it was its duty to do. Two seizures were made; and not until fines of $10 had been paid were the two boats in question released. One of these boats was, *"The Jed,"* owned by Mr. John Ashby of Erie, Pennsylvania, the other being *"Cloud Nine II"*, owned by Mr. E. H. Sturdevant of

Canfield, Ohio. Five other United States boat in the port at that time were ordered to leave. The owner of one was a United States visitor who had this to say. "I have been coming to Port Dover for 40 years. I was born in Canada and this is the first time I have been asked to leave the country." The incident to which I have referred has damaged good will between our countries and brought disrepute to our tourist industry. Our tourist industry is most important, and if this sort of thing is tolerated efforts at tourist promotion become a mockery.

I do not wish to be entirely critical, Mr. Speaker. I wish to suggest some solutions. As has been suggested in other contexts, the customs officials at Port Dover should be paid sufficient overtime to induce them to work at peak periods during the week end, when the majority of people call in at Port Dover. Let it be worth the while of the customs official to work overtime. Also, give him some leeway and discretion. Perhaps customs clearance might be effected by telephone. Another possible solution would be for an extra man to be taken on for the peak period of three months. Still another solution might be to permit marina operators in the town of Port Dover, willing to undertake those duties, to take necessary information from the visitors and turn it over to the customs officer when he opens his office the next day.

Perhaps the R.C.M.P., who are already on patrol there, might be given the authority to clear these boats. Above all, Mr. Speaker, a directive for the guidance of the officer must be forthcoming from the department. Action must be swift. Phone calls are now being received at Port Dover from United States tourists who are planning to visit there from July 1 to July 4. Phone calls are being received from Erie, Ashtabula, Cleveland and Buffalo, inquiring whether clearance will be given to them at the port of Port Dover. This is an urgent problem and demands urgent action.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to reply to this question by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Coté). The minister's reply is as follows.

In reply to the question raised on June 23 by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), two pleasure craft owned by residents of Pennsylvania were penalized $10 each on Saturday, June 21, by the R.C.M.P. for failure to report at customs although one had been in Port Dover for approximately 22 hours and the second for a period in excess of four hours. The customs officer in charge at Port Dover was available at his residence to accept such reports, if and when requested, a fact which would have been known to the marina operator at which the boats were docked. The owners of the other five pleasure craft referred to left Port Dover without contacting either the R.C.M.P., or the customs officer in charge at Port Dover, so there was no question of their being ordered out of the country.

In so far as the procedure for clearing United States visitors through customs on week ends is concerned, notification was given, under cover of letter dated June 4, 1969, to all boat clubs and marina operators in the area, as well as to other interested organizations at Port Dover and Simcoe, informing all concerned that as of Saturday, June 28, 1969, the Port Dover marina would be serviced by a customs officer from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday and from 9 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturday, until September 6, 1969. At other times, visitors may report to customs by telephoning the customs officer in charge at Port Dover at his residence, or customs officers at Simcoe, details of which, including telephone numbers, are to be posted on the customs office door and at the Port Dover marina.

HARBOURS—TORONTO—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN CONSTRUCTION OF PORT

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on behalf of the city of Toronto. I thank the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) for being here this evening.

The port authority of the city of Toronto has come up with a most imaginative and realistic plan for the development of the whole waterfront. By an inexpensive method they propose to improve the harbour service by sucking sand from the shallow waters of the old inner-harbour and a new outer-harbour and by combining this dredged material with fill from construction sites to add over 1,000 acres to the waterfront. This new land would: add to the Canadian National Exhibition Grounds; greatly increase the recreation area of the islands; provide a site for a harbour city to house about 75,000 people; make possible the modernization of the inner-harbour; create a new outer-harbour which would provide about 400 acres of dockage and give Toronto a new airport to replace the now obsolete island airport.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:20 p.m.)

The plans as worked out between the port authority, the planning departments of the city and the province have won the acceptance and praise of all who have seen them. Because of the excellence of the engineering, the acre cost is low and the whole scheme is economically sound. At present ships cannot use the shallow eastern gap but must detour to the western entrance. The harbour and docking services are inadequate for the immediate future. The sand to be dredged from the west end of the harbour would help create land for the new city and fill the western entrance, thus providing land access to the new city and the recreation islands. The sand dredged from the east end of the inner-harbour, the new eastern ship entrance and the outer-harbour would be used to create the airport.

The eastern headland for the outer-harbour—now almost three miles in length—is being built at a fraction of the cost of standard construction through the utilization of fill and new design. But the Authority has now reached the point where it cannot move ahead efficiently, or much longer at all, until the Department of Transport makes a decision in respect of the dredging for the new harbour entrances, and approves the airport. I ask that the decision be made now so that all of this imaginative and energetic planning is not lost.

On December 19 I spoke opposing the proposed enlargement of the Malton airport on the grounds that it would seriously affect housing and was too expensive, and I suggested that it should be located further away from Toronto or in Lake Ontario which would be convenient, would not require extra highway construction and would not add noise pollution over residential areas. The then minister of transport abandoned the plan for the major enlargement, at great savings to the department and with little loss in total potential.

The need to construct a second major airport was recognized. Since then studies have been going on as to the best location, but the approval of the Toronto harbour airport need not wait until that decision is made. The cost is low and it has sufficient merit to warrant immediate approval.

Originally the Toronto Port Authority proposed an airport on the southwest side of Toronto Island at Gibraltar Point. Understandably there were objections that the flight pattern was too close to the city and to the air approaches to Malton. Since then the authority has changed its plans and it now proposes that the airport be located on the east side of the new outer-harbour, at the east end of Toronto.

They suggest a runway of 7,500 feet with an approach parallel to the shoreline but over the water so as not to interfere with housing, and a second runway of 2,500 feet for STOL aircraft. From my investigation, this site is far enough away to avoid any interference with air space for Malton.

Toronto, or more properly Ontario, does require a second major airport but if the lake port is developed now the second major port could be delayed a little, perhaps until the development of a rapid transit system would make it feasible to locate it further out as part of an over-all complex and on land not required for urbanization. I suggest it is wrong to delay this project for years of research and study, negotiations with provincial and planning authorities, and hearings under the new Expropriation Act. There are compelling reasons for proceeding with this project now. They are:

(1) It is relatively inexpensive. Four hundred and fifty acres could be assembled from reclaiming sand and the utilization of fill at an estimated cost of $10 million, but in any event for less than $25 million. A regular land based airport would cost many times as much.

(2) It would service the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal passengers who make up about 40 per cent of the Malton traffic. It would be a rapid transit by air pending the development of land transit.

(3) It would relieve the traffic at Malton and thus allow that airport to become a trans-continental and inter-continental airport.

(4) It would relieve severe intensification of flights at Malton which would be as undesirable from a standpoint of living conditions as the original proposed addition of runways.

(5) If we count the economy of time for the public and the efficiency of those travelling the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal triangle, it would save millions. The travelling time from downtown hotels would be about seven minutes.

(6) By using computers at various locations in the city, all tied in with a master computer, and the existing rapid transit system or airport buses, people could leave their cars at home and check in at various city locations and step from the bus with their baggage directly to the plane. It is too late to

introduce this concept at Malton but there is no reason why it could not work at Toronto.

(7) By checking in at city locations and taking a bus or a rapid transit we would utilize existing facilities in the city and avoid the cost of substantial airport buildings.

(8) But most important, if the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration, which is now carrying out an intensive study, comes up with a new and relatively inexpensive material for floating airports, another runway could be tied to the existing airport and thus provide substantial enlargement at reasonable cost. Time could demonstrate that it should become the major airport.

(9) Should we decide to proceed with a second major airport at some other site the Toronto airport would still be required for the new STOL planes.

(10) The proposed development would provide Toronto with new assessment in excess of $2 billion.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that seldom has it been possible for so much to be done for a city at so little cost and with so little risk.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has advanced ten most interesting and imaginative ideas with regard to the so-called sandspit airport at Toronto. Each one of them would require far more time than I have on this occasion to deal with all of them, and what I would simply like to say is that the sequence of events over the past few months has been that we originally announced, as a government, plans for the substantial improvement and expansion of Malton.

As a result of representations, some of them I may say most effectively from the hon. member who has just spoken, it was decided to change that decision and proceed with the provision of an alternative site in the Toronto or southern Ontario region. Within this framework we must also consider the matter of a downtown airport for the city of Toronto. It is exceedingly difficult to try to measure the comparative benefits or effects of proceeding now with a most limited kind of airport facility for Toronto. There is no doubt many of the advantages the hon. member has outlined are true. I would have some reservations about the total impact being as great, and would have to say there are difficulties in respect of this project which he has somewhat underestimated.

The fact of the matter is that the area to which the hon. member referred has potential. It will be considered and considered quickly, not over a period of many years, as indeed a possible alternative site for the so-called second airport. It may be that the possible development will take place at that location. But even if that is not to be the case, and there is a second development elsewhere I can assure the hon. member and members of the house that I am quite confident some form of downtown development or an intercity airport will be part of the over-all air policy for southern Ontario. I am delighted the hon. member brought this to my attention and I am most sympathetic to his proposals. I shall be pleased to discuss them with him and with any other member in detail.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 27, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, June 27, 1969

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Gérald Fauteux, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 27th day of June at 12.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant
Louis-Frémont Trudeau
Brigadier General
Assistant Secretary
to the Governor General.

PROCEDURE

NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO MOTION IN NAME OF MINISTER

Mr. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order at this time because this is the proper time to take at least a preliminary objection. It deals with a notice of motion appearing in yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings* standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) for Monday next.

My objection is such that we will be arguing at the appropriate time that this motion should not be put. I must raise the point in a very limited way without in any sense arguing about the merits.

The motion of the President of the Privy Council involves a duplication of the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, for the adoption of a report of the committee. The minister's motion involves two changes, but apart from these changes it is identical to the motion of the hon. member. I wish to mention only one change.

Under the proposed Standing Order 75(b) the majority of the parties may work out the agreement as to the allocation of time. The order proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) provides, "a majority including the government". In other words, there cannot be a majority unless the government is part of that majority.

My objection, Mr. Speaker, is based on the fact that this constitutes anticipation of a motion with which this house is at least partially seized. The report of the committee has been tabled. The motion for concurrence has not been put, but it has been stood on several occasions by the hon. member who is the chairman of the committee.

• (11:10 a.m.)

The motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) will in effect block the hearing of the motion which a committee of this house, through its chairman, has brought before the house, and I submit there are ample precedents to warrant Your Honour's holding that this is improper and should not be done. I will renew my argument before the motion is actually put.

I only add this, Mr. Speaker, that if the government can at any time through a variation of a committee report, by a motion like that of the President of the Privy Council, prevent the discussion of that report, then our so-called committee system will be in a much sorrier state even than it appears to be at present.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I rise merely for the purpose of entering a caveat with respect to this matter. I agree with my colleague that the time to argue it is perhaps on Monday or Wednesday, or whenever the matter comes before the house; but since we are aware of the government notice of motion that is on the order paper I believe we should draw Your Honour's attention to any objections we have at this time.

The hon. member for Peace River has referred to the rule of anticipation. May I just read one paragraph from citation 131 in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which is as follows:

> In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of *anticipation*, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the house within a reasonable time.

There is another paragraph of some length which I need not read at this time. However, I would point out that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) is on the order paper in a place where it can be

called literally any day. So there is no question as to the probability of this matter being brought before the house in that way, if the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization wishes to exercise his right under that motion. Therefore it does seem to me that Your Honour should consider whether the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) does in fact anticipate, or in other words block something that is already on the order paper.

I realize, and I suspect the President of the Privy Council may draw attention to this fact because I notice he was trying to get to his feet, that some of us were not party to the report of the standing committee. We have even had some argument on the floor of the house as to whether it was a report of the majority or a report of the committee. I recognize the rule in this matter, but the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton went to pains yesterday to emphasize that what he had presented was the report of the committee.

Surely at some point a decision has to be made. Are these rule changes that are proposed changes that are in the name of a committee, whether in its totality or majority, or are the changes being made in the name of the government? Later on we will have time to argue as to whether it is proper to change the rules of the house on the initiative of the government, but I think the point has to be made at this moment.

I also draw attention to the same point made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), that if it is the desire of the government to make some amendments or some changes in the rules brought forward by the committee, the government should be required to follow the rules that face all the rest of us, instead of being able to act under some special provision.

All told, Mr. Speaker, we think this is not the manner in which the rules of the house should be dealt with, and while we do not seek a ruling at this point my colleague and I both felt that since the item has just appeared on the order paper we should indicate our objection to the way this matter is being handled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be rather brief, because the two previous speakers have already expressed the opinions that we of the Ralliement créditiste wanted to make known.

The committee report, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, does not constitute an exact report of the proceedings. Standing Order 75c which has been presented at the very last minute by the government does not represent the committee's views. We deplore that this report was included in the Votes and Proceedings No. 175 of last Friday and that we might have to discuss it in a few days if not today.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling was that what we will discuss does not represent the committee's report, especially as far as Standing Order 75c is concerned, but only the government's views.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I shall not go into any detail on the arguments raised, because it was only an instant before the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) rose that he mentioned to me he would be taking this position. If I could, I should like to refer the Chair to the fact that the rule with regard to anticipation refers to actual discussion as opposed to putting the motion. The motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) has not been put and therefore the precedents referred to by the hon. gentleman do not apply. I think we are entitled to be a little amused at the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who earlier this week disavowed the report of the Committee on Procedure, and has now adopted it as being something good.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) knows better than to try to put words into my mouth by suggesting I am adopting the committee's report. He knows very well I am against the motion to adopt it hook, line and sinker, but I insist that the government must make clear whether it is trying to give this to us as a committee report or as a government motion, with all that goes with that situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether we are not debating the matter at the present time. I understand that hon. members are just entering a caveat that they propose to raise this matter next week or the following week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The caveat has been entered and noted.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Twenty-fifth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, in French and in English—Mr. Clermont.

Twelfth report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, in French and in English.—Mr. Isabelle.

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

TRADE

REPORT BY MINISTER ON JOINT CANADA-U.S. MEETING IN WASHINGTON—TABLING OF COMMUNIQUÉ

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to report briefly on the twelfth meeting of the Canada-United States Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs which was held in Washington on June 25 and 26. This was the first meeting of the committee since the assumption of office by the present Canadian ministry and the administration of President Nixon. My colleagues and I welcome this first opportunity to discuss with our United States counterparts a wide range of problems, both bilateral and multilateral, of great importance to our two countries. As is customary on these occasions, the committee reviewed the international political and economic situation and addressed itself to a number of specific issues of current concern.

I should like to table the communiqué issued by the committee at the end of the meeting yesterday. This communiqué gives a fairly full account of the discussions and I should like at this time merely to draw the attention of house members to certain highlights of the meeting. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the discussions were wide ranging and, in my view, both constructive and businesslike, exemplifying the community of interest and the friendliness which characterize our relations with the United States. These discussions should be regarded as part of a continuous process of consultation through which our two governments inform each other of their views and interests, and make appropriate adjustments in their policies. The communiqué refers specifically to a number of issues on which understandings were reached and arrangements for follow-up action was taken.

• (11:20 a.m.)

I will, for the moment, restrict myself to the discussions on international wheat marketing, during which the two delegations expressed their concern at developments which are placing serious pressure on the price provisions of the International Grains Arrangement, and expressed their readiness to consult with other governments on measures to restore stability in the world grains market. I would hope that it will be possible for the wheat exporting countries to meet very soon to discuss these important issues.

There was also a good discussion on energy relations between Canada and the United States, and it was agreed that current difficulties with respect to the level of our oil exports to the United States should be the subject of further consultation which I expect to start in Washington on Monday.

Attention was also directed to the problems of inflation in Canada and the United States, and to the appropriate policies to be pursued in this situation, and to a variety of individual trade and economic problems. It is worth mentioning, in particular, the agreement that was reached to achieve an early understanding on methods for dealing with problems which may arise in cross-border trade in certain agricultural products; the agreement to negotiate on the delineation of United States-Canadian continental shelf boundaries and the agreement to explore the resolution of problems which have arisen from the imposition in 1968 of a numerical limitation on western hemisphere immigration into the United States.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this was one of the most substantial and productive meetings of the joint committee which it has been my privilege to attend, and I think it augurs well for our future relations with our great neighbour to the south.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments about the minister's statement and I will try to be brief.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Go easy on him. He is more to be pitied.

Mr. Stanfield: I think we must, of course, all approve of these meetings as institutions, and certainly they ought to be useful because they do provide an opportunity for Canadian ministers and their counterparts in the United

States to discuss problems of mutual concern. That is the kind of discussion that in itself certainly ought to be useful.

It is really quite difficult to tell from the communiqué or from what the minister has said what real progress had been made toward the solution of the matters that were discussed. For example, the annex refers to the position of the United States, that the world payments equilibrium would require the United States to rebuild a substantial surplus concurrent account, and that this would entail adjustments in the pattern of world payments.

This is a very obscure statement that might very well give some cause for alarm, if anybody could figure out exactly what it means; but clearly all the annex does is indicate substantial conflict of position as between the United States and the world at large, including Canada, in this regard.

Canada's statement of its position as to its long term objective of greater balance in its over-all current account, which would reduce Canada's dependance on net inflows of capital, indicates nothing at all as to what progress if any was made to reconcile these apparently very conflicting positions.

They apparently talked about the operation of the international monetary system and the annex is very obscure with regard to this. It is not clear, for example, whether the ministers representing the two countries are happy with the arrangements that have been made to provide for stability, such as special drawing rights, or whether in fact there is concern as to what is likely to develop, and whether the ministers from the two countries formulated any approach to these problems.

The United States members apparently noted with satisfaction the fact that Canada has accelerated its Kennedy Round tariff reductions by putting them into effect immediately, and that Canada is liberalizing its tourist allowances. The United States should note that with satisfaction.

With regard to some matters of very intense concern to Canadians at the present time, there is very little that is of a concrete nature. The ministerial committee apparently reviewed the grain situation and "the two governments agreed to co-ordinate their efforts to reduce distortions and impediments to agricultural trade." But not the slightest indication is given as to the mechanics of this co-ordination or what specific measures the two countries propose to take in concert to achieve this end. For example, what is the attitude of the two countries with regard to the suggestion made that the governing body of the world wheat agreement may propose a reduction in grain prices? In other words, judging from the communiqué and the annex, the ministers may have made some progress or they may have made very little. I believe the people of this country are entitled to know precisely what mechanics will be employed to follow up this general statement which may be no more than a pious hope of the efforts of the two countries to reduce distortions and impediments in this area.

There are references to underdeveloped countries; there is reference to cross-border trade in respect of certain agricultural commodities; there is talk about early consultations. But again, these mean nothing unless, in fact, arrangements have been made for the establishment of machinery to deal with the problems. There is nothing in the communiqué or the minister's statement which gives the people of this country any means of judging whether they are simply pious statements or whether, in fact, a foundation has been reached for some action.

With regard to the comment on energy resources, oil and other things, as far as the communiqué is concerned it adds nothing to the information we already have. However, I understood the minister to say that he proposes to take some initiative himself in this regard, commencing on Monday. As I understood him this morning, he said he would open discussions on Monday next with authorities of the United States regarding oil arrangement. I hope the minister will correct me if I am wrong. This provides one concrete bit of information that is not contained in the communiqué.

There is reference to the law of the sea having been discussed, but there is no indication whether any of the conflicting opinions between the two countries have been resolved in any way. Again, there is pious statement about seeking solutions to water and air pollution problems along our common frontier. However, there is no indication at all whether this is simply a pious statement or, in fact, concrete measures were discussed with a view to solving the problems.

This kind of meeting is useful; but surely, if we are to have effective participatory democracy we must have more solid information than the minister has given us. Surely parliament and the country are entitled to some frankness as to what differences of opinion there were and what real progress was made with regard to reaching solutions. We are entitled to statements going beyond

pious or general declarations of intention. I admit that the minister was restrained in his report; he did not tell us what the weather was like down there. But a good deal of the report he made is about as interesting and illuminating as the discussions that take place in connection with slides that acquaintances sometimes invite us to watch in their basements, after their return from a trip abroad.

• (11:30 a.m.)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the communiqué he has just tabled—I thank him for sending us a copy of it—gives a full account of the discussions which took place at Canada-United States ministerial meeting in Washington this week. This seems to me a very generous interpretation of the term "full account". As a matter of fact, there is a report from Washington in this morning's *Globe and Mail* under the by-line of David Crane which contains a great deal more information than the communiqué the Minister has tabled. It seems to me passing strange that parliament is always the last to know what is going on and that the press seem to be able to get a great deal more information about these conferences than the members of parliament are able to secure from ministers of the Crown. We do not expect the minister to tell the house what position the United States representatives took at these discussions—that, of course, is confidential—but certainly the house is entitled to know the position which the Canadian representatives took at this meeting, and there is no indication in this communiqué or in the statement made by the minister of the position which the Canadian government took with respect to any of the matters outlined in this communiqué.

The minister says, for instance, that discussions were held regarding the International Grains Arrangement. The minister says that it is hoped there will be a meeting of the countries involved. But there has been a meeting this week in London of the exporting nations to discuss the matter of prices. What position did the Canadian representatives take at the Washington meeting this week? Did they secure any assurance from the United States government that the United States would not continue to sell below the floor price of the I.G.A.? Was any such assurance asked for and was any given? The minister surely is obliged to tell the house whether or not Canada has agreed *sub rosa* to some reduction in the floor price under the I.G.A.

The communiqué says that the Canadian representatives were concerned that we should reduce Canada's dependence on the net inflows of capital, but we are not told whether the Canadian government proposes to take any steps or proposed any steps at this conference for the reduction of the net capital inflow, and we are still waiting for a statement from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) as to what steps the government proposes to take about the takeover of Canadian financial institutions, which would be one way of dealing with this problem of the net inflow of capital.

There is no statement in the communiqué as to what the government's proposals were at this conference with respect to the oil policy. Is the objective of the Canadian government to reduce the deficit which we have in our oil dealings with the United States? Is the position of the Canadian government that we should endeavour to make greater use of our own oil resources and supply our own market for oil to a greater extent than we are now doing, and were discussions held with the United States representatives to this effect?

We have no information in this communiqué as to what the discussions were about the Canada-United States auto pact. The report from Washington to which I referred earlier says that the Canadian government wants to include the parts industry. Surely if that can be told to a press man in Washington it could at least have been conveyed to the House of Commons. Is that the government's position? Did the government make any representations regarding the very wide disparity in the price of cars sold in Canada and the price of cars sold in the United States, a disparity which the auto pact was designed to remove? What progress was made in this regard?

Mention has been made of the fact that the government discussed the possible reduction in the distortions and impediments to agricultural trade. What particular agricultural commodity does the government have in mind? What was the nature of these discussions. Surely ministers who have gone to attend a very important conference owe this House of Commons much more explicit information and a clear statement as to what the government policies are and what proposals the Canadian representatives put forth at that conference.

We are told, for instance, that the United States representatives were pleased that

Canada has reduced its tariffs under the Kennedy round. Did the Canadian government representatives ask for any *quid pro quo*? Is the United States prepared to make commensurate reductions in their tariffs to meet the reductions which the Canadians made? On the contrary, this communiqué points out that the Americans now are hinting to the Canadian government that they propose to take some action to stop the volume of textiles which are entering the United States market. About this the communiqué says absolutely nothing.

I hope that when we get statements from the government in the future they will give us some information, rather than reading like a telephone directory that has been sent over from Washington.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) who had the text of the communiqué delivered to us in good time and in good French, although there are some sentences that we cannot easily understand since the communiqué itself is very short and—

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is the same in English.

Mr. Rondeau: Yes, it is the same in English, and we are not told much.

The purpose of that meeting was mainly to find new trade opportunities between the countries concerned and to develop world trade. We trust that the ministers have made arrangements that will be profitable to Canada, although this morning's communiqué does not provide us with clear and precise information as to the future of our international trade.

We are rather inclined to believe that the meetings held recently, mention of which is made in the press release, were mainly attempting to adjust the Canadian economy according to the wishes of the United States. In my opinion, this communiqué outlines the problems of Canada-United States trade as well as world trade but suggests no solution.

On page 2 of the release, paragraph 5 deals among other matters with a question not pertaining to international trade but which was studied by this committee, namely inflation. It concerns everybody, I agree, but it is a Canadian problem which we could solve without taking into consideration what the other countries we are dealing with do or think. Here is what is said:

> The Committee agreed that inflation and the need to cool their overheated economies were serious problems facing both countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a hope is expressed. No reference is made to a solution to the problem of inflation, but the fact is deplored that Canada and other countries are experiencing inflation and that they must act so as to cool their overheated economies.

Mr. Speaker, over heated economies are like an overheated soup which sticks to the pan and has a burnt smell. The communiqué did not offer any unusual solution to the problem of trade with other countries.

The Governor of the Bank of Canada, who has just authorized the Bank of Canada to increase interest rates in the country,—one of the main causes of inflation—was one of those who believed that Canada was faced with inflation. On the other hand, he did not say to the trade committee which met in Washington to study our inflationary problems, that he would take measures to lower our interest rate.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that we must look into our world trade problems, and from inside the country first. If we are unable to cope with our economic and commercial problems, how can we send a Canadian delegation to Washington or elsewhere with proposals and suggestions to solve trade problems throughout the world?

I am all for giving suggestions to other countries, but the best thing for Canada to do would be to show them the way by a fine management of her own trade affairs. Then, we could say: This is what we have done at home. Here are the solutions we have decided upon, and followed, and here are the results.

Mr. Speaker, we have considered those problems, and now this morning, a statement is made which offers no solution insofar as the future of our trade is concerned.

• (11:40 a.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we resume the business of the house I feel it is my duty to remind hon. members once again of Standing Order 15(3) which specifies that—

> —a Minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy. Any such announcement or statement should be limited to facts which it is deemed necessary to make known to the house and should not be

designed to provoke debate at this stage. A spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government may comment briefly, subject to the same limitation.

I have said before that brevity is a relative term but if I am to judge by the length of the statements made in recent days and weeks by spokesmen on behalf of the opposition, their standards are rather different from mine. I would remind hon. members that these statements should be limited, and ask them to accept the spirit of this standing order. When, as happened today, a statement lasting three minutes is followed by more than 20 minutes of comments on behalf of the opposition—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What about yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: —I suggest there is perhaps a situation which we might look into and try to correct. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Center points to the fact that the ministerial statement was long, and I appreciate this; I felt as unhappy yesterday as I do today. The rule is applicable to both sides of the house and hon. members will recognize it is my duty from time to time to bring it to the attention of the house. Perhaps we might all give it some thought during the summer months.

Mr. Stanfield: I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will meet with your wishes in accordance with your interpretation of the rules of the house. I will simply say that it will assist us quite a bit if the minister's statement did contain facts.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I can assure Your Honour that we shall endeavour at all times to comply with your wishes. May I take the liberty of pointing out that while the statement itself took only three minutes to make, the minister was referring to a communiqué which is three pages in length and which contains in addition an annex in which are included some 13 items? When a communiqué of that length is tabled it is very difficult to make a comment about it in two or three minutes. Though the statement itself was brief, the communiqué was an extended document.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

COMMENT ON MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order:

June 20, 1969—Mr. Blair (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization):

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Dropped.

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: The item stands.

INVESTMENT COMPANIES ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING SUPERVISION, CERTIFICATES OF REGISTRY, AND OTHER MATTERS

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved the first reading of Bill S-17 (from the Senate) respecting investment companies.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TRADE

WHEAT—CANADIAN-U.S. PRICING POSITIONS AT WASHINGTON MEETING—RENEGOTIATION OF DIFFERENTIALS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether he will disclose the position the Government of Canada has taken with regard to suggestions being considered by the International Wheat Council in London to fix a new and lower minimum price for wheat on the ground that a world surplus exists.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Did I hear well? I am very surprised that the Wheat Council suggests this should be done. That is not the information I have.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister say whether the ministers in Washington took a definite position with regard to this matter? Will he tell us whether the government is insisting on the maintenance of the present position, and whether Canadian ministers solicited and obtained the support of United States ministers with regard to this?

Mr. Pepin: Reference was made this morning to the communiqué. I might say there is a fine art of reading a communiqué, also. Everything is quite clear. "The committee expressed concern about current developments"—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pepin: The hon. member for Crowfoot may want to send me back to the university to teach. Maybe he should go, too. The communiqué refers to "serious pressure" it refers to "the need to consult bilaterally with governments of other countries", "in order to bring about stability in world markets". This morning the Secretary of State for External Affairs expressed the hope that a meeting of exporters at ministerial level would be held very soon—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister is now making a speech.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not think I need any lectures from the minister, although I appreciate—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I will just ask him a direct question, one which, having spent many years in a university, I am sure he is fully qualified to understand, if he brings his mind to bear on it. Will he answer the question I asked and tell me whether Canada took the position at Washington that the present prices should be maintained? Will he tell us whether Canada solicited and received agreement of the ministers at Washington that this would be their position? If the minister is not prepared to answer this question I can only assume he wishes to evade it.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Pepin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman gave us a lecture lasting 15 minutes this morning on communiqué drafting; I am giving him one now on communiqué reading.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We do not appear to be making much progress.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wonder whether the minister will get down from his throne, cease this studied insolence to parliament, and answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest the right hon. gentleman is not helping the situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am asking the minister to straighten up the record and make a statement of fact. Did the Canadian government make strong representations to the United States ministers against the United States policy of underselling wheat below the price set by the international agreement? What was said by the Canadian representatives in this connection? What undertaking did the United States give that the course of action it is following which is detrimental to Canadian wheat producers is going to be stopped?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, many exporters are selling below the set price at this time.

Some hon. Members: Answer the question.

Mr. Pepin: That is done by all exporters.

Some hon. Members: Answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister might be allowed to reply to the question.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, hon. members no doubt are aware that on March 14 I said in this house that we would be becoming fully competitive.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But the government has done nothing since that time.

Mr. Pepin: We have become competitive at the highest possible level. We have become competitive with some exporting countries, although France undersells everybody. Ours is a responsible attitude to take and at Washington we were strong advocates of price stability and pointed out that the downward movement of grain at this time is not in Canada's best interest, and is not in the interest of the world. We strongly supported the idea that there should be more co-ordination and co-operation between exporters if we are to prevent a disastrous downward price movement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have finally smoked out an answer, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister now say what attitude the United States representatives took, or was their attitude such that the minister prefers to keep it confidential?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be kept confidential. The people down there are very intelligent, they speak well and are quite capable of speaking for themselves. The right hon. gentleman asked me what the position of the Canadian government was in these matters. Our position was that everything should be done to prevent prices from going down. We are trying to build co-operation between exporters. Some of them have not been as co-operative as others in recent weeks and we are trying hard now to rally the troops.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Did Canada during the discussions bring in proposals with regard to renegotiating price differentials as they presently exist between the different qualities of wheat in the different countries?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, we did not discuss this in detail because we had more urgent matters to discuss.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister had more urgent matters to discuss, and so many bushels of Canadian wheat lie piled up on the prairies.

Mr. Pepin: I am afraid the understanding of the hon. member for Prince Albert is incorrect. We had more urgent matters to discuss in the sense that we wanted to bring about, first of all, co-operation. What needs to be done later will be done later.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: That is a very nice statement. Brilliant.

Mr. Gleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect to obtaining co-operation, did the Canadian delegation succeed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I invite hon. members to allow the Chair and other hon. members to hear the question the hon. member is trying to put.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, did the Canadian delegation succeed in obtaining the co-operation of the United States authorities to the extent that a useful approach will be made toward negotiations going on in London under the auspices of the International Wheat Council? Are those negotiations being conducted with a view to stabilizing prices under the International Grains Arrangement?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs expressed the hope that such a development would take place. Knowing how well informed he is, I have every reason to believe that his hopes will be met.

Mr. Baldwin: That is not what happened in Stockholm.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. So that there is no misunderstanding, are we correct in assuming that although the ministers of the two governments agreed to continue discussions, there was in fact no agreement as to the prices at which these grains would be maintained?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the agreement was that they would be maintained at the highest possible price.

GRAIN

WHEAT—BOX CAR SHORTAGE—REQUEST FOR EXTENDED GRAIN YEAR

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is more or less a related question and arises from the statement made by the minister about the position of present producers. Because of the present box car shortage and in view of climatic and other circumstances which prevented grain deliveries this spring, will the minister authorize an extension of the current grain year until such time as all delivery points are at least on a five bushel quota. This matter has been raised in this house time and time again, Mr. Speaker. I therefore ask whether the minister will assure grain producers that time for the five bushel delivery will be allowed before the cut off date is enforced by the Canadian Wheat Board?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we have recently consulted the Wheat Board on that situation. The quota situation has been improving steadily in recent days and I think the latest figures will indicate to my hon. friend how close we are getting in most instances to the five bushel quota level.

Mr. McIntosh: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister to disregard the figures he has alluded to and obtain information from members representing grain growing constituencies. He can learn accurate figures that way. He will also learn that it is almost impossible at present for Canadian Pacific and Canadian National to bring box cars into certain areas in order to take out the wheat the minister has promised will be taken out. Some areas have delivered one bushel less than their quota, in fact. If the goals that have been set are to be realized something must be done right away. Will the minister look into the situation and see what can be done.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FINANCE

WASHINGTON MINISTERIAL MEETING—REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON OUTFLOW OF CANADIAN CAPITAL—TAKEOVERS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the statement that Canadian representatives at the ministrial conference were concerned about reducing Canada's dependence on net inflows of capital, may I ask whether the minister has any proposals to make or any statement to give to the Parliament of Canada about the outflow of Canadian capital? I ask this question because hundreds of millions of dollars of Canadian capital is flowing to the United States for purchase of equities. Did the minister make any proposals at the conference about reducing the net inflow of capital? Were any proposals made with regard to restrictions in outflows of Canadian capital? If so, what were the proposals?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the outflow of Canadian capital for the purchase of United States equities is, of course, a matter that has to be decided by individual Canadian investors. This matter is not under the control of the Canadian government or the United States government. On the matter of capital inflow, I indicated that it was our intention to balance our current account, or do better than that in the long run, in order that we might depend less on foreign capital.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since takeovers of Canadian financial institutions result in increased outflows of Canadian capital, particularly from pension funds and insurance funds, will the minister be ready in a day or two to make his long promised statement on the action the government of Canada proposed to take with respect to the takeover of Canadian financial institutions and investment houses?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I think the assumption my hon. friend made at the beginning of his question is wrong. As to the second part of his question, I hope to be making my statement on Monday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance.

We have been informed that the Placements collectifs du Québec would be sold in the near future. Can the minister assure the house that this important financial institution will not be sold to American interests?

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of such proposals.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

APPLICATION OF POLICY TO WESTERN FARMERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

As several newspapers have announced that the government was seriously considering granting an acreage subsidy to western farmers, could the minister tell us whether this is a new policy or whether the government is seriously thinking of confirming the statement to the effect that subsidies would be granted to western farmers so that they refrain from sowing in order to avoid producing a surplus of grain?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): That question is really too complex, Mr. Speaker, for a brief reply, but the Minister of Agriculture has repeatedly stated that the income situation of western farmers is now being reviewed by the government.

[*English*]

OIL

WASHINGTON MINISTERIAL MEETING—U.S. INTAKE FROM CANADA—SECRET AGREEMENT—ALTERNATIVE SUPPLIES

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his capacity as head of the Canadian delegation that has been conferring in Washington. In view of the statement of the Secretary of the Interior of the United States that that country could absorb 500,000 more barrels a day of Canadian oil in addition to the 300,000 barrels which the secret agreement of 1967 permits Canada to export to the United States, did the United States ministers indicate a willingness to increase steadily the intake of Canadian oil so that the upper limit of 800,000 barrels a day can be achieved in the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, what the members of the United States administration indicated to us is what the hon. gentleman

already knows, that the whole subject of oil import policy and oil policy in the United States is under study by a task force appointed by the President of the United States. Until that task force reports, the United States government does not have a view.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did they indicate when this task force is liable to report so that we can get on with the job?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. They expect it will be in the reasonably near future. They have welcomed any contribution we can make to the study.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Did the Canadian ministers express a Canadian oil policy? Did the Canadian ministers put forward to the ministers in Washington Canadian objectives with regard to the export of oil and gas?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We supported the general policies that the deskmate of the present Leader of the Opposition espoused. We continue to follow a national oil policy designed to maximize the output of oil and to maximize our exports to the United States.

Mr. Stanfield: Did the Canadian ministers put forward a specific policy or did they simply talk in terms of maximizing exports and the sort of general objective the minister is talking about?

Mr. Sharp: I do not know anything more important than to maximize the exports of Canadian oil. I hope my hon. friend will agree with this. It is a desirable objective.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In view of the answers of the minister to the Leader of the Opposition, I wonder whether I may put a question? I refer to paragraph 10 of the communiqué which was filed this morning. The last sentence of the paragraph reads as follows:

> In this connection, the United States members described the intensive review being undertaken of United States oil import policies.

It does not refer to any intensive research or study of Canada. I think it is time we had an answer to this question. Will the minister now confirm or deny whether there is a secret agreement between the United States and Canada which has been made by the government since the secret agreement of 1967?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have arrangements with the United States which are designed to result in the largest flow of oil across the Canada-United States border that is possible. The hon. member is perfectly aware of this. It is desirable to promote this objective with the maximum agreement from the United States. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Woolliams: May I put one supplementary question? Will the minister answer the question whether there is now a secret agreement between Canada and the United States which was completed since 1967? If the minister fails to answer, the answer must be in the affirmative.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is an open border between Canada and the United States with respect to oil. That is the objective of the Canadian government, to maintain an open border. If the hon. member wants to have that border closed, he can go on talking as he is talking now.

Mr. Woolliams: On a question of privilege, the minister knows I have never suggested that the border be closed when speaking for that industry in western Canada or any other industry. If the minister was not guilty of so much verbicide and always being so decisive in everything he says, he would be able to give me some of this information.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): A supplementary question with regard to the discussions on oil policy. When these discussions took place, did the minister clearly indicate that Canada had other alternatives failing the admission of additional oil to the United States, such as a pipeline to Montreal?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the United States government knows and we have discussed with them on many occasions that there are alternatives available. It is our view, however, and I hope the hon. gentleman agrees, that the alternative we should choose is the one that results in the maximum output of oil from western Canada.

Mr. Saltsman: Did the minister make very clear during these discussions that the Canadian government was prepared to go to these alternatives failing access to the United States market?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, if by chance, and I hope this will not happen as a result of some of the irresponsible statements being

made here today, that happens with the United States market, then we will have no alternative. I hope these alternatives can be discussed in an open and responsible way, and that is what I urge upon the house.

Mr. Stanfield: I hope the type of answers given by the two ministers who reported this morning does not reflect that the ministers had a very bad time.

Mr. Sharp: I hope the Leader of the Opposition, when he makes comments upon these discussions, will realize that if we are going to make progress with our friends we do not reveal in an open session matters which they discussed with us confidentially.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—PERMISSION FOR DAYLIGHT FLIGHTS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the light of the renewed threat of mass starvation in Biafra, will the government accept the proposal made by Canairelief and use its good offices with the federal government of Nigeria to get it to accept or permit daylight flights into Uli airport?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had representations from this organization which I intend to reply to shortly. I just received a telegram. I can assure the hon. member that we have been trying for months to get daylight flights accepted. The preliminary response from Colonel Ojukwu indicates that daylight flights are available with certain conditions. Whether these conditions are acceptable to the Nigerian authorities, we are not sure.

BIAFRA—CANADA-U.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING —TRANSPORT BY SURFACE CORRIDOR

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): During the minister's discussions in Washington, did he discuss with the Secretary of State of the United States what action Canada can take to assist in the United States plan for transporting relief by surface corridor as agreed to by Biafra and as suggested by the United States?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this was not a specific subject of discussion at our meetings. I did have an opportunity of talking to the United States Secretary of State on this subject. Moreover, we have been in constant touch through diplomatic means in support of this initiative of the United States.

FINANCE

KENNEDY ROUND—AGREEMENT BY U.S. TO TARIFF REDUCTIONS—BENEFIT TO CONSUMERS

Mr. J. G. Lind (Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the Minister of Finance. Is the United States government agreeable to reducing its tariffs on our products in the same proportion as we have done in the Kennedy round of tariff reductions, as announced in the recent budget?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the matter of a reduction of our tariffs by an average of three percentage points on some $2 billion worth of exports was designed for purely Canadian purposes and we sought no *quid pro quo*. It was designed to help in the fight against inflation in this country. However, I did stress in Washington that we in the Canadian government looked forward to further major negotiations with regard to reduction of non-tariff barriers as well as tariffs in the future.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has made it very clear that machinery cannot be introduced to require importers to pass on these tariff reductions to consumers, would the minister not agree that his move has been a complete failure?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's statement that the 3 per cent reduction in Canadian tariffs was to fight inflation, and in view of the fact that the Americans are also concerned about that problem, did the Canadian government seek any *quid pro quo* from the United States government prior to the minister making the announcement in his budget speech that Canada would reduce tariffs by 3 per cent?

Mr. Benson: No, I did not discuss with the American authorities or with anyone else the decision of the Canadian government to take action to fight inflation in this way.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-V.S. MINISTERIAL MEETING—DISCUSSION OF INTEREST RATES AND INFLATION

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Finance. Following the meeting with the United States authorities, does he maintain that it would be possible to find some solutions to the problems of interest rates and inflation, in a tangible way, in the near future?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, at the meeting I was very impressed with the determination of the secretaries present representing the United States government to tackle this problem with all the effort they could put forth, and they in turn congratulated the Canadian government for the work we had already done in this direction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

CASHING OF OUT-OF-TOWN CHEQUES WITHOUT BANK EXCHANGE CHARGE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the great profits that Canadian banks are making and in view of the fact that about 95 per cent of United States banks cash all out-of-town cheques at par, would the minister appeal and recommend to the Canadian Bankers Association that all out-of-town cheques be cashed by Canadian banks without bank exchange being charged?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring the hon. member's representation to the attention of the Governor of the Bank of Canada. I think that the benefit of cashing all out-of-town cheques in the United States in the way he has described is offset at least to some degree by the requirement of maintaining balances.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR CONSENSUS BEFORE ACTION ON POLICY STATEMENT—FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In the light of the very grave concern expressed by a number of representatives of the Indian people with regard to the policy announcement he made in the house the other day will he give a firm assurance to the house and to the country that no steps will be taken until there has been the fullest consultation with the authorized and responsible representatives of the Indian people and, hopefully, a consensus reached?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give that assurance to the hon. member.

Yesterday afternoon, I spent two hours with some of the leaders of the Canadian Indian Fraternity and we reached an agreement. It is obvious that we will have consultations at the national and regional level in the future, and I am convinced that the Indians will understand that this policy is meant to offer them greater participation in Canadian society.

[*English*]

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In light of the clear request by the Indian people for the right to conduct their own consultations, will the minister say whether he intends to have money made available to the National Indian Council on Indian Rights and Treaties in order that they may carry out their own responsibilities in a way that will ensure the Indian people a greater sense of participation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we have been having consultations for a year now and we intend to continue having them in the future.

As for the committee mentioned by the hon. member, I can say it will work in cooperation with the new claims commissioner who should soon be appointed. He will be authorized to provide the committee with funds to pursue its work.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—DISCUSSION WITH TRADE UNIONS ON PACT EXTENSION—DISPARITY IN PRICES

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

The communiqué tabled today made reference to the efforts that are being made to extend the automotive pact to related industry which would include special replacement parts, special vehicles, tires and tubes. Have the Canadian unions which would be directly affected by such an extension been consulted on it?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my department has conducted a series of consultations on these matters with both sides of industry. My officials have accumulated knowledge on this subject which will be taken into consideration in assessing the kind of broadening of the agreement we will be seeking.

Mr. Broadbent: In order that I may be clear on this, Mr. Speaker, did I understand the minister to say that the specific proposals which the Canadian government is making were discussed with the Canadian trade unions affected?

Mr. Pepin: I will check to see if this has been done as formally as the hon. member is indicating, but I know there was consultation with the labour as well as the employer side of industry. I have taken part in such consultations myself on some occasions.

Mr. Broadbent: As a further supplementary question, if the minister should discover that these specific proposals have not been discussed with the trade unions will he assure the house that they will be?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think the question is hypothetical.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether there were any discussions regarding the disparity between Canada and the United States in consumer prices for cars, and did the Canadian government make any proposals on how to bring about greater uniformity in prices on both sides of the border, in view of the fact that the auto companies may now move goods across the border without paying any duty?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that the idea of reducing that disparity is one of the objectives of the Canadian government, but in answer to written and oral questions I have also indicated that this is only one of many factors that have to be borne in mind in making discussions on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, just to come back to the previous question asked by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, consultation on these matters cannot come to a conclusion with everybody in total agreement. I recall that some people who were opposed to the automobile agreement in the first place are now exporting 60 per cent to 65 per cent of their production to the United States.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the minister says that uniformity of consumer prices of cars was one of the objectives of the agreement? Since this objective has certainly not been reached, has the minister set any tentative date when he hopes to reach this objective?

Mr. Pepin: It has not been reached but the disparity has been regularly reduced.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FREEZE IN TRACKER AIRCRAFT OVERHAUL

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for whichever minister is in the house today answering on behalf of the Minister of National Defence, who was slated to be here, or in his absence whichever minister is supposed to answer for the Minister of Supply and Services, who was also slated to be here today, and is not. In light of the assurances given to the house less than a week ago by the Minister of National Defence that there would be no significant cut-backs in spending within maritime command without prior notice and consultation with the communities involved, can the minister answering today explain to the house and to the people of Dartmouth why there has been a freeze imposed on the Tracker aircraft overhaul and repair program?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring the hon. member's question to the attention of the Minister of Supply and Services.

Mr. Forrestall: When the minister is doing that will he bring to the attention of his other colleagues in the cabinet the fact that a very grave disservice was done to the house, in the light of the minister's assurance that there would be no cut-backs and the fact that cut-backs of a significant nature have followed within three or four days of the minister's announcement?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the ministers will read the hon. member's comment with interest.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM VENEZUELA

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of a distinguished delegation from Venezuela led by the Minister of Mines, His Excellency Mr. Perez La Salvia. I should like to welcome these gentlemen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

TRANSPORT

BORDEN-TORMENTINE FERRY—SERVICE BELOW CAPACITY

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I know he has had to leave the house to meet a commitment elsewhere, so I shall direct the question to the Minister of Agriculture in his capacity as acting Minister of Transport in the hope that he will be kind enough to take it as notice so that an answer may be given on Monday. Is Canadian National Railways at the present time operating the ships on the Borden-Tormentine service at less than capacity as a result of crew reductions that make it impossible for them to comply with steamship inspection regulations, especially with regard to the manning of lifeboats? If this situation exists, can the minister say when it will be rectified?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Bell: You are not even supposed to be here.

WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ACTION TO PREVENT POLLUTION

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the fact that weeks ago the minister promised a statement to the house on the pollution problem in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, and in view of the fact that in today's *Globe and Mail* there is a report that the Erco plant is expected to announce today the date of re-opening of the plant, when may the house expect a statement on the serious problem of pollution and whether steps will be taken to ensure that adequate protection is afforded to the fishing industry in that area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the fishermen are catching more top quality fish in Placentia Bay than ever before. The plant will only open on a schedule which is satisfactory to the government.

COWICHAN BAY, B.C.—PROTECTION FROM INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry whether his department has any information that large-scale industrial activity is expected in Cowichan Bay near the mouth of the Cowichan River which as the minister knows, is one of the largest salmon spawning grounds in British Columbia? Are these reports correct and, if so, is the department taking protective measures against the possible dangers to the fishing industry in that area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we are looking carefully into the matter, but I would be surprised if the reports are correct.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of what has happened at Placentia Bay, would the minister assure the house that steps will be taken to ensure that the toxic material is taken out of the effluent so that the fish will not be killed?

AGRICULTURE

ACTION TO CURB LOW PRICED U.S. IMPORTS

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Finance. It deals with his statement concerning the 3 per cent general tariff reduction which was discussed with the United States representatives. Would the minister state whether any agreement was reached in respect of the establishment of a practical method of quickly curbing imports from that country if they are found to be creating a great hardship on any segment of Canadian industry or are having an effect on the cost of living and are encouraging inflation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the matter of disruption of certain Canadian producers applies particularly

to agriculture. In our discussions with the United States authorities we considered specific actions which might be taken at particular times if our agricultural production would be drastically upset as a result of large imports. We have taken action in this regard from time to time, although it is not the type of action one likes to take, by establishing values for duty, as we did in respect of potatoes some time ago.

NATIONAL CAPITAL

POLLUTION OF AREA WATERWAYS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of resources. It relates to a situation I mentioned on Monday concerning pollution in the Rideau River and Nepean Creek and arises from a statement attributed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Has the government undertaken to give federal assistance to clear up this situation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. I have not seen the statement of my colleague to which he referred. The general approach of the government to problems of pollution will be made known at the time of the appearance of the draft of the Canada water act. It is not our intention to give any general undertakings in connection with these matters until that time.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion with regard to what he had said but since he is not here I shall abandon it.

FISHERIES

RECONVENING OF LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE—DISCUSSIONS ON STRAIGHT BASE LINES

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. During the minister's recent visit to other countries did he discuss the necessity of reconvening another United Nations law of the sea conference to win international approval for the extension of exclusive fishing zones to the edge of the continental shelf? If so, when may we expect a report indicating that another conference will be called or may be held?

[Mr. Benson.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, plans are now being discussed for the calling of another law of the sea conference at which time, of course, we will be pressing our particular points of view. The Soviet Union and the United States, the two principal powers, are prepared for this conference and have certain ideas to put forward, some of which we agree with and others with which we do not agree.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question relating to the discussions which took place during the recent visit to Washington about the law of the sea. Is the minister prepared to say whether or not Canada and the United States are now in agreement with regard to the lines that Canada is drawing with relation to territorial waters?

Mr. Sharp: The United States has expressed some reservations about the lines we have drawn. They have made this quite clear. I do not think that as yet we see eye to eye concerning the law of the sea, but that is not surprising. I do not think there are any two countries in the world which see eye to eye on these questions. We hope we will be able to influence the United States in our direction.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might indicate that we have gone beyond the time allotted for questions. I note that many members this morning have not had an opportunity to ask questions. This is perhaps due to the special circumstances. I would think, unless there is unanimous agreement of the house that we continue, the question period at this time cannot proceed further. Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: No, no.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTION TO SUSPEND SITTING ON MONDAY PRECEDING DOMINION DAY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Tuesday is a holiday, I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council, through the usual channels, would ascertain whether it might meet with general approval if we were to suspend the sitting on

Monday so that we might approach our work in a better mood on Wednesday?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order. I had a question for the Minister of Transport which I consider to be of an urgent nature. I was hoping that the minister's absence from the house on this his allotted day would be only of a temporary nature. My question is urgent in that it affects—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot seek privileges which other hon. members are not seeking.

Some hon Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: He is not the only one. The hon. member must realize there are at least ten other hon. members who did not have an opportunity to ask questions. I would think that all the questions asked during the question period were urgent, as well as the other questions which could not be asked. I suggest the question will have to be asked on Monday.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Or Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: It might be in order on Monday for the Chair to look at the back benches before looking at the front benches in order to give an opportunity to hon. members—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: —who do not have the opportunity to which they are entitled under the rules of the house. Unfortunately I do not think it would be in order to allow the hon. member to ask a question at this time in preference to others when the question period is over.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, may I say that if the government intends to require us to sit next week it should at least see that the ministers are in their places and ready to answer questions. For the record I want to say that my spot check shows that on 148 occasions ministers have not been in their places.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

29180—677

• (12:30 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WAYS AND MEANS

The house proceeded to the consideration of a ways and means motion to amend an act to amend the Income Tax Act:

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide that the surtax on individuals and corporations by Part 1A of the Income Tax Act be applicable in the case of individuals to the 1970 taxation year and in the case of corporations to taxable income earned in 1970.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-211, to amend an act to amend the Income Tax Act, be read the first time and be printed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF, EXCISE TAX ACT

The house proceeded to the consideration of a ways and means motion to amend the Customs Tariff and to make a consequential amendment to the Excise Tax Act.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved:

[*Editor's Note: See Votes and Proceedings of June 3, 1969 for text of motion.*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

CUSTOMS TARIFF, EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-212, to amend the Customs Tariff and to make a consequential amendment to the Excise Tax Act, be read the first time and printed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Thursday, June 26, consideration of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development, and motion No. 6, Mr. Burton, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Skoberg.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, the minister had just commenced his remarks before the adjournment at ten o'clock. I should like to say a few things concerning this bill but I certainly am prepared to hear the minister first.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in principle I do not object to the proposed amendment on the order paper, concerning the obligations imposed to the companies. I do not have the same objections which I had, for instance, to the insertion, in the bill, of a provision which would restrict capital investment to underdeveloped areas exclusively, because there would have been some discrimination against underdeveloped areas.

In this case, it cannot be said that there would be any discrimination against underdeveloped areas. If I hesitate so much, Mr. Speaker, it is only because in fact there should be a provision, a general legislation obliging all employers not only to refer to Manpower centres but also to provide a reasonable notice in case of lay-offs.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept the proposed amendment, but it may be somewhat difficult to enforce because when the last amounts have been paid, how shall we manage to compel the employers to respect this provision?

There is something hazy about this amendment but anyhow, I cannot oppose the principle. I would simply have preferred that the matter be dealt with through legislation of a general nature. One may well object: "Very well, pass such legislation and we shall withdraw the amendment." Then, I daresay such a remark would make sense.

[Mr. Benson.]

So, since there is no basic objection and since it may be our fault somehow if the general legislation is not yet before the house, I am not willing in the circumstances to start a debate against that amendment and I shall accept it.

[*English*]

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the minister has decided to accept the motion proposed by myself together with the amendment moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), which corrected an error in my motion as first submitted.

I recognize the point made by the minister that in fact there may be problems of enforcement after the total sum of money has been paid out, or after the day of expiration of the legislation, for that matter, on December 31, 1976. I should think, however, that the minister with his ingenuity, imagination and capable staff will be able to give this matter consideration and come up with proposals to be placed before the house providing for efficient guarantees of enforcement of the provisions of this clause together with the amendment.

In my opinion the principle is very sound of requiring companies to adhere to the provisions of this clause which provides that an exchange of information and consultation must take place between companies and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The fact that consultation is required underlines the point that industry and the economy generally are involved, and that no group of individuals or companies in today's economy can consider their welfare solely but that the welfare of society as a whole must be considered. I believe that the amendment proposed by myself, together with the alteration by my colleague, will assist in assuring a more equitable implementation of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Skoberg) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the motion as amended carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Burton) as amended agreed to.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (for Mr. Macdonald, Egmont) moved:

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended by inserting in clause 13 thereof, next following subclause (1), the following subclause:

"(2) in keeping with the spirit and intent of this act, the minister shall have regard to increasing productive employment opportunities for persons local to the designated region and, to this end, shall whenever possible encourage and promote the recruitment, training and employment of such persons by the applicant."

He said: Mr. Speaker, it may be that the minister is prepared to accept this amendment because it is very much in keeping with the spirit of the bill and in my opinion is an excellent amendment.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a stimulus to the economy of certain areas where it is needed. The purpose of the amendment is to encourage the employment of local labour by new industry which comes into an area and to express a legislative intention to that effect. As was said by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) last night, we in this party are more concerned about the effects of a new industry upon an area and its people rather than about the industry itself. In that light we approve of the principle of the bill.

The amendment does not lay down specific requirements as to how many people should be employed or what the percentage should be, but it does give direction to the minister, his officials and industries as to the concern of parliament that the areas involved actually receive the benefits. Until now most new industries established in designated areas have been quite reasonable in connection with the employment of local labour. We realize that a new industry must bring key people with it in order to operate a special factory or process because they have knowledge that local people do not, but we believe it would be very helpful if there were an express statement by parliament that local labour should be used to the fullest extent possible. I therefore hope the minister will see fit to accept the amendment.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, if this bill is to fulfil its purpose of providing employment opportunities in designated areas, the minister should be able to accept the amendment without much difficulty. We recently had in my area the experience of $40 million worth of work being carried out by Ontario Hydro, yet the employment situation in the area was not much improved. There are a number of reasons for this. One is the competitive factor which affects contractors who employ certain classes of workers. Ontario Hydro has in its master contract a clause which provides that wherever possible people will be employed from the local unemployment insurance area. This provision has been of great advantage in giving the people the opportunity to apply for jobs in the normal manner with some hope of success.

Difficulty often arises because several unions are involved in projects. I believe the minister should find a solution to the problem of employing local people when unions are involved and the area concerned is far removed from urban areas. It is often almost impossible for local people to get a job because outsiders are brought in to do the work. I believe this is a very important clause. We have been very interested in federal employment practices. Projects have been started in areas which have large native populations. I refer to the Northwest Territories, where little consideration has been given to employing local Indians and Eskimos. If an employer wishes to establish a business in such an area, he should be obliged to employ local people even if it is necessary to train them.

Many industrial complexes which may be established as a result of this bill will, of course, find it necessary to import skilled personnel. I think everyone will agree that in some cases this is a necessity. But I believe the degree to which this is done can be limited and controlled so that there are job opportunities for the greatest number of local people.

This has been a very complex problem when dealing with people who must be trained. I should like to give an example. The contractor on the Ontario Hydro project may need truck drivers. The truck drivers in the local area may have been used to driving trucks with a capacity of up to ten tons, and the trucks used on the project may be very much bigger. Unless local people are trained to carry out these jobs they may not have the opportunity to work. Restrictions may be applied by the employer which make it very difficult for local people to be employed.

The former minister of northern affairs was well aware of this problem. He did not go so far as to have a provision written into master contracts covering all government projects in the Northwest Territories, but on specific

occasions he made it a condition of the contract that 10 per cent, 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the employees had to be residents of the areas in which the project was being undertaken.

Members of Parliament should seriously consider this matter. If we are to try to help a given area to expand and achieve a high degree of economic growth, we must consider the employment picture that will be created. If employees are imported into such areas the purpose of the bill will not be fulfilled; auxiliary services and industry that would be created by the establishment of the main project will not come to fruition.

I hope the minister will seriously consider this exceedingly difficult problem. He has a great deal of knowledge of the problem caused by the complications of union jurisdiction in connection with this type of project. People employed in skilled trades in northern Quebec and northern Ontario have not had the opportunity to join unions, particularly craft unions, and in many instances when a contract is signed in the initial stages of development it prohibits local people being employed and workers are brought in from other areas. I have found that when the unemployment insurance offices and manpower centres have co-operated they have been able to exercise influence on contractors, subcontractors and many of the craft unions to eliminate what would otherwise become an exceedingly difficult political problem and often a difficult and insoluble community problem.

Because of the minister's experience, he should be aware of the problem and willing to accept this type of amendment. It may be that he can suggest an amendment which would have the same effect as this one. He should be willing to accept this kind of proposition, whether it is put in this form or some other. I strongly urge the minister to accept the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my support of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). It is a very important amendment if we are to fulfil the purposes of the bill. Once again I should like to refer to the basic intent and purpose of the bill as set out in its title, which is as follows:

An act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment.

If this purpose and intent are to be achieved, I believe it is very necessary to make a special effort to ensure that people living in a region which is in need of special assistance are able to obtain employment in any industry established in the region. The bill should be designed in a way that will assure this opportunity to local people.

• (12:50 p.m.)

I believe that for this reason the amendment is very useful and would be a good safeguard to put into the bill. The minister is given very wide powers in the bill but, as has been noted, certain limitations, conditions and requirements have also been placed in the legislation. Consequently I think that this requirement would be a useful addition in fulfilling the intent and purpose of the bill.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I am most surprised that the minister did not rise to reply and to state his views on the amendment. He is a man who has had wide experience in union and labour work, a man who has compassion for his fellow men, and here we have an amendment put forward by a sincere and dedicated member of the house which indicates his concern with regard to the implementation of the bill. I ask the minister to rise in his place and give his views on this important matter.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, what this amendment does is to ask that I do my job as minister in charge of regional development. The whole purpose of this law is to do exactly what the hon. member is asking—to create more employment and greater local opportunities. Therefore, all the amendment of the hon. member does is to ensure that I do my job. But this is the purpose of the proposed law. My objection to the amendment is that at best it is redundant and, indeed, by confusing the issue it could make the legislation less effective in fulfilling the purpose toward which the hon. member is aiming.

I think we both agree on the principle and objective of the bill. What will we do if, when the bill is passed by the house, we find that before we can give any incentives to employers the law imposes a condition on them? That is the purpose of the amendment. If this is stated in general terms in the bill,

does this give, say, a labourer without any skill the right to say to his employer, "you are not going to hire a skilled man from outside even if it is absolutely necessary for the operation of the plant because it is stipulated in the law that you cannot do it"? The hon. member has to take into account that in certain circumstances it would not be wise for the local workers to do that. So I believe we are in perfect agreement on the objective we wish to achieve. This is the very purpose of the law, the purpose of the manpower centres, and this is why they are there. The amendment puts an obligation on the employer to do exactly what is the purpose of the law, but in that case he will have no incentive.

In principle I cannot object to the amendment because it tries to achieve the very purpose of the legislation, which is to create local employment. Therefore I cannot tell the hon. member that his suggestion is contrary to the bill. All I can tell him is that it is redundant. We are trying to achieve this purpose and we will put such an obligation on the employer. However, to place such an obligation in the bill would be tantamount to giving such a right to any local employee, which I think is wrong, and I believe that in certain circumstances even the hon. member would not be in agreement if such a request were made by an employee. We must have flexibility.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the minister at the very moment he was about to reach his conclusions. Is it the wish of the house that the question be put?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to hon. members that this vote be deferred, along with other votes, until two o'clock. If such is the wish of the house, all questions which have been deferred will be put after the house has been called back at two o'clock.

The Royal Assent

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-210, an act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1970.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General that this honourable House attend him immediately in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

• (1:10 p.m.)

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act respecting The Canada Trust Company.

An act respecting The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.

An act to amend the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act and to make a consequential amendment to the Criminal Code.

An act respecting Canadian Order of Foresters.

An act respecting Gillespie Mortgage Corporation.

An act to prohibit the advertising, sale and importation of hazardous products.

An act respecting the production and conservation of oil and gas in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories.

An act respecting The Perth Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

An act respecting Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An act to incorporate Atlantic Mutual Life Assurance Company.

An act respecting Nova Scotia Savings & Loan Company.

An act to amend the Patent Act, the Trade Marks Act and the Food and Drugs Act.

An act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act.

An act to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act.

An act to regulate products used for the control of pests and the organic functions of plants and animals.

An act respecting the National Library.

An act to establish the Export Development Corporation and to facilitate and develop export

trade by the provision of insurance, guarantees, loans and other financial facilities.

An act to amend the Income Tax Act.

An act to amend the National Housing Act, 1954.

An act to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act.

An act to amend the Criminal Code.

An act to amend the National Housing Act, 1954.

An act to establish a Canadian corporation for telecommunications by satellite.

An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: It being after one o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The house will now proceed to the taking of deferred divisions on motions nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 in respect of Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

The question is on motion No. 1, Mr. Broadbent:

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions in Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting in clause 2, section (f), all the words after the word "of" in line 13 of page 2, and by substituting therefor the words:

"all forms of industrial activity."

[Mr. Speaker.]

The house divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Broadbent) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Coates
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Forrestall
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Latulippe
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Rynard
Scott
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—72.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Beer
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans

Lachance
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Watson
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—106.

Mr. Speaker: Since there has been a negative recorded vote on motion No. 1, I am advised that there may be a disposition to decide motion No. 2 on a voice vote. I wonder whether this is the disposition of the house.

Mr. Aiken: No, Mr. Speaker, that was not the agreement. After motion No. 2 is disposed of I may have a suggestion to make in connection with motion No. 3.

Mr. Speaker: The question then is on motion No. 2, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting paragraph (f) of clause 2 and substituting therefor:

(f) "facility" means the structures, machinery and equipment that constitute the necessary components of

(i) a manufacturing operation;

(ii) a tourist operation;

(iii) a service operation;

(iv) a processing operation other than an initial processing operation in a resource-based industry.

The house divided on motion No. 2 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Coates
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Forrestall
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Latulippe
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Rynard
Scott
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—72.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Beer
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre

Division

Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—107.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 3, Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting paragraph (b) of clause 4 and substituting therefor:

(b) In the case of a proposal to establish a new facility or to expand an existing facility to enable the manufacturing or processing of a product not previously manufactured or processed in the operation or to expand an existing tourist or service operation, a secondary development incentive by way of additional financial assistance to the applicant for the establishment of the new facility or the expansion of the existing facility for that purpose.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, as this amendment is consequent upon the amendment which has just been defeated on a recorded vote, we would request that a standing vote not be taken.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion. All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. The motion is defeated on division.

Motion No. 3 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 4, Mr. Burton:

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by including in clause 7, subclause 1, the following new paragraph:

"(c) the establishment of a Crown corporation in consultation with provincial authorities would make a more significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within the designated region."

The house divided on motion No. 4 (Mr. Burton) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Gilbert
Gleave
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mather
Peters
Rose
Saltsman
Skoberg
Thomson
Winch—18.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Basford
Beaudoin
Beer
Bell
Benson
Bigg
Blair
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Carter
Chappell
Clermont
Coates
Comeau
Comtois
Crossman
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Dubé
Éthier
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Gundlock
Haidasz
Hales

Harkness
Hees
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Horner
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lachance
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang
Laniel
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
MacLean
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Morison
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Munro
Noël
Nowlan
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Paproski
Peddle
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (laval)
Ryan
Rynard
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stafford
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whiting
Woolliams
Yanakis—158.

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 7, Mr. Aiken, for Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended by inserting in clause 13 thereof, next following subclause (1), the following subclause:

"(2) in keeping with the spirit and intent of this act, the minister shall have regard to increasing productive employment opportunities for persons local to the designated region and, to this end, shall whenever possible encourage and promote the recruitment, training and employment of such persons by the applicant."

Division

The house divided on motion No. 7 (Mr. Aiken, for Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Coates
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fairweather
Forrestall
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Latulippe
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Rynard
Scott
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—71.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Beer
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans

Division

Lachance	Pilon
Laing	Portelance
Lang	Pringle
Laniel	Prud'homme
Leblanc (Laurier)	Richard
Lefebvre	Roberts
Legault	Robinson
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Rochon
Lind	Roy (Laval)
Loiselle	Ryan
Macdonald (Rosedale)	Saltsman
MacGuigan	Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
McBride	Smith (Saint-Jean)
McIlraith	Stafford
Mahoney	Stanbury
Major	Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
Marceau	St. Pierre
Marchand (Langelier)	Sulatycky
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)	Sullivan
Morison	Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Munro	Trudel
Noël	Turner (London East)
O'Connell	Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Olson	Wahn
Orange	Walker
Osler	Watson
Ouellet	Whelan
Pelletier	Whiting
Pepin	Yanakis—105.
Perrault	

• (2:50 p.m.)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved:

That Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development on Tuesday, June 17, be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time, by leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, JULY 2

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the debate on third reading of Bill C-202 I wish to ask for the unanimous consent

[Mr. Speaker.]

of the house to revert to motions for the purpose of considering Monday's sitting.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There have been some discussions following the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that we dispense with the sitting next Monday, and there appears to be a degree of support for that proposal in all corners of the house. Therefore, if there is unanimous consent I wonder whether the following could be made an order of the house:

That when the house rises this day, it shall stand adjourned until Wednesday next, July 2, 1969, at 2 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion put by the President of the Privy Council. Is there agreement to it?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Marchand (Langelier) that Bill C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, speaking on third reading of the bill I want to be brief.

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Broadbent: I want to be brief because a number of points have already been made, but certainly the members of our party believe that the bill, which we supported in a very fulsome way at the outset, has taken on a somewhat different tone, particularly as evidenced by the emphasis in the supporting speeches of the minister. We supported this bill at the outset, Mr. Speaker, because in our view there are now two major problems in Canada and both are concerned with poverty; one is regional poverty and the other is poverty within the regions of Canada associated with class or occupational groupings. We are

pleased that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should have made this one of the important issues he decided to stress in his election campaign. I refer to the overcoming of regional economic disparities. We supported the government in the establishment of the new department and from the outset we have supported the bill before the house.

The legislation has two important features which constitute improvements on existing statutes intended to deal with regional poverty. First, broad discretionary power is given to the minister. We think this is excellent; it is something which should have been done in earlier measures. It will enable the minister to see to it that firms which do not need special economic benefits do not get them. Second, there is the emphasis placed on the concept of growth centres as the criteria to be used when providing economic assistance. This is something for which the N.D.P. has been arguing for years and we welcome the improvement of this principle as part of the bill.

There is one thing which has been said in the house by the spokesmen for our party and for the Conservative party as well. It is that no significant amount of money has been allocated by the government in its budget to deal with regional poverty. This is a crucial aspect of any meaningful action in this direction. No matter how good the bill is, or how sound it is in general principle, if we do not allocate important amounts of money to be spent on this program there is no real chance of a meaningful start being made next year. I shall not dwell on this argument because it has been made already, as I mentioned.

In addition, we have attempted to do three things by way of amendment at the various stages of the bill. First, we have argued that the notion of a growth centre being restricted to a manufacturing centre is really outdated. We, and members of the Conservative party, have voted on an amendment which would have extended the concepts to include, for example, the service industry and the tourist industry. In our view it is not at all sensible to exclude from the provisions of a bill which is intended to provide a framework for a comprehensive plan for a variety of regions, provision for the financing of the service industry and the tourist industry. Both are important aspects of a modern economy especially as they affect certain regions of Canada.

Second, our party entered an amendment which would have prevented funds going to firms owned or controlled outside this country. We argued that foreign ownership has already gone as far as it should go in this country—to understate the case by about 100 per cent—and that we should not provide public funds to subsidize further takeovers of our economy. I shall not repeat the arguments which I, the leader of my party and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) have made on this point. I refer members of the government to their own Watkins report and to the speeches made by former cabinet ministers in their own administration. This question is one which is of basic significance to Canada and it is a shame that a bill which has a noble intent, that of reducing poverty in certain areas of Canada, should contain a built-in provision whose effect would be to encourage the further ownership of our economy by those living outside our nation.

The third amendment put forward by this party and voted down by the house would have made specific the importance of Crown corporations in the government's efforts to deal with regional poverty. This is a deliberate and serious part of the approach of the New Democratic party both to the question of regional poverty and to that of foreign ownership. It seems to us there are all kinds of examples in Canadian history and in the history of western European nations, as well as of developing nations, of public corporations being used to stimulate growth and economic expansion. The argument put forward by the leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and by the minister stressed that to exclude foreign owned or controlled firms from the benefit of the legislation would, in effect, be to say that such firms should locate in the already industrially prosperous parts of this country.

Our response to that argument is: yes, it is a probability, but we should provide national leadership on this question by setting up Crown corporations to fill the necessary role when we cannot get enough Canadian capital to move into parts of the country where it is needed. To me, it seems incredible that at a time when other countries of the world, most of them much poorer than Canada, are exercising strict safeguards against the foreign ownership of their economy, we in Canada should go merrily on our way quite unconcerned about this threat. This is not just a negative argument calling for the exclusion of foreign capital. We should certainly encourage foreign investments but this investment should be in the form of arrangements whereby Canadian private or public capital would

exert the controlling interest. Minority shareholding would certainly be welcome, and it is needed in this country.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Although some of my arguments have been repeated elsewhere, the one I am about to raise has not been. I refer to the very important constitutional question. If this bill is to have the effect that the minister and members of the government wish it to have in removing poverty, it is important for us to avoid a narrow-minded, legalistic and rigid approach to the constitution. The Prime Minister's thinking on the subject has characterized that approach. Anyone examining the Prime Minister's writings on this subject will see that he has adopted the classical eighteenth century view of federalism which is permeated with the idea that there must be rules and regulations governing the strict division of powers. That view ignores the fact that constitutions must reflect social and economic realities. Any constitution with any meaning changes; it changes so that the people living under it may come to grips with their social and economic problems. The minister must persuade other members of the cabinet who may be wedded to the Prime Minister's view to adopt a less rigid approach to the constitution. There must be less rigidly defined lines of responsibility between federal and provincial governments.

The minister must persuade the Prime Minister to yield to his arguments. He must argue for the adoption of a form of co-operative federalism under which the federal government can take initiatives in areas which, strictly speaking, lie within the provincial domain. I do not say we should ignore the constitution. In certain areas, such as those involving schools, roads or hospitals which lie within the provincial domain, the federal government must consult the provinces. I am not advocating arbitrary action; I merely advocate federal leadership. The minister must exercise that leadership throughout the country. The minister touched on the importance of there being federal participation in areas which, strictly speaking, come within provincial jurisdiction.

In this connection may I read from Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 14 of the Standing Committee on Regional Development. At page 286 the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) is reported to have said:

> Mr. Saltsman: What strikes me as rather significant and important in the program you are bringing forth is that it clearly indicates that the federal government can take the initiative in co-operation with the provinces in any area at all virtually, provided the provinces are willing to have them go along and that the excuse for non-federal intervention or the federal government not seeking the role in some areas is no longer as valid as it might have been before.

The minister's reply was, "Yes". That was a decisive reply because the minister acknowledged that if his department's plans to help the depressed areas of Canada are to have any real meaning, they must cut across constitutional lines. The minister's department will therefore require the co-operation of provincial governments. I see the minister is shaking his head. Does he disagree? I beg your pardon. The minister is not shaking his head. He agrees. I am pleased to see that. It seems to me that the Prime Minister will have to modify the stand he has taken in this house and outside. In any event, I hope the minister wins this argument and that the Prime Minister loses. I say that for this reason: if the minister does not win the argument the poor of this country will be the losers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Broadbent: That is all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker. My party wishes the minister well and his department well. We consider this bill, by and large, to be good and important. We have made certain suggestions which, if implemented, we think will bring about substantial improvements in this legislation. We shall watch with great care what the minister does and we hope, for the sake of the poor of this country, that he is successful in his endeavours.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate sincerely the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) for his outstanding contribution in committee and for the sincerity with which he has approached the whole problem of poverty in Canada. Hon. members no doubt will have noticed that the hon. member and I are not in complete agreement on all aspects of this matter.

I have been considering this problem for almost five years. One of the first matters I had to consider on coming to the House of Commons was the question of designated areas. The government of that day introduced this stupid program under which they robbed

Peter to pay Paul. I have spoken on the subject many times. Many times I and others in my party have told the government it was introducing inadequate legislation; that it constituted a cruel hoax and would not help the people of the depressed areas of Canada. We have gone full circle. Having brought in inadequacy after inadequacy, the government for the first time has recognized that rigid sets of rules will not really solve the problem. We do not need legislation to solve the problem of poverty in this country. All we need is a willingness on the part of the government to allocate resources and funds in a proper way so that the problem of poverty can be wiped out in this country.

I am speaking in this manner because I do not wish to see the minister's power limited more than it has been. When I first spoke on this bill, I said that the minister was being given the powers of an economic czar. Perhaps he needs those powers and, in any event, my remarks were not intended to be derogatory. I said he has virtually unlimited power in this field and complete flexibility. He may now be able to reach his objectives. I point out that from now on we shall not be looking so much at the legislation and saying that one clause needs to be altered here or a few words added there, but we shall be looking at what is done. We shall be looking at the results of the minister's actions and at the willingness of the government to give him backing.

We have finally escaped from the concept of ordinary criteria. When the government adopted so called criteria based on unemployment or growth standards with respect to designated areas, it looked to some of us very much as if the government was trying to avoid decisions. For instance, the government could always say to an applicant, "But your area does not fit into the pattern; it does not exhibit this characteristic or that characteristic and therefore we cannot help you." That was one way of passing the buck. I have seen this sort of thing happening for five years during which the people of this country have suffered because the government did not take a firm stand and solve the problem of poverty. I may be excused for wishing the minister and his program well because at the moment his intentions are not obvious. Everything is so flexible that we feel he needs all the goodwill in the world, not only from the opposition, but from members of his own party in order to achieve some success in this direction.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I am pleased to see in this legislation the emphasis on the development of secondary industry. Too many of the disasters of this country can be traced to primary resource development. We have seen industries engaged in primary resource development after a few years leave nothing but a wake of human disaster in their trail. The way this bill is written seeks to recognize that Canada is becoming a secondary manufacturing nation. Primary resource development should not be encouraged; it has to be there anyway and if the inducement to go there is not enough, that is as much as we should do.

While the minister has somewhat neutralized his position regarding primary resource development, if he really recognizes the importance of secondary industry he should have some very detailed discussions with his colleagues about the kind of incentives we are now providing to the mining industry in this country. This industry does not need these incentives, with the result that much capital is being misallocated. If the principle of this bill is to be carried through, the minister should recommend to his colleagues the implementation of the proposals of the Carter Commission on the tax changes and capital depletion allowance.

I agree with the provisions of this bill regarding service industries. In my experience, service industries will go where there is an industrial base. If there is no industrial base, no inducement in the world will bring a service industry into that area. On the other hand, if there is a prosperous industrial base everything else is parasitic, everyone lives from the employment provided by that industry base. A concentration of basic development is needed in this country, not any kind of industrial development, but largely manufacturing development. This is necessary for every part of this country.

It is possible for every part of this country to have secondary manufacturing. I really believe this. I do not think it is necessary to live with the idea that some parts of Canada are good only for mining and tourism. Under a properly organized and planned program, we can all benefit from secondary manufacturing. This should be our purpose. Manufacturing provides the flexibility that is needed in a changing society. It enables people to adapt. It means the capital resources which go into a townsite or community will not be lost because a mine happens to close down or

one industry decides to move to another location. The idea of growth centres, moving the development closer to the people so that they do not have to migrate from the area where they were born or live in order to find employment, is a good concept and one I would encourage.

Having pointed out the great opportunities that exist within the framework of this legislation, let me also say that I intend to be extremely critical if the minister or the government does not live up to the promises before us. It is not enough to have legislation and to have the power. Probably no one recognizes this more than the minister.

If this government is not prepared to allocate a fair share of the resources of this country to this development, this or any other program will fail. How the government demonstrates its goodwill and intentions is by its willingness to spend money on these ideas. To the present time, and certainly not during the committee evidence, there has been no indication that the government is allocating greater resources than before to the problem of depressed areas in Canada.

The second area the minister must deal with, and he must deal with it in cabinet, is the problem of unemployment. If he does not solve the problem of unemployment, the whole development program will amount to nothing. The minister must realize the facts of life in Canada. It is all right to say we are going to bring in industry that does not exist elsewhere, new industry, but that would unnecessarily limit the minister. In any event, he has no way of controlling this. This means industry from the heartland of Canada will have to be transferred to the depressed areas of this country if we are really sincere about helping them. I speak as a member who comes from a highly industrialized area. I think the people in my constituency understand the needs of the people in the Maritimes, Manitoba and other parts of Canada which require assistance and industry.

They will understand this on one condition, if full employment is maintained in this country. There is a grave responsibility on the minister and his government to see that full employment policies are maintained in this country. It is within the power of the minister and the power of the government to see this happens. There can be no excuse for unemployment in a modern world. There is no need for unemployment. If unemployment exists, it is because governments want it to exist.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

For this program to be successful and to achieve its objectives, we cannot tolerate 4 per cent or 5 per cent unemployment. We cannot even tolerate 3 per cent unemployment in Canada. When you cut unemployment, the whole business of the willingness of industries to move and contemplate new locations will become easier. It is a prior condition to the success of this program.

My colleagues are very concerned about the fact that much of the industry that may receive bonuses in these areas will be foreign. I agree with my colleagues that this is very sad. This again represents a failure on the part of the government to create an instrument of public control for the development of this country. I say in sadness at this moment that we have no choice because of this government's past record but to let some foreign companies come in and develop the underdeveloped areas of Canada. As has been pointed out in this chamber many times, it is very hard to say to the poor and unemployed of this country, this is a pad foreign industry; we do not want it. This is pretty hard to sell to a man who needs a job and has a family to look after. We have to accept this situation because we recognize the box into which many of our people have peen put.

• (3:30 p.m.)

But this does not mean we have to go on living with this kind of situation. In this country we must create a Canadian entrepreneur corporation for the development of our resources. When asked a question by a member of his own party about upping the percentage of grant higher than indicated in the legislation, the minister said, "If we have to give more money than that we might as well vote it." I suggest there are very good ways in which Crown corporations could be effectively used to develop Canada, and specifically certain parts of Canada. Many of the vast inducements envisaged by this legislation will go to private industry, and in particular foreign owned private industry. At the moment we do not have any choice because there is no instrument ready to take advantage of this legislation under government sponsorship.

The other failure is a failure in imagination. This failure goes back to the question of crown corporations. It goes back to the question of designated areas all over Canada. It goes back to the government's unwillingness to accept responsibility for establishing crown corporations whereby, for the first time, Canadians would have a basis upon which to judge the success of their government. By

turning all this over to private industry, how does one judge the effectiveness of it? When some private industries do not perform well we have to bail them out, yet very little is said about that.

I now wish to make another proposal which to me seems a necessary condition for the success of a development program. It is a proposal to implement a guaranteed annual income. This may seem a rather odd place to introduce this concept but I am convinced it must be done. Only if you provide a guaranteed annual income to take care of the people who must inevitably be displaced under a development program can the program itself be justified in any kind of humane terms. At the moment many industries in Canada survive because of only one thing, and it is called the Unemployment Insurance Act. Let us not make any mistake about whom that act benefits. It is often said that it is the seasonal worker who benefits. People can see the payments going directly to him, but I would suggest he does not get that much from the unemployment insurance fund. It is inefficient industries that benefit, and the act is merely a prop to maintain industries that should not be in existence. The only way these industries exist is through releasing their workers so they become a public cost. If these workers had to be retained, retrained and paid all year, those industries would have to change their ways and become efficient or else go out of business.

In our humane attempt to help people engaged in seasonal employment, we have indirectly created some serious industrial problems. Therefore, it is far better to make direct payments to people so that we can make an analysis of our society and take a good look at these industries that are being shored up by the Unemployment Insurance Act. The truth of the matter is that the largest recipients of charity in this country are some of our industries, not some of our people.

If the minister carries out these suggestions that I have made this legislation can do a very great job. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I recall some words that I spoke when I participated in the debate on this legislation three weeks ago. At that time I called the minister one of the bravest men in Canada. I wished him well because this legislation really puts his neck on the block. He must prove himself. He has power to act. He must prove himself not only in this house but, more importantly, he will have to use his power in the cabinet. He will have to demand those concurrent conditions that are necessary to the success of this legislation.

With the greatest sincerity at my command, I wish the minister well. He is being asked to do a job in which everyone else has failed. For that reason, all of us most sincerely wish that he will be the exception. I can assure him that we in this party will help him if we possibly can. We want this program to work. We feel deeply about the poverty of people in Canada. The juxtaposition of the rich and the poor is a disgrace to our eyes and an affront to our sensibilities. As I say, we will do everything we can to assist the minister, to provide encouragement, and on occasion stimulation to ensure the success of the program.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I believe short speeches are the order of the day, but after we have all had a chance to get our second wind over the long holiday it may be a somewhat different story next week. I simply wish to make one point to the minister. It arises from questions asked earlier today by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), relating to problems incurred by a defence plant in his constituency. The point I wish to make is that the minister should have the closest liaison possible with other departments of government that have a direct effect upon employment in Canada, particularly in areas that need assistance.

The minister has said that a capital investment of $25,000 per job is a likely rule of thumb with respect to the type of problem he is facing. Using the minister's own yardstick, the lay-off of 40 men can immediately run into a figure of $1 million. I hope that in charting the broad course for helping the poorer areas of Canada the minister will bear in mind that there are other government ministers who can be jogged, who can be asked what their particular departments can do. Since the Fairey Aviation matter is a mixed problem of defence and economics, I do not want to argue the defence aspect of it because I would be immediately ruled out of order. However, I do wish to say we all know that these situations should be given consideration when we are dealing with the spending of taxpayers' dollars.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I should like to dwell on the economic side of this question for a moment and suggest seriously and earnestly to the minister that every day his department operates he not

only ask himself what he can do to better the lot of the people in the poorer areas of Canada but that he not let any other department or any other minister off that same hook.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Motion agreed, bill read the third time and passed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might again have permission to revert to motions to deal with a matter having to do with the Library of Parliament and the report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It has been brought to my attention that if it were possible to adopt the report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament this afternoon, the parliamentary librarian would then be in a position to give a holiday to his staff on Monday and Tuesday next week. Could there be agreement to the following order:

That the Report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament laid upon the Table of the House by Mr. Speaker on Wednesday June 25, 1969 be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion with regard to the order of business. I think it might be found there would be some agreement to calling order No. 77 in respect of Bill C-194, to amend the Patent Act.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, if we could complete consideration of that bill in short order, then we might ease the mind of the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski), who has partly delivered his speech, by dealing with the official languages bill if there is time before four o'clock.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I welcome that suggestion.

[Mr. McCleave.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

THE PATENT ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE AUTHORITY TO MAKE RULES RESPECTING FEES— REPORT STAGE

The house proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-194, to amend the Patent Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved:

That Bill C-194, to amend the Patent Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on Monday, June 16, 1969 be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time? By leave now?

Some hon. Members: By leave now.

Mr. Basford moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government house leader, while the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) is in his seat, whether the government intends at the next sitting of the house to give consideration to the area covered by consumer and corporate affairs? In respect of this department, we find ourselves having to deal with a number of standing committees of the house and I believe this to be an unsatisfactory arrangement.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): This might be an appropriate subject for discussion when we consider reconstructing Standing Order 65 with regard to committees. I would be prepared to take up this matter with my colleagues on all sides of the house.

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

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE— APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.

The house resumed from Friday, June 20, consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special

Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and motion No. 6 (Mr. Baldwin).

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to page 10509 of *Hansard* for June 20, 1969 at which time I mentioned that General de Gaulle did not make his discovery of Canada until 1967. I regret I cannot find any evidence of any Ukrainian of Polish explorers in Canadian history books. But when I see Chirikov listed as the discoverer of Alaska in 1741 that has a familiar ring. In any case, we are all here now and we must make the best of it. We must make this the best country we possibly can.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Paproski: I say, therefore, that the Canadian people of all races and cultures have a right to have their wishes respected. The constitution that we are dealing with is the constitution of Canada, a federally chartered nation. The constitution is the charter of that nation. It is not, and must not, be a charter for one group or one segment to the exclusion of others. We cannot have a constitution embodying in its structure a principle of discrimination. We cannot have a constitution favouring some to the disadvantage of others. In a free, democratic nation there must be respect for the rights of all and that respect must be embodied in that nation's charter, the constitution.

I think it is a well known principle that Canada is, in effect, a nation with a written constitution, like that of the United States. There is, in fact, no one, all inclusive document. We do have the British North America Act of 1867. But we have a number of other acts, such as the Act of Union of 1841; the Statute of Westminster, the Bill of Rights of 1961 and other similar statutes which can be regarded properly as forming part of Canada's constitutional law. And this bill calling for official language rights will, if passed, become part of the body of constitutional law.

I am rising today in order to put before this house a view of the problem that I feel has been rather neglected. Coming, as I do from a group of Canadians numbering close to one-third of the population—the third force—those neither of English nor French descent, I feel that their views are worthy of consideration for a good many reasons. I feel an obligation as a member of this house to speak on behalf of a very large group among our fellow citizens who, while looking with tolerance and good-will upon the English and French cultures, are not bound to them by ties of blood or history. I think it is a point of view which needs to be put forward and one which is worth listening to, not because it is my own, but because it is the view of a very large proportion of the people of this country.

We hear a great deal about the English fact and the French fact in this country, but there is another fact, a third fact, which we do not hear so much about; yet it is a very important fact and should not be neglected. It is that there are in this nation nearly 7 million people, or one-third, who are neither English nor French by descent. The figure given by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism is 26 per cent. I feel that is restricted and comes from a narrow interpretation. When you consider, for example, that the Scots and the Irish are not really English but that they were among the first to be culturally absorbed by Britain as it were, or at least up to a point, you find an interesting picture. Even in this august chamber, it is no problem to find 25 or 30 members who are of neither English nor French descent.

It is not my intention to review at length the statement in the B and B report by Dr. Rudnyckyj on the question of subsidiary or supplementary languages. But I would refer to one or two of his conclusions:

> The above considerations led me to the conclusion that there is an objective need to recognize some extra privileges for the languages of ethnic groups in regions where there is a concentration of speakers of a particular mother tongue. I believe that the following languages are spoken by enough people to be considered: Eskimo and Indian in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon; German and Ukrainian in the prairie provinces; Italian in the metropolitan areas of Toronto and Montreal.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Alexander: And in Hamilton.

Mr. Paproski: And in Hamilton, the hon. member for Hamilton West said.

This statement by Dr. Rudnyckyj is deserving of careful consideration by this chamber. In another place, he makes a statement which I consider extremely significant and deserving of support by the majority of Canadians.

> The category of moderately minded Canadians of non-British and non-French origins, however, shows a remarkable degree of agreement and positive support for constitutional recognition, use, and teaching of the two official languages of Canada from coast to coast, and for a greater degree of official bilingualism in the federal and provincial governments as well as in the public services. These people are firmly convinced of the utility and future survival of the French language in

this country. There is no objection on their side to the role of French as the language of instruction in public schools where it is warranted by general demand.

While recognizing and supporting the idea of a broad application of official bilingualism in Canada, the adherents of this attitude foresee the preservation of other ethnic languages in addition to the two official languages in bilingual provinces and districts, and in the context of regional bilingualism (English or French, plus another language) in provinces and districts where unilingualism (French or English) now prevails. However, in either case, the adoption of other ethnic languages as subjects of instruction is strongly emphasized.

There is a case, and a strong one, for official recognition by this country of languages and cultures other than English or French, providing they are of interest to a sufficient number of Canadians. I, therefore, feel that in dealing with this matter it is important to establish the basic principles on which we intend to operate.

I would say first, that in Canada the principle must be positive. We should put to one side national or racial prejudice. We should start on the assumption that in this nation, from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic coast, individuals have a right to the language and culture of their choice. We should also establish that it is the function and duty of the federal government to be the watchdog of minority cultural and linguistic rights in this nation, because there is no one in Canada who is not, in some way and under some circumstances, a member of a minority group. Some are in a majority in some areas, but in a minority in others; some control the situation in one region or even a province, but in another province find themselves in a minority. Therefore, no group is in a position to force or impose its will, and the only proper, reasonable and decent method in which to operate is by co-operation, not compulsion.

We in Canada have, as a nation, put to one side the theory of the melting pot, and if we do not want a melting pot nationally it becomes contradictory for certain groups in certain areas to be deemed a melting pot provincially. I may say that no group and no area is free of this kind of an approach, which in my estimation stultifies and destroys everything for which Canada stands. I want to make it clear that in political life there are no instant solutions. We must proceed on a step by step basis. We can only go as fast as the people will let us; but not to go as far as the people will let you is, in my mind, unjustifiable in this country at this time.

[Mr. Paproski.]

Therefore, I would assume we recognize in Canada the existence of the constitutional guarantees accorded in 1867 to English language and culture and French language and culture. These are the two languages of the 1867 constitution and I propose to refer to them as the constitutional languages. No one wants to change that. I would point out that those guarantees, will last as long as the constitution lasts and as long as the nation lasts. When the constitution is changed or if the nation founders, then a different picture will emerge.

I will not go into the history of the guarantees except to say that English Canada has safeguarded and protected a way of life just as French Canada has. As a result of the constitutional guarantees accorded in 1867, Canada has seen the emergence on the North America continent of the only bastion of French language and culture in America. I attribute this to Confederation, because in the melting pot society, where there were no such guarantees, there was no such emergence.

The question arises today whether these guarantees shall be extended. I think it is quite clear that French Canada entered Confederation on the understanding there would be protection for its language, culture and property laws. That protection was accorded in so far as French Canada existed in any substantial way at that time—the province of Quebec. We are now being told that unless those rights and guarantees extended to French Canada in 1867, in so far as Quebec was concerned—because the two terms at that time were practically identical—French Canadians will no longer be at home in Canada. French Canada now extends outside the bounds of the province of Quebec and this fact should be recognize in an extension of the cultural and linguistic guarantees of the 1867 constitution.

This argument establishes a distinction between French Canada—a linguistic, ethnic and cultural group enjoying certain traditional and constitutional rights in Canada—and the province of Quebec, one of the ten provinces. Without going into the argument whether Quebec is in fact the national, cultural and ethnical homeland of French Canada—because that argument must be settled within French Canada—or whether people in one section can be represented in cultural matters by a government for whom they cannot vote, I feel at the moment that the distinction between French Canada and Quebec is a valid one.

Constitutional prerogatives accorded in 1867 to a people at that time domiciled in Quebec, if they are to be extended across Canada, can be accorded to the same people. I fail to see how extra-territorial privileges can be accorded to a province involving cultural matters in any other province. This would make of Canada a babble of confusion. It would result in a cultural balkanization which would destroy national unity.

As Professor Rudnyckyj has pointed out, there is agreement or at least no opposition among ethnic groups to according recognition to French language and culture from coast to coast; not as any special recognition to a province, but as simple justice to 6 million Canadians who in 1867 were given certain guarantees applying to the situation as it then existed. These were guarantees extended to French Canada. The right to the French language in parliament, for example, was not restricted to French speaking members from Quebec but applied to French speaking members anywhere in Canada. Today, there are a number of French speaking members of parliament from various parts of Canada. The partner races of Confederation were English and French, and English is recognized from coast to coast. There is no ethnic objection to the same recognition being accorded to the French language.

Now, what of the ethnic cultures? Can we have in this nation a multi-racial, multi-cultural society with a bi-cultural constitution? I think we can. I think it is a noble experiment worth trying, and one that may lead to success at a time when to all intents the American society is foundering on the rock of racial prejudice. We must at all costs in Canada avoid the destructive, disastrous land mine of racial prejudice. Let us not in our deliberations embrace a narrow, restrictive, biased, partisan and personal approach. Let not our approach be one of shutting out others, but of opening a door to all those who wish to contribute.

I maintain our country is enriched by the beautiful and noble culture of the first Canadians: by the gaiety and passion of French Canada; by the measured dignity of the Anglo-Saxon; by the stern efficiency of the Tutonic races with their poetic imaginations; by the vivid tones of the Celts and the moving processional of 1,000 years of the Slavic people, along with the brilliant, colourful zest of the Italian community; the grandeur and pathos of the Jewish pilgrimage and the beauty and age old mystery of Asia. Are we to shut out of our calculations any of these world-wide and age old races, cultures, peoples and civilizations? Where shall we start? Where shall we stop?

• (4:00 p.m.)

While recognizing the constitutional undertaking of 1867 and the necessity of extending it to cover the present, is it not more reasonable, more positive and more beneficial as far as all Canadians are concerned to extend the umbrella of recognition to cover our other cultures? I am not, of course, suggesting the constitutional underlining or emphasis of cultures other than English or French. Certainly, the first step in ensuring the progress of this nation is to resolve the question of English and French relationships, but no one should feel this will be the end of all the problems.

Is there any reason why there should not be at the federal level recognition of the validity of our native Indian and Eskimo cultures? Such recognition already exists in a limited way through Indian schools and support of Eskimo art. This is not enough. Those cultures which embrace a sizeable proportion of our population should achieve special federal recognition through a department of Canadian culture having as its function and prerogative the recognition, extension and support of the various cultures which make up the charm, colour and vitality of this nation. This would not require particular constitutional changes at the moment. It could be achieved in a tangible way through an extension of the citizenship activities of the Department of the Secretary of State, which would preserve for Canada the enriching and ennobling aspects of the many forms and varieties of Canadian life and make this country unique among the nations of the world.

I am not suggesting the preservation and support of a particular culture for any reason other than that it is Canadian. When you have half a million or a million or more Canadians caught up in a particular cultural stream, it is a fact worth recognizing. This would apply to the culture of native Canada, French Canada and the many cultures that have been brought to this country and have since made their contribution here. I include the Germanic, Slavic and Italian cultures because their representatives are numerous.

I do not think Canada can in any way suffer by a sympathetic recognition of and creative approach to the many cultures which good fortune has brought to our shores. This

is the expansionist, positive, productive approach which makes nations great. We shall not become a great nation by a process of exclusion—by shutting out colour, race, religion or national characteristics. Let us embrace them all. Let us take them to our collective national bosoms, extracting from each the great good their contribution can convey to this fabulous and favoured land.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope the government will consider the amendment which would delete clause 38 of the bill and substitute therefor:

38 (1) The right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages shall not be restrained or restricted in its natural development in any way.

(2) The Governor in Council may by Order in Council enter into an agreement with the government of any province which has been authorized by legislation so to do, for the purpose of encouraging natural development of any such minority language especially as regards the use of such language in matters of education.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. It being four o'clock, the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be the general disposition of the house that we proceed this afternoon with items Nos. 6 and 7, that is Bill S-32 and Bill S-39, and after those two bills have been given second reading and referred to committee, adjourn the house.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the parliamentary secretary is a correct reflection of what has been agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE CANADA NORTH-WEST LAND COMPANY (LIMITED)

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's) moved that Bill S-32, respecting the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited) be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

BOY SCOUTS OF CANADA AND TO INCORPORATE L'ASSOCIATION DES SCOUTS DU CANADA

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface) moved that Bill S-39, respecting Boy Scouts of Canada and to incorporate L'Association des Scouts du Canada be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the house do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Pursuant to special order made this day, this house stands adjourned until Wednesday next at two o'clock p.m. May the Chair wish you and yours an enjoyable and happy holiday and hope that on Tuesday hon. members will celebrate with pride our national holiday.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 4.09 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE

TAKEOVER OF ROYAL SECURITIES CORPORATION—STUDY BY INVESTMENT DEALERS OF FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, recently I undertook to make a statement on the takeover of Royal Securities Corporation by Merrill, Lynch and Associates, and on the implications of this action. Since then my officials have been in touch with representatives of the Investment Dealers' Association and of certain stock exchanges.

The I.D.A. and two of the main stock exchanges have announced that they are going to study together the whole subject of foreign ownership and control of member firms and to decide what policies and courses of action they themselves should follow within their institutional jurisdictions. They have also made it clear that pending this study they will defer consideration of new applications for membership from foreign-based brokers and investment bankers as well as any new applications for approval of purchases by foreign interests of Canadian investment firms now holding membership in any of these industry organizations.

I welcome this initiative. I believe that the subject merits such a study. The government will follow with great interest its course and outcome. We will, of course, actively pursue our own review of the situation as it affects the national interest. This review will include a study of limitations which might be placed on the access of foreign-owned firms to the credit facilities available to money market dealers.

I do not believe it would be appropriate nor have we presently the power to stop the sale of Royal Securities Corporation to Merrill, Lynch; nor do I believe it would be appropriate to request the Bank of Canada to amend at this time their credit arrangement with Royal Securities as a money market dealer. However I feel we should be free to bring them and any other firms in a similar position within the ambit of any general limitations which may result from our review.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the minister he is not taking any action but is reserving the position that whatever will be done can be applied to the firms in question. I am not going to quarrel with that position but I do believe that the kind of inquiry the minister has in mind should go much further than he has indicated.

In an earlier debate we on this side of the house made a number of concrete proposals with regard to this kind of question. There is of course the matter of positive encouragement to Canadians to control their own corporations, and I would hope something would be forthcoming in this regard in the minister's white paper. The suggestion has also been made that we might give some leadership in encouraging international study of international aspects of international corporations. Such an inquiry might serve a useful purpose in providing us with a good deal of information as well as reducing some of the jingoism and nationalistic emotion that have sometimes been introduced into some of our inquiries and discussions. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it most necessary to emphasize that it is time to stop these hesitant, rather fumbling steps in the dark, staggering from instance to instance of this kind of difficulty. It is time we took a much more co-ordinated over-all approach.

I certainly do not want to see anything done to discourage foreign enterprise in this country because I recognize its value here, but on the other hand there are certain key sectors over which we ought to maintain control, and it is important that we outline an integrated and comprehensive approach to this problem.

• (2:10 p.m.)

There is at present a patchwork of measures in various sectors of the economy to prevent or discourage foreign takeovers or encourage Canadian ownership and control. But we must have a more coherent approach in contrast to the sort of ad hoc approach we

have adopted. I am sure the first step is to decide what are the key sectors of our economic and social structures, the ownership and control of which are of critical significance to our national development.

I suggest there should be an inquiry in respect of the industries affected. I believe they ought to have an opportunity to be heard. Perhaps a committee of this house should hear representations and examine the effectiveness of the present legislation, regulations, guidelines or policy as applied in the various sectors. Then hopefully the government could announce a rational policy relating to ownership and control in the country generally. After examination and public discussion of some document presented by the government the house might consider any necessary legislation.

I believe it is only in this way that we are likely to develop a sensible approach and a sensible set of policies relating to economic and cultural sovereignty, if we are to think in these terms. This is the kind of action which would produce policies that would carry general support in the country, and the kind of action which would be meaningful if one really wants public participation in our political system.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it would be an understatement for me to say that this announcement by the minister is extremely disappointing. Many members and many other people in Canada have been disturbed by the revelations of the Watkins report which show the increasing takeover of the Canadian economy, but at least those financial institutions have not been interfered with adversely by reason of the steps taken by the previous minister of finance to stop the takeover of the Mercantile Bank by Citibank of New York. We at least thought that the financial institutions were free from foreign interference.

When the Royal Securities Corporation was taken over by Merrill, Lynch and Associates the minister expressed some concern, as did the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Ever since that time the minister has been promising to make a statement. I understand a statement was sent to the offices of the leaders of the various parties on Friday but was recalled. I do not know whether the minister intended to make a more forthright statement and got cold feet, but what we have now is a non-statement. It states first that the government is going to do nothing at all about the takeover of the Royal Securities Corporation and, secondly, that it is not even going to discontinue allowing them access to the credit arrangements of the Bank of Canada. They enjoyed this privilege along with 14 other investment houses, and now are to have this access to the facilities of the Bank of Canada.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

It seems to me appalling that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) intends to take no action at all. The second and more serious statement in this matter is that the minister at the present time does not propose to take any action to prevent further takeovers, other than to watch with interest the investigation being conducted by the Investment Dealers Association. He says of course that his department will pursue actively their own review of the situation as it affects the national interest.

Surely at some point these studies should result in some action by the government. We had a long investigation by the Watkins Commission. We have had the report of the Watkins Commission, but no action has been forthcoming. Now we have the beginning of a takeover of the Canadian financial institutions, and the best the Minister of Finance can offer us is that the investment dealers, who have an axe to grind that is distinctly different from the national interest of this country, are to make an investigation. Meantime we are to wait until we hear the result of their investigation, before we will know what the minister intends to do. The Canadian parliament must recognize how important this matter is. First of all foreign control of our financial institutions will hinder our capacity to promote economic growth.

We speak a great deal about lacking funds in Canada, but the fact is that in mutual funds alone, from December 31, 1962 to December 31, 1967 United States and foreign assets increased from $144.1 million to $1,008,-200,000 an increase of 600 per cent in their holdings of foreign assets, mostly United States. In the same period of time their domestic assets increased by only 83 per cent.

It is increasingly apparent that there are investment houses in Canada which would like to get access to the United States market but find it difficult to do so, and are now prepared either to sell out or merge with United Stated financial houses in order to get access to that market and to funnel Canadian savings into that market to purchase United States equities. How can we talk about the need for economic growth when we are allowing Canadian funds to pour out of this country?

The second thing is that unless the Canadian government is prepared to take a firm hold of the financial institutions in this country they are lessening their ability to cope with the problems of inflation. We are ceasing increasingly to be masters in our own house.

I want to say to the minister that the statement he has made today will disappoint a great many people. Only yesterday was the 102nd anniversary of Confederation and all over this country people were standing up to sing "O Canada, we stand on guard for thee". The best the minister can tell us about the takeover of financial institutions is that all the government intends to do is wait until the Investment Dealers Association has made a survey. I say to the minister this is a shameful betrayal of his responsibility as the Minister of Finance of this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I also agree with the hon. members of the opposition that it is time to assume our responsibilities in order to settle our problems once for all.

I think that it is completely abnormal that a country like Canada should continue to lend abroad while borrowing in Germany and in the United States at 7 per cent, thus bleeding the Canadian economy.

As for brokers who are selling our country piecemeal abroad, more stringent legislation is needed to control that practice. I have always wondered why this house does not pass legislation enabling Canadians to continue to hold 51 per cent of the shares of Canadian companies and to restrict the percentage of other countries to a maximum of 49 per cent. Thus, Canadians could have real control over their economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to influence investment dealers to make them embrace a nationalism which will make it possible to commemorate other anniversaries of the Confederation as we did yesterday, so that Canada will become a great country from an economic point of view.

[*English*]

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING TIME ALLOTMENT

On the order: Government Notices of Motions:

June 26, 1969—*The President of the Privy Council:* That the Standing Orders of the House be amended by adding the following new Standing Orders immediately after Standing Order 75:

Debating Time Allotment

75A. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to allot a specified number of days or hours to the proceedings at one or more stages of any public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

75B. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the Government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation; provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

75C. A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to put to Your Honour as briefly as I can the substance of the complaints I have which were mentioned by myself and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) last week when we indicated we had objections we hoped Your Honour would sustain in respect of this particular motion. I find it is essential to argue the point at this time before the house becomes seized of the motion under Standing Order 21, under which it becomes a government order. Might I just briefly retrace the steps which have led up to this point of order now being raised by myself.

Debating Time Allotment

• (2:20 p.m.)

On June 20 the chairman of the procedure committee introduced the report of that committee dealing with proposed Standing Order 75A, 75B, and 75C. On June 26 the President of the Privy Council made a statement in the house in which he said in part:

> I might indicate that I plan to give notice later today of a motion dealing with the question of time allocation in conformity with the decision of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

That statement referred to a decision which had been tabled by the filing of the committee's report and which was then the subject of a notice by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) that he proposed to move concurrence in the report. I call to Your Honour's attention the words used by the President of the Privy Council:

> —in conformity with the decision of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

This indicates that the minister intended to move a motion which would be virtually the same as that which was the subject of the report of the committee dealing with proposed Standing Order 75A, 75B and 75C. Proposed Standing Order 75A deals with the unanimous approval of all parties before proceeding with a time allocation order; 75B deals with a provision that a majority of the parties might make a decision which could then be made the subject of an order of the house; 75C, which is the ill-starred and illegitimate by-product of the mating of proposed Standing Order 16A and closure, was introduced by the committee in almost precisely the same terms as the motion of the President of the Privy Council, with two exceptions.

I think I am entitled to call to the attention of Your Honour and the house that the committee report, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), was the report of the government members on that committee and was subject to their approval. The President of the Privy Council, as a member of that committee, provided for these things; but the report did not provide precisely for the type of majority the government wanted. The government wanted only a majority of which it is a part. Therefore the proposed change of the President of the Privy Council makes this alteration, that in making a decision which can later become the subject of an order of the house, a majority of the parties of the house must include the government.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I think I am entitled to call attention to the fact that because of this omission or default on the part of the committee's report, which is in fact the report of the government, the President of the Privy Council introduced his motion. If he had not, the government would have been in the unfortunate position, if it desired to amend the committee's report, of asking that the report be sent back to the committee. This would be a very serious state of affairs for the government.

I can recall a most distinguished member of this house saying last fall that the opposition had become caught in a trap in connection with procedure matters. I would point out that as I watch the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the President of the Privy Council floundering around in this net today I am reminded of these words of Sir Walter Scott:

> Oh, what a tangled web we weave,
> When first we practise to deceive!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: If Your Honour accepted the motion of the President of the Privy Council, which would then become a government order, we would have the extraordinary situation of there being on the order paper two motions which are the same but for the exceptions I have mentioned. Which one do we debate? Which one does Your Honour accept? What is the position to be?

On that basis I refer Your Honour to the practice in the United Kingdom which has been imported into this house by our Standing Order 1. Many years ago it was held in the United Kingdom that a private member's placing of a simple motion on the order paper would have the effect of forestalling a motion of a similar kind, even though it were introduced by the government.

I think the classic example was where a private member placed a motion on the order paper dealing with the conduct of the government in the Boer war in the 1900's. He then sailed away to the war in Africa, and while he was absent it was impossible for the government to introduce a measure along the same lines. This is the kind of situation with which we may have to deal here.

There are precedents which I wish to cite to Your Honour briefly, because I am sure Your Honour will want to give some consideration to this issue. Redlich, 3rd edition, deals with this particular matter, and at pages 222 and 223 lays it out very specifically with regard to the whole conduct of the house and of the Speaker in a matter of this kind.

He relates there to the fact that the Speaker is given discretion to make a choice. If the motion which is first on the order paper is one which is likely to be debated under the rules of the house, Your Honour should give effect to that fact, allow that motion to be debated, and not let it be blocked by the government introducing another motion.

That is carried forward in the 17th edition of May at page 399 where it is said that a matter already appointed for consideration by the house cannot be anticipated by a motion, an amendment or a notice of motion as long as it remains upon the order paper, whether for a specified day or not. This is precisely the situation which prevails in this house at the present time.

This has been followed in our house. Citation No. 131 in Beauchesne's 4th edition provides:

> In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the house within a reasonable time.

Certainly the notice of motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) is before the house and can be debated at any time. Until June 26 there was every belief that this was a motion which the house was going to debate.

Finally, I wish to refer Your Honour to the most succinct and clear statement on this issue, contained in "The House of Commons at Work" by Eric Taylor which, I suggest is pertinent and right on the nose. The statement appears at page 99 and reads as follows:

> There is, finally, the rule against anticipation. Debate must not cover the ground of a motion which is on the order paper, and likely to be discussed. Formerly, even the fact that a motion stood on the order paper was enough to prevent debate on the subject it dealt with, and until recently private members who wished to prevent the discussion of a particular topic made a practice of putting down motions which they never brought up for debate. Nowadays, however, unless there is a reasonable chance of a motion coming up for debate, it cannot prevent members raising the same subject on another motion.

That is what I would ask Your Honour to hold before you when you come to make a ruling.

So much for the precedents. Let me point out that, rather like the pilots in the early days in my country, the house and Your Honour, with these new rules, are flying collectively by the seat of their pants in the matter of making decisions and rulings on the new practices upon which we have embarked. This is not the first instance with regard to a committee report. I need only to go back to the report of the Transport Committee and to other reports which, properly considered and discussed in the committee and later brought into the house, have been ignored.

The government is divided. On June 18 last the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), dealing with amendments to the official languages bill, took the position that he could not support an amendment proposed by this side of the house because it had already been dealt with by a committee and the committee had come to a decision. Under those conditions the government was so struck with the importance of the committee report that they had decided to follow the views of the committee.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I just want to suggest to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that in trying to oversimplify my remarks he is distorting them.

Mr. Baldwin: Usually I find it difficult to oversimplify the remarks of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Benson: But you find it easy to distort them.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: What is your position to be, Mr. Speaker? The committee structure was to have been the foundation of the new order through which the just society would be ushered into this country. Here we find an important committee report being ignored. Logic, reason, persuasion, have gone out of the window because the Prime Minister, the President of the Privy Council and their colleagues have accepted the rule of the bulldozer. From now on, apparently, the rules belong to the government, and the house has no interest in them. I sometimes wonder what will be the value of the Committee on Procedure and Organization if this is the way in which recommendations are to be considered.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): It is a refreshing change that for once the hon. member has been citing some parliamentary authorities. One recalls that his previous guide in connection with these matters was the *Canada Year Book*. Not only can he cite that publication but he can cite Sir Walter Scott. I am glad he has learned a little bit about the rules. Perhaps I,

too, could make a quotation, this one from Pope: A little learning is a dangerous thing.

An hon. Member: You have a hell of a lot.

Mr. Hees: Now you have exhausted your capacity for humour, let us get on with it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): While I may have exhausted my capacity for humour—

Mr. Hees: This is going to be terrific, Donald. I hope your wife is here today to hear that. She would be proud of you. What a meatball!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It has been argued that if I move my motion today I will be anticipating the motion of which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has given notice, and that consequently my motion cannot be admitted.

This argument is based on the assumption that whenever a motion would bring on a debate and a decision by the house which might be brought on by another motion of which notice had been given, the former motion cannot be moved. But in the case under consideration, I would point out first of all that there is no question of supplanting a proceeding which has already begun. May states that a motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the house, whether it be a bill or an adjourned debate upon a motion. This citation appears on the same page as that to which the hon. member referred, though he did not quote it. In this case the motion has not even been moved. If the hon. member had moved his motion, and if a time had been appointed for the resumption of an adjourned debate upon that motion, the situation would obviously be different.

All that the house now has before it from the hon. member is a notice of motion. I raise this question: How can either Your Honour or the house know whether it is still the hon. member's intention to move that motion?

Mr. Aiken: I gather that it is not.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member strengthens my point by raising a doubt as to whether it will ever be moved. I cannot guarantee that it will, nor can you, Mr. Speaker. Nor can one predict when that motion would be called. Indeed, there seems to be a certain disposition in the house—and I refer to the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in this regard as reported at page 10699 of *Hansard*—that the motion by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton should not only not be moved but that it should be dropped.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): See! I think it is clear from what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said and from what the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has said that there is reason to doubt that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton will go forward.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Of course not; he has been bulldozed by the government to drop it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): To ask that my motion, which I am quite prepared to move today provided the house disposes of the official languages bill, be prohibited because at some future time the hon. member may decide to move his motion, is to engage in dilatory speculation. Neither you, Mr. Speaker, nor the house should be asked to make decisions on such a basis.

Referring to the authorities, both Beauchesne, at the place indicated by the hon. member, and May make it clear that the decisive consideration involved here in deciding whether or not a proceeding already begun by a motion in the house can be supplanted by proceedings on another motion is whether or not the supplanting provisions, that is to say, the subsequent proceedings, will be at least as efficient as those supplanted. Here May says at page 399:

> The rule against anticipation, which applies to other proceedings as well as motions, is that a matter must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated, but it may be anticipated if it is contained in an equally or less effective form.

In other words, when there is a conflict between the proceedings already begun and supplanting proceedings the test is the comparative efficiency of the proceedings. The question is: Will the new proceedings be at least as satisfactory for the house as those they will supplant? In the present instance, if the hon. member had moved his motion the question would be whether my proposed motion would enable the house to debate the subject of time allocation as effectively as his motion. The proceedings on my motion would not need to be better. All that would be necessary would be that my motion should

bring on proceedings at least as effective as those already in progress on his motion.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that my motion would bring the house into direct contact with the subject of time allocation. It would permit the house itself to amend the proposed new standing orders. In the case of the motion of which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has given notice, the subject of time allocation would be approached by the house only indirectly, as the hon. member for Peace River has pointed out, that is, by considering whether or not to concur in the report of a committee. In a proceeding of that kind the house itself would not be able to amend the proposed new standing orders. It would be able only to send the report back to the committee for amendment.

We now find ourselves in a situation the reverse of that in which we were placed last December. At that time, and for good reasons, I submit, when involved changes in standing orders were being considered, particularly with regard to supply, it was decided that the house should consider those changes by way of a report and discuss the recommendations in a general way before making a further reference to the committee with regard to a complex picture. But here we have a simple question—whether these recommendations should be adopted, or whether the terms of the standing order should be amended by the house itself in the course of debate. This subject is not one so complex that an approach by way of returning a report is desirable. I mention this, not to claim that the proceedings on my motion would necessarily be more efficient. Rather, I am only claiming that the proceedings on my motion would permit a debate at least equal in efficiency to the proceedings on a motion to concur. If this is a valid claim, then I submit that both May and Beauchesne show I have a right to make my motion.

Hon. members will readily understand what the consequences of any interpretation of the rule against unwarranted anticipation other than the one given by Beauchesne and May must be. If merely by introducing a public bill, or by inscribing a notice of motion under that heading in *Votes and Proceedings* and then relying on speculation that the bill or motion would be proceeded with inside a reasonable time, a member could block government bills or motions dealing with the same subject, it could be made impossible for parliamentary government to continue. On every issue in every session a government could be rendered impotent by the exaggerated interpretation of the rule against anticipation now favoured by the hon. member for Peace River.

Perhaps I might deal with one of the arguments raised by the hon. member last week, namely that by proceeding on my motion the opportunity to discuss the report would be lost. I should like to bring to the attention of the house the decision of Mr. Speaker on February 24, 1936 to be found in volume 74 of *Canadian Commons Journals* at page 68 wherein the Speaker of the day, ruling in favour of a motion put forward by the government, made it perfectly clear that the motion which was being supplanted could be discussed when the matter in question was under consideration.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Therefore, if I have taken some time to present what I believe is the rule on anticipation, it is because a decision in this instance favourable to the views put forward by the hon. member could not help but be damaging to parliamentary government, and I think would push us toward a congressional system.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) seems to get some satisfaction out of the fact that I would like to see the motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) dropped. May I say that that is a correct statement, and that I should like to see the motion of the President of the Privy Council dropped as well.

Lest there be any doubt about this, let me make it perfectly clear that we on this side of the house are completely opposed to the provisions of rule 75c. We are opposed to it in substance, and we are opposed to any moves that might facilitate getting that rule through the house.

The President of the Privy Council has sought to argue that the rule on anticipation can be brought into play against a second motion only when debate on one motion has actually been commenced. I submit that the authorities are not as clear on that point as the President of the Privy Council would have us believe. For example, if one looks at the wording of citation 131 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, he finds these words:

> In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

There is nothing in that sentence which says that the matter being anticipated has to be one already under discussion. In fact, the next sentence reads:

> The anticipation rule, which forbids discussion of a matter standing on the Paper being forestalled, is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session.

The words in that sentence that I would underline are "a matter standing on the order paper". There is no question but that the motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, which he placed there in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, is standing on the order paper. Therefore, in our view the motion now proposed by the President of the Privy Council is one that would anticipate a matter that is standing on the order paper, and I suggest this is a case in which the rule on anticipation should be applied.

However, Mr. Speaker, in case the arguments of the President of the Privy Council on this point carry more weight than I think they should, may I go a step further and deal with the situation that could develop in a day or so, whenever we get to this matter. Is it not a fact, even if the arguments of the President of the Privy Council are correct, that once one of these debates is started, then the other cannot be commenced? Therefore, the decision that will be made by Your Honour, or by whoever does make it, as to which of these debates is first called will be a decision in favour of the rules of the house being amended, on the one hand by debating the report of the committee, or on the other hand by means of a motion blatantly brought in by the government itself.

If this situation seems to put Your Honour in a difficult spot, then I recognize that. But it seems to me that the President of the Privy Council has, in effect, already put you in that spot in quite an unfair way. He has argued that what Your Honour has to look at is the efficiency or effectiveness of the operation of either motion. He has quoted those words from various authorities and has argued that his motion is at least as effective as the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton in bringing this matter to a head. Therefore, in effect he is asking you to decide on the merits of these two motions, on which is the more effective and better motion.

I submit that Your Honour should not be put in this position. Your Honour is not concerned with substance and should not have to decide which is the better of two motions. But I do argue that Your Honour does have the right and responsibility to protect the rights of the house, and in particular to protect the rights of the private members of this house.

What is involved in this issue is a very simple question: Are we going to approach the amending of the rules of parliament on the basis of a report brought in by a committee of all parties, even though that report is of the kind that we have already described, or are the rules of parliament going to be amended on the basis of a government notice of motion brought in by the government house leader on behalf of the Prime Minister and the cabinet? In that situation, if the issue is as simple as I have tried to state it, if it is between parliament and the government on the matter of the rules of parliament, I submit Your Honour should rule in favour of parliament, not in favour of the government.

Another argument that was advanced by the President of the Privy Council was what I noted as his impotence argument. He suggested that, if the ruling for which we are asking were made, the result would be to hamstring parliament from here on and turn it into a congressional system or something or other. I am not going to deal at length with that argument, but I would point out both to Your Honour and to the President of the Privy Council that the rules are quite clear: A private member's public bill, under the rule on anticipation, cannot anticipate or block a government measure.

As a matter of fact, there is a pretty good precedent on this score. A few years ago I had a private member's public bill before the house having to do with an aspect of the labour code. The Conservative government of that day brought in a bill touching on the same matter, and as soon as this proposal was brought in the debate on my private member's public bill had to stop. So there is no basis at all for the argument that a ruling such as we are calling for would make parliament impotent in the future and would create a situation in which private members could block the operation of parliament as the government wants it operated. I submit that this was a case of much ado about nothing, if I may indulge slightly in the kind of references which have been made up to this point.

Let me move on the another point. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has already indicated that the motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council

calls for the adoption of rules 75A, 75B and 75C in almost exactly the same form as the rules spelled out in the committee's report but for the two minor changes that have already been noted. In other words, it is quite clear that what the government has sought to do is to amend the committee's report without going through the process of having that report referred back to the standing committee.

I submit that that is clearly a case of the government's seeking to do indirectly what it is not permitted to do directly. Such a devious course is not open to the ordinary members of this house and I do not think it should be open to the government. As I said a moment ago, when Your Honour is called upon to decide, on matters of procedure and rules, between the government and parliament, there is no question which side you should come down on: You should come down on the side of parliament.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Another point I want to make, which you might say is more a matter of privilege than a matter of order but which I think comes into the picture, is this: What is happening here is that the government is upstaging the committee. The President of the Privy Council seems to get a certain amount of satisfaction out of the fact that I take no responsibility for the report of the committee because I voted against it, as did all the members of the opposition, and then I come along and want the debate in the house to take place on the committee's report rather than on a motion made by the President of the Privy Council.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that even though I may attempt to defeat the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), I have a right, in a parliament which is putting all the emphasis that this parliament is on the work of the committees, to insist that a committee should not be upstaged by a government that wants to take things in its own hands and run parliament the way it wants to without regard for the wishes of parliament as a whole. Even though I may be opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and even though I may do everything I can to try to have it defeated, I still think I have the right as a member of parliament and as a member of that committee to ask that that be the vehicle by which this matter is brought before this House of Commons.

May I say if Your Honour finds this an extremely difficult decision to make and, as the President of the Privy Council suggested, if Your Honour feels that you are getting into an area of substance rather than into the area of rules, I hope Your Honour will be very clear on the point that this matter cannot be debated under both motions. If Your Honour allows one, Your Honour certainly will not be able to allow the other. Therefore the issue becomes a very simple one, and Your Honour's ruling is crucial to this problem. Are we going to debate the changing of the rules of parliament on the basis of a study by an all-party committee, or are we going to debate the changing of the rules of parliament on the basis of a blatant government motion that has no regard for the tradition that the rules of this House of Commons belong not to the government, but to parliament as a whole? That is the issue, clear and simple.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to get into an argument of anticipation or to review the arguments advanced by my colleagues on this side of the house. I simply want to draw to Your Honour's attention that the essence of the difficulty today in the government's position is that it is confusing the nature of the motion put on the order paper by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair).

That motion was to adopt a report by a committee of the house which was directed by the house to sit and to consider the matter referred to it. It is not merely a motion standing in the name of the hon. member in his own capacity: It is a direction from this house. I will reiterate the argument put forward by hon. members on this side, that the rules belong to this house. Frankly, I can only say that the government's motion as it now stands is in contempt of the house. The direction was by this house to bring in a report regarding the rules. This is what the committee did. I will not go into the specifics of that, nor the question that it was adopted on a majority view, or anything of that nature.

The committee reported back to the house as it was obligated to do. The government says: We will set that aside; we couldn't care less what the house is directing; the house is going to do what we say. Therefore in line with that kind of reasoning it is open to the government to take any committee report and, because it does not like it, introduce a motion so that such committee report shall stand bypassed, and then decide in what way it should be handled. Under the rules, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to proceed.

This house directed the committee to bring in a report. The house must consider the committee report and not the government motion. I say further, with all due respect, that the Chair was elected to protect the rights of the house, and not just by fiat of the government to accommodate its desires. Under those circumstances I say to Your Honour with the greatest respect that the privileges and rights of this house must be protected. This includes all hon. members of the house and not merely the government which seeks either to direct the debate in the house or to act in a particular way.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, in considering this point of order, I ask Your Honour to consider that you are being asked to consider a very fundamental question, not just a procedural one. The reason it is fundamental is the fact the government has come in right over top of the committee which the house appointed, that committee which the house requested to report, which did report and is now being overruled by action of the government. Therefore it is a fundamental question on procedure whether the house is seized of its own business or whether the government has superiority or priority over the house itself. It is a very serious fundamental question that must be determined at this point.

The remarks of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), as I heard them, added up to this: Why proceed on the basis of a committee report when the government is so much more effective? What the minister is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the government with its majority can crush the opposition faster in the house than it can in the committee, so why go through this long roundabout way of crushing the opposition through committee reports? Why not bring it into the house where the government has a majority, and where they can crush the resistance effectively once and for all? Those are the questions being raised.

This is one of the most serious constitutional and parliamentary questions that has ever been raised. I think the government has engaged in an outrageous abuse of the powers which by custom and tradition have been given to government to direct the business of the house. These powers are not being used in a proper manner, but in an improper, immoral and illegal manner to thwart the ordinary business of the house. This is an inadequate way to consider a committee report. I was also opposed to the committee report and I would be very strongly voting against it. Nevertheless it is a priority item, ahead of the one the government has brought forward. It must be considered in that manner.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. This is not the case of the government's overruling a committee report it did not like. That would be bad enough. This is even more outrageous, in that the government is trying to overrule a committee report which only their own members supported, and which came in as a majority report. In other words, not only are they reversing the whole membership of the house represented on that committee, but they are reversing their own members on the committee by suggesting in this manner that the committee did not make a proper report. They are reversing their own decision in the committee.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: During the last 45 minutes or so hon. members on both sides of the house have cited numerous rules, authors and precedents which would have to be considered very seriously by the Chair. If hon. members will allow me to do so, within the next few hours I will have an opportunity to study the presentations made in the chamber by hon. members who have taken part in this procedural debate, and without delay give a decision, which I am sure will not please everyone. The motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council will stand for the time being.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CERTIFICATES OF IDENTIFICATION TO U.S. CITIZENS

Question No. 1,228—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. Is it the policy of the Department of Manpower and Immigration to refuse Certificates of Identification to Americans who come to Canada and voluntarily give up their United States citizenship?

2. Is it possible for such individuals to travel outside of Canada without a Certificate of Identification?

3. What is the basis for this treatment of such American immigrants?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. In the absence of special compassionate reasons, it is not the policy

of the government to issue certificates of identity to former citizens of a friendly country, such as the United States, who have voluntarily become stateless by renouncing their citizenship after arrival in Canada, unless they have done so with the intention of becoming Canadian citizens, or because they are conscientious objectors.

2. Whether the individual is able to travel outside Canada without a certificate of identity depends on the entry requirements of the country he intends to visit.

3. With the two exceptions stated above, Canadian certificates of identity are normally only issued to persons who have entered Canada as refugees or stateless persons and have not been in Canada long enough to acquire Canadian citizenship.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE POLICY COUNCIL

Question No. 1,928—**Mr. Saltsman:**

Does the government have any plans to implement the proposal made by Dr. Solandt that a Social Science Policy Council be established to parallel the Science Council of Canada?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): No. The government does not have any plans to establish a Social Science Policy Council.

TREASURY BOARD DIRECTIONS UNDER ADMINISTRATION ACT

Question No. 2,042—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has Treasury Board issued directions under section 85 of the *Financial Administration Act* and, if so, what are they?

2. Has Treasury Board issued orders under section 84 of the *Financial Administration Act* and, if so, what are they?

3. Has Treasury Board established regulations under section 80(3) of the *Financial Administration Act* and, if so, what are they?

4. During the last two years, did the Auditor General indicate in his reports that funds had been withheld, pursuant to section 73 of the *Financial Administration Act* and, if so, what are the facts regarding each of these cases?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. No; arrangements on this subject have been made informally.

2. No; arrangements on this subject have been made informally.

3. No; arrangements on this subject have been made informally.

4. No.

VANCOUVER AIRPORT HIGHWAY

Question No. 2,203—**Mr. Godin:**

1. Has the Canadian Government contributed financially to the recent construction of a highway between the City of Vancouver and Vancouver Airport?

2. If so, how many miles have been constructed?

3. Is it a four-lane highway?

4. What amount was set aside for this project?

5. Has the Province of Ontario approached the federal government for the improvement of the highway connecting the centre of the Capital with the Ottawa Airport?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport and the National Capital Commission as follows: 1. No. However, the federal government has undertaken to construct a bridge between the airport and the city mainland which is to be paid for by tolls.

2. The length of the river crossing will be approximately 650 ft.

3. The bridge will carry four lanes of traffic.

4. An amount of $18 million wat set aside for the bridge and associated highway improvements on the airport.

5. Prior to the completion of the Ottawa/Hull Area Transportation Study of 1965, the Province of Ontario expressed some interest in the construction of a high standard road connecting the centre of Ottawa to the Ottawa Airport.

ACREAGE REDUCTION PAYMENT

Question No. 2,213—**Mr. Southam:**

In light of the apparent oversupply of red hard wheat in the world today, is the government giving consideration to an acreage reduction payment to Western farmers as an emergency measure to overcome the overproduction and short cash situation?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): The government has introduced a number of measures to assist western farmers and is giving consideration to longer term solutions to these problems.

SECRETARY OF STATE PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,256—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Questions

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. At the present time the Department of the Secretary of State has a public relations staff of four information officers.

2. Prior to 1965, there was no one employed in the public relations field within the Department of the Secretary of State. The total cost for the years 1965-1968 inclusive is as follows: 1965, $3,971; 1966, $26,787; 1967, $47,784; 1968, $34,690.

CONTEMPLATED ABOLITION OF INDIAN ACT

Question No. 2,260—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Is the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development contemplating the abolition of the Indian Act and, if so, has he reached any decision regarding the fate of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): A statement and the policy was tabled in the House of Commons on Wednesday, June 25, 1969.

BOIS-FRANCS, QUE., POST OFFICE MAINTENANCE

Question No. 2,270—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Who provides the cleaning and maintenance products for the post offices of the Bois-Francs area in the Eastern Townships and in Montreal?

2. Who purchases these products for the Post Office Department?

3. Are purchases made for a whole area or for each post office separately?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department of Public Works.

2. The Department of Supply and Services.

3. Purchases are made in bulk for the whole area and charged to the individual post office when issued.

[*English*]

PLANS FOR STORED WHEAT SALES

Question No. 2,282—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Has the government any announcement to make regarding how it plans to market the 800,000,000 bushels of wheat which it is estimated will be lying unsold in the granary across the country by July 31, the end of the present crop year?

2. Has the government considered any form of aid to these farmers, many of whom are finding it difficult to finance this year's crop?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Agriculture as follows: 1. There are very large stocks of wheat in the world and trade has declined. Many countries are experiencing difficulties in exporting wheat and there can be no definitive announcement at this time concerning the marketing of the existing stocks of Canadian wheat. The government, the Canadian Wheat Board and the private grain trade continue to make every effort to market Canadian wheat.

2. The government has introduced a number of measures to assist western farmers and is giving consideration to longer term solutions to these problems.

INVESTMENT OF INDIAN BAND FUNDS

Question No. 2,340—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. In what manner are Indian Band Funds invested or otherwise dealt with?

2. What interest rate is paid on such funds?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Indian Band Funds are not invested but are held in Consolidated Revenue. These funds may be used for the benefit of the band in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act and with the consent of the Band Council concerned.

2. The rate of interest paid on approximately $31 million is 5 per cent. The rate of interest on the balance, about $1 million, is 6 per cent.

COST SHARING PROJECTS FOR INDIANS

Question No. 2,367—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Has the federal government refused to proceed with several cost-sharing projects for the benefit of Indians in Ontario despite an agreement to do so in 1966 and, if not, has the attention of the government been drawn to the statement to that effect made by the Prime Minister of Ontario in the Legislature?

2. When did the Federal-Provincial Committee on Indian Affairs last meet (a) who is responsible for calling such meetings (b) if the meetings have not been called for a year, what is the reason?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Under the terms of the Community Development Agreement, signed in 1966, Canada agreed to share in the cost of projects for Indians approved by the Federal-Provincial Coordinating Committee composed of officials of both the Ontario and federal governments. The federal government has not refused to proceed with any projects approved by this

committee. Yes, the statement has been drawn to the attention of the government.

2. The Federal-Provincial Committee on Indian Affairs last met on September 4, 1968. (a) Chairman of the Committee, a nominee of the province; (b) Not applicable.

RELEASE OF INFORMATION ON COMBINES INVESTIGATIONS

Question No. 2,380—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What is the reason that no information is released about investigations being undertaken by the Director of Combines Investigation?

2. What is the amount spent on investigation in each of the last ten cases referred to the Director?

3. How many witnesses other than employees or officers of the company under investigation were called or interviewed in each case?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. The reasons, as explained in detail by the then Minister of Justice, will be found in Unrevised *Hansard* for November 23, 1964, at pages 10377-78.

2 and 3. Investigations are instituted by the Director of Investigation and Research whenever he has reason to believe there has been a violation of the Combines Investigation Act. The Director's reason to believe may result from information or complaints brought to his attention in a variety of ways. Statistics are not kept in a manner which permits a clear identification of "the last ten cases referred to the Director". Assuming this to mean the last ten instances in which formal inquiries have been instituted, the information is as follows:

Case No.	Amount Spent to May 27, 1969	No. of Witnesses
1	Not yet available	1
2	$376.04	3
3	293.31	19
4	Not yet available	20
5	161.85	–
6	531.47	3
7	526.99	26
8	219.86	4
9	2.50	2
10	151.65	8

The foregoing inquiries have not been completed. Records are not kept of the time spent by the staff of the Director of Investigation and Research in formal inquiries, so that amounts set out above are exclusive of salaries.

TORONTO METROPOLITAN ZONE BOOK

Question No. 2,386—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many copies of the publications Toronto Zone Book and Toronto Metropolitan Zone Book were printed?

2. What was the cost of such printing?

3. How many of each version were distributed?

4. What was the date of such distribution?

5. Who comprised the group which prepared the Zone Books and the zoning system for Toronto?

6. When did the group begin its work?

7. When was the work completed?

8. What was the total cost involved in the establishment of postal zones for the Toronto area?

9. Did the Zone Books indicate that the zone numbers had been set up in such a way as to eliminate the necessity of any changes over the next thirty years?

10. Is it intended to retain the zone numbers as set out in the publications referred to in part 1?

11. Has a task force been appointed to study a zoning system for other Canadian cities?

12. Who are the members of the task force?

13. When is it expected that their report will be completed?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:
1. Originally: 75,000 of Toronto, 75,000 of Metro Toronto (Perimeter Post Offices); Reprint: 200,000 of each.

2. $50,000.

3. 75,000.

4. April 17, 1969.

Questions

5. A project officer from Headquarters and several officers appointed by the District Director of Postal Service and the Postmaster, Toronto.

6. April 19, 1967.

7. The work of the planning group was completed when zoning was inaugurated on May 1, 1969.

8. $130,681 comprised of: Salary of one Project Officer for approximately 4 months, $3,996.00; Travel Expenses, $300.00; Salary of 11 Public Relations Officers for varying periods, $3,600.00; Artwork printing and production costs, $12,000.00; Advertising, $60,-785.09; Printing of Zone Books, $50,000.00; Total, $130,681.09.

9. Yes, for Metropolitan Toronto.

10. Yes.

Note: It is expected that, if a postal code is introduced in Canada, the new zone designation will be integrated with it.

11. No, however a task force to study the use of a postal code in Canada has been appointed.

12. Messrs. J. W. Moody, S. H. Bacon, F. Gagnon, with the assistance of a firm of management consultants to be selected shortly.

13. Toward the latter part of 1969.

VANCOUVER POSTAL ZONE SYSTEM

Question No. 2,409—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is the postal zone system which was in force in Vancouver on January 1, 1969 now in force?

2. Is the 3 digit postal zone system which was to go into use in Vancouver on June 15 now also in effect?

3. How many postal zone books outlining the new 3 digit postal zone numbers for Vancouver were distributed?

4. When were these books first given out and when did the Post Office Department stop distributing them?

5. How much did these books cost the Post Office Department?

6. Did the Post Office Department renumber the postal zones of addresses on mailing lists for Vancouver destinations and at what cost to the Post Office Department?

7. When was the campaign advertizing the new 3 digit postal zones in Vancouver first put into effect and when was this advertizing discontinued?

8. How much did this advertizing campaign cost?

9. For how long is it estimated that Vancouver will continue to have two overlapping postal zone systems?

10. Is the Post Office Department suggesting that clients now using the 3 digit postal zone system might revert to the system formerly in use?

[Mr. Kierans.]

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:
1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. 900 advance copies in the form of printed sheets.

4. Begun 26 February 1969, ended 23 May 1969.

5. $250.

6. Yes; $644.

7. No direct advertising campaign was conducted. The Vancouver Post Office requested local mailers to have their mailing lists rezoned.

8. No direct cost.

9. Until the study of the possible use of a postal code in Canada, now being organized, is completed and its results and recommendations are evaluated.

10. No. Customers are told they may use either zoning system.

THREE DIGIT ZONING

Question No. 2,412—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Which cities are zoned by a 3 digit zone system?

2. Is it possible that the 3 digit zone system now in force in these cities will be dropped as a result of the review of zoning systems suggested by the Minister of Communications on May 29?

3. For which 3 cities were changes in postal zones planned at the time of the Minister's suggestion of May 29 and what was the planned date of implementation in each case?

4. In which cities have advertising campaigns been undertaken to advise users of postal services of impending changes to a different postal zone system and at what cost in each city?

5. In which of these cities were clients of the Post Office advised to change letterheads and stationery to comply with the projected zones?

6. What was the response to these Post Office Department suggestions?

7. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to determine which clients of the Post Office paid to have stationery printed to include changed postal zone numbers only to find that plans for implementation of the changed postal zone programmes cancelled or postponed?

8. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to reimburse these clients of the Post Office for these expenditures?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:
1. Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver.

2. Yes, but not probable. It is expected that, if a national postal code is adopted in

Canada, existing 3 digit zone designations will be integrated into it.

3. Quebec, October 1, 1969; Vancouver, June 1, 1969; Ottawa, August 1, 1969.

4. Toronto, $72,785; London, $8,402.

5. Toronto, Vancouver and London.

6. The response was generally favourable.

7. No.

8. No. Use of either old or new zone numbers will be quite compatible with the Post Office mail processing procedures. There is no need for anyone to change a zone address designation on his stationery at this time.

TORONTO—CONTRACTS PRECEDING THREE DIGIT ZONING

Question No. 2,413—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Which companies were awarded contracts for advertizing campaigns preceding the scheduled introduction of the 3 digit zone programme for Metropolitan Toronto?

2. According to the contracts, how much was to be paid to the companies which were awarded contracts?

3. What were the terms of the contracts?

4. When was each of these contracts signed?

5. How much was actually paid to the companies awarded these contracts?

6 Who was responsible for the publication of the Toronto Zone Book and for the Toronto Metropolitan Zone Book?

7. Did any companies prematurely terminate advertizing the introduction of the 3 digit zone system on the grounds that a sufficient number of zone books were not available to the public in Metro Toronto?

8. Has the Post Office Department suspended or cancelled implementation of the rezoning programme and, if so, for how long?

9. What was the cost to the Post Office Department of planning the proposed 3 digit zone system for Toronto and (a) what was the cost of advertizing this proposed system (b) what was the cost of publishing the Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto zone books (c) what was the total cost to the Post Office of the proposed 3 digit zone programme for Toronto?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. Foster Advertising Agency of Montreal which conducts the complete Post Office advertising program.

2. See answer to Item 5.

3. See answer to Item 5.

4. Not applicable.

5. No separate contract was entered into for zoning advertising which was included in the general advertising program. Payments were: Advertising, $60,785 (including 15 per cent commission to the agency); Production, approximately $12,000.

6. The Director of Information and Public Relations of the Post Office Department.

7. No.

8. Implementation of the zoning system has been temporarily suspended pending the completion of a study of the possible use of a national postal code in Canada.

9. Planning, $7,896; Advertising, $72,785; Publishing, $50,000; Total $130,681.

MOOSONEE EDUCATION CENTRE

Question No. 2,414—**Mr. Roy (Timmins):**

1. What were the last actual costs paid to the Province of Ontario on the basis of expenditures incurred for the following courses given at the Moosonee Education Centre: construction labourer, heavy equipment operator, hotel and hospital services?

2. Were the initial invoices submitted by the Province for these courses, identical to the actual costs paid or were they adjusted before payment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Payments:

	Interim	Settlement	Total
	$	$	$
Fiscal Year 1967/68			
Basic Training for Skill Development			
Heavy Equipment Operator	6,480	5,395	11,874.77
	18,560	76,260	94,820.29
	25,040	81,655	106,695
	$		
Fiscal Year 1968/69			
Construction Labourer	15,360		
Heavy Equipment Operator	28,800		
Hotel and Hospital Services	11,520		
	55,680		

Questions

Contracts for the payment to a province of costs incurred for supplying courses under the Adult Occupational Training Act provide for: (a) interim payments each month based on the number of training places occupied in the previous month, and a per-student cost specified in a schedule to the contract, and (b) a final settlement which is determined by subtracting interim payments from total costs.

The province is required, within one year following the close of the fiscal year in which the costs were incurred, to submit a claim for the total costs of providing training. Provinces customarily submit such claims late in the ensuing fiscal year, covering all training supplied during the previous fiscal year. Because of this arrangement, total cost data are currently available only in respect of training conducted in the fiscal year 1967/68. In that year only two courses, Basic Training for Skill Development (16 students) and Heavy Equipment Operator (15 students) were provided at Moosonee.

2. For the fiscal year 1967/68 the province submitted its total cost claim, dated April 9, 1969, amounting to $106,695, and indicating a balance due from the federal government of $81,655. This amount was paid on 14 May, 1969. As previously agreed between the federal and provincial governments, payments are in all cases subject to any adjustment which may be required by subsequent federal audit.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT
PUBLIC RELATIONS

Question No. 2,422—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Post Office Department have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department: 1. (a) Yes, carrying out a combined information and public relations program; (b) Headquarters, 27; Field, 28 (plus support staff shared with other functions).

2. *1960-61, $262,258; *1961-62, $312,738; *1962-63, $300,623; *1963-64, $270,943; 1964-65, $377,416; 1965-66, $416,060; 1966-67, $515,387; 1967-68, $583,585; 1968-69, $764,594.

Note: Salary costs for field personnel not included as the information cannot be extracted from expenditure records without substantial delay and excessive cost.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

* Salaries and travel costs for Headquarters personnel not included. These were not segregated in a separate allotment prior to 1964-65.

FEDERAL PARKS IN QUEBEC

Question No. 2,454—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the government intend to establish other federal parks in the Province of Quebec (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, where?

2. Since the adoption of the Act respecting federal parks, how much money has been spent on federal parks and of that amount, how much has gone to the Province of Quebec?

3 Is the government negotiating with the Government of the Province of Quebec with a view to establishing other federal parks in that Province?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. (a) The federal government would welcome any request from the province of Quebec for the establishment of other National Parks in that province; (b) Any area in the province considered of national significance and worthy of preservation for future generations.

2. Since the establishment of the first National Park (Banff) in 1885, $355,289,424 was spent on National Parks in Canada. (This comprises Operation and Maintenance Capital investments and money spent on trunk highways.) Since there were no National Parks in Quebec, no money was spent in that province for National Parks.

3. No.

CANADIAN OVERSEAS TELECOMMUNICATION
EXPROPRIATIONS

Question No. 2,456—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Did the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation expropriate assets of Canadian Marconi Ltd. and of Cable and Wireless Ltd. and, if so, on what date?

2. Was compensation made and on what date?

3. What compensation in the case of each company was made, on what basis was it set, and was reference made to the Exchequer Court in that connection?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): The Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation reports as follows: 1. The Corporation expropriated all the assets of Canadian Marconi Company Ltd. and Cable and Wireless Ltd. in Canada which had been operated for overseas telecommunications services. Notices of expropriation with respect to Canadian Marconi

Company were published in the Canada Gazette on June 7, 1950 and March 15, 1952 and a notice with respect to expropriation of the assets of Cable and Wireless Ltd. appeared in the Canada Gazette on June 7, 1950. Expropriation took effect on those dates.

2. Compensation was made to Canadian Marconi Company Ltd. on the following dates: September 27, 1950, May 4, 1951 and May 1, 1952, and to Cable and Wireless Ltd. on August 28, 1951.

3. Canadian Marconi Company was paid a total of $2,776,761 and Cable and Wireless Ltd. $550,000. Expert evaluations of all properties and equipments were made for the Corporation and these formed the basis of negotiations with the two Companies. Canadian Marconi Company Ltd. filed a claim with the Exchequer Court but subsequently withdrew it when negotiations indicated that a mutually satisfactory settlement could be concluded.

SALE TO JAPAN OF IRON ORE CONCENTRATES

Question No. 2,467—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Since January 1, 1969, did Iron Ore Company of Canada Ltd. make any arrangement to deliver or sell iron ore concentrates to Japan and, if so, what amounts of such ore, over what periods of time and at what price?

2. Does the government have any assessment of the number of man-days of employment that would accrue to Canadian workers if this amount of iron ore were processed in Canada into (a) pig iron, and (b) tubular steel?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes. As publicly announced by the company, an arrangement has been made whereby the Iron Ore Company of Canada Ltd. will supply Japan with approximately 800,000 tons of iron ore concentrates. Shipments will commence during 1970 and will be half-completed by the end of 1971. Information with respect to the completion and the price of this supply arrangement is not available.

2. (a) Not available; (b) Based on available statistics, our assessment is that 800,000 tons of iron ore concentrates processed and manufactured into some 315,000 tons of tubular steel products could represent approximately 800,000 man-days.

LONG HARBOUR, NFLD.—POLLUTION BY ELECTRIC REDUCTION PLANT

Question No. 2,470—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Had the Department of Fisheries and Forestry facilities to anticipate the damage done by the amounts of toxic waste dumped into Long Harbour, Newfoundland, by Electric Reduction Company of Canada?

2. Did the Fisheries' biologists advise action after dead fish were found in December and poisoned herring appeared in February?

3. Why was action not taken to close the plant and stop the fishing before the month of May?

4. Can Long Harbour be reclaimed for fishing?

5. When, and at what estimated cost?

6. Who will pay the bill?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. No.

2. No.

3. Because the Department did not have evidence that the plant was at fault prior to that time.

4. Yes.

5. Later this year and at no cost to the Canadian government.

6. The Electric Reduction Company of Canada.

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,479—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Yes, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources does have a public relations staff. The Public Relations and Information Services Branch services the Department in this capacity. This branch has a total staff of 42, of which 15 work at public information full time. The remaining staff is concerned exclusively with the editing and production of scores of scientific and semi-technical reports, edited for scientific and specialized audiences.

2. Prior to the year 1967 the budget for salaries and other expenditures were part of the departmental administration vote and were not recorded separately. The total cost of operating this branch for the fiscal years 1967-68 and 1968-69 was as follows:

Fiscal Year	Expenditure $
1967-68	432,000
1968-69	585,000

Questions

FABRIC FLAMMABILITY STANDARDS

Question No. 2,491—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the intention of the federal government to develop Canadian standards on fabric flammability and flammability ratings leading to a possible labelling system?

Hon. Ron. Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Yes.

INCREASE IN PASSPORT OFFICE PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,504—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. By how much has the staff of the Passport Office been increased in the past two months?

2. How many people are now involved in the processing of passport applications and, how many for the corresponding period in 1968?

3. How many passport applications have been processed to date this year and, how many for the corresponding period of 1968?

4. Does the government anticipate further hiring of personnel to increase the staff of the Passport Office in order that a greater degree of efficiency in that Office be attained?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. On April 16, 1969, this office employed 289 employees. As of June 16, 1969, the office has 404 persons on staff or an increase of approximately 40 per cent, but had been reduced to 363 by Friday evening, June 20 to reflect the fall in workload.

2. At the present time there are 363 employees involved in the processing of passport applications. This figure included a second and third shift of passport writers and other employees in the production line. Last year during the same period the Passport Office had a staff of 213 employees.

3. Up to Friday, June 20, 1969, the Passport Office has issued 235,420 passports whereas during the same period in 1968, 203,665 passports were issued and renewed. It should be mentioned however, that during the last seven weeks or since May 1, 105,558 passports were processed or an increase in production of 45 per cent over the same period in 1968.

4. No, the Passport Office does not anticipate hiring additional personnel at present because, following its normal seasonal pattern, the volume of passport applications has dropped.

INDIAN AFFAIRS PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF

Question No. 2,524—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

[Mr. Lang.]

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes. 22.

2. 1960-66: Prior to April 1, 1966, the Department did not have a Public Relations Staff as a separate entity. The funds were at that time included in the budgets of various branches and it is not possible to segregate the number of staff and expenditures from 1960 to 1966; 1966-67: $204,063. 1967-68: $221,081. 1968-69: $406,965.

CAUSE AND CURE OF HEMOPHILIA

Question No. 2,530—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. Has the government made funds available for research into the cause and cure of hemophilia?

2. If so, how much has been made available?

3. If not, is serious consideration being given to making provision for such research, and when will a decision be taken?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes. The Medical Research Council is prepared to grant funds for research into the cause and cure of hemophilia.

2. In response to applications in 1968-69, the Medical Research Council made grants totalling $59,700 in relation to research into the cause and cure of hemophilia.

3. See answer in Part 2.

SASKATOON, SASK.—FUNDS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Question No. 2,557—**Mr. Gleave:**

1. How much money is being contributed by the following toward the 60 public housing units presently being constructed in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan (a) the federal government (b) the provincial government (c) the City of Saskatoon?

2. What amount was paid for the land involved?

3. What recreational facilities will these projects include (a) inside (b) outside?

4. On what basis will the tenants be selected?

5. On what basis will the rents be set?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. (a) The federal government's contribution is estimated at $835,327.50; (b) The provincial government's contribution is estimated at $222,754; (c) The city of Saskatoon's contribution is estimated at $55,688.50.

2. The cost of the land was $123,922.

3. (a) As these units will be semi-detached houses located on scattered sites in N.H.A. approved subdivisions throughout the city, there will be no special inside recreational facilities included; (b) Outside recreational facilities will be those normally provided by the municipality in the various subdivisions and localities in which the houses are located.

4. The tenants will be selected by the local Housing Authority on a point rating system which takes into consideration present accommodation, present rent, number of dependents, eviction notices issued, overcrowding and income.

5. Rental rates will be in accordance with the rent-to-income scale.

COST OF REFORESTATION PROGRAM

Question No. 2,561—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the federal government have a plan of reforestation in areas ravaged by forest fires and, if so, what is the yearly cost for this program?

2. In what areas of Canada is the reforestation plan implemented?

3. How many trees are planted yearly in the reforestation program?

4. Does the federal government have a joint program of reforestation with any provinces and, if so, to what extent and where is the program carried out?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. No.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

"FOREIGN TRADE"—NUMBER OF COPIES IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH AND COST

Question No. 1,807—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many copies of the publication "Foreign Trade" were printed each month for the past year (a) in English (b) in French?

2. What was the total cost of printing and of circulating (a) the English edition (b) the French edition of "Foreign Trade" each month for the past year?

3. How many copies were distributed free of charge and how many copies were sold each month for the past year of (a) the English edition (b) the French edition?

4. To what group of readers is "Foreign Trade" chiefly directed?

5. What was the cost each month for the past year of translation in connection with the French edition?

Return tabled.

Questions

NUMBER OF ASSISTANTS TO CABINET MINISTERS

Question No. 2,017—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many Executive Assistants, Special Assistants and Ministerial Aides were on the staff of each member of the Cabinet on March 30, 1968?

2. What were their names, their duties and what salary did each receive at that time?

3. How many Executive Assistants, Special Assistants and Ministerial Aides are on the staff of each member of Cabinet today, and what are the names of these individuals, what are their duties, and what is the salary paid to each?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES—NUMBER OF VACANCIES IN EACH DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,019—**Mr. Coates:**

How many vacancies exist on the information and public relations staffs of each department today, will these vacancies be filled and, if so, in what manner?

Return tabled.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS INFORMATION SERVICE—COST AND NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS, 1960-68

Question No. 2,254—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of External Affairs provide an information service and, if so, what is the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost of each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

EDUCATION—NUMBER OF APPLICANTS FROM ONTARIO AND QUEBEC FOR FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Question No. 2,267—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. How many applications for scholarships at the secondary, university and postgraduate levels were made to the federal government by students from (a) Quebec (b) Ontario?

2. How many applications were refused in (a) Quebec (b) Ontario?

3. How many were accepted in (a) Quebec (b) Ontario?

Return tabled.

Motions for Papers

TECHNICAL EDUCATION—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO QUEBEC

Question No. 2,411—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. Did the federal government contribute to the cost of building composite schools or technical schools in the Province of Quebec from 1960 to 1968 and, if so, at what locations in Quebec were these schools constructed, what was the amount of this contribution, and under what agreement was it made?

2. Is the federal government considering a financial contribution for the above purposes for the fiscal year 1969-70 and, if so (a) for what projects, at what locations, and what will be the amount of the federal contribution for each project, and (b) under what agreement with the Province of Quebec?

Return tabled.

CUSTOMS OFFICES—LOCATION, NUMBER EMPLOYED AND COST

Question No. 2,493—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many Customs Offices are there in Canada and where is each located?

2. What was the total cost to maintain and staff each Customs Office in Canada for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many Customs Officers are there in each of the Customs Offices in Canada?

Return tabled.

TASK FORCES ON SPORTS AND HOUSING—COST AND NUMBER EMPLOYED

Question No. 2,551—**Mr. Anderson:**

With reference to the Task Force on Sports and the Task Force on Housing (a) how many persons were employed in the preparation of the reports (b) for how long were these persons employed (c) what was the cost of each Task Force?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 119, 140, 172, 173, 175, 193, 194, 207 and 224.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

CONSULTANT STUDIES ON SCIENCE POLICY

Motion No. 119—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the five consultant studies referred to by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, in their submission to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, April 30, 1969, Appendix "K", Page 50, of that Department's submission.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, of the five consultant studies referred to in the motion three can be tabled. The two remaining studies have not been completed. One of these is expected to contain industrial proprietary information which could not be made public. The second will be published exclusive of commercial confidential information within one year of the completion of data collection and analysis. It is expected that data collection and analysis will be concluded sometime in 1970. If the hon. member accepts these limitations and withdraws his motion, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is willing to table copies of the three studies.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): That is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and limitations expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 119 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLES REMISSION ORDER

Motion No. 172—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, agreements and arrangements between the Government of Canada and the Canadian automobile manufacturers regarding custom duties related to Order-in-Council headed: Financial Administration Act; Customs Act Motor Vehicles General Remission Order. PC. 1969-172.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there are no agreements or arrangements relating to this motion. Some correspondence on this subject has been tabled on April 26, 1965, and September 16, 1968. In addition a letter from the government to the Ford Motor Company of Canada, made available recently to the Public Accounts Standing Committee, can be forwarded to the member if he wishes. Other correspondence is confidential and its disclosure is not in the public interest. In view of this situation the minister

hopes that the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, COST-BENEFIT STUDIES

Motion No. 173—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all papers and studies presented at the North American Conference on Cost-Benefit Analysis, May 14 and 15 at Madison, Wisconsin, sponsored by Canada's Department of Manpower and Immigration and the United States Department of Labour as mentioned in the Department of Manpower and Immigration Press Release of May 6.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) I wish to report that the papers called for in this motion are shortly to be published jointly by Queen's University and the University of Wisconsin. In view of this fact, I wonder if the hon. member would agree to withdraw the notice of motion?

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ADULT TRAINING PROGRAM STUDY

Motion No. 175—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the cost-benefit study on Canada's Adult Training Program showing a 2.5:1 benefit-cost ratio as mentioned by the Assistant-Deputy Minister of the Department of Manpower and Immigration at the University of Wisconsin Conference on May 14, 1969.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) I wish to report that the study referred to does not exist in a convenient physical form and as a result the minister does not see any value in reproducing it for the house. However, he will be pleased to make it available for the hon. member's perusal. In view of this fact, the hon. member might wish to withdraw the notice of motion.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): That is agreeable.

Mr. Speaker: Withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

TASK FORCE PLAN FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Motion No. 193—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the plan of the Special Task Force to study the question of summer jobs for students as stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his Address to the Canadian Vocational Association on May 23, 1969.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) that the documents called for in this motion are internal working papers used by departmental officers and, as such, are traditionally privileged. In view of this fact, I would ask that the hon. member withdraw his notice of motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

STUDY ON ADULT OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

Motion No. 194—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the preliminary study of the Occupational Training for Adults Program showing a 3:1 benefit-cost ratio as stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his address to the Canadian Vocational Association on May 23, 1969.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) reports that the study referred to does not exist in a convenient physical form and as a result the minister does not see any value in reproducing it for the house. However, he will be pleased to make it available for the hon. member's perusal. In view of this fact, the hon. member might wish to withdraw the notice of motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Motions for Papers

REPORTS PREPARED FOR JUNE BUDGET

Motion No. 207—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the studies on the impact of deferred capital allowances, taxes on air fares, speed-ups, in bringing about the final three stages of the Kennedy Round tariff reductions and any other reports, studies, or reviews etc. prepared for the June Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, any reports, studies or reviews within the scope of this notice of motion would have been internal working papers prepared only for the information of the minister, and it has been the invariable practice to consider such material as privileged. The government's decisions on these matters and the reasons for them were set forth in the budget brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) on June 3. In view of this fact, it is hoped that the hon. member will agree to withdraw his notice of motion.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate pursuant to standing order 48.

KAISER JEEP CANADA LTD.—DISCONTINUANCE OF PRODUCTION

Motion No. 224—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Kaiser Jeep Canada Ltd. regarding the discontinuation of its production activities in Canada.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) wishes to inform the hon. member that correspondence related to this motion is of a proprietary nature and therefore confidential and cannot be tabled. The minister would request that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may direct attention to my notice of motion for the production of papers No. 189, having to do with a copy of the report of a special committee on increasing the pensions of retired public servants. I wonder when I may expect a return to that notice of motion? It has been on the order paper since May 26.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I could not read the lips of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury).

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—RED CROSS RELIEF—INTERGOVERNMENTAL DISCUSSIONS ON ACTION—ARMS SHIPMENTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, now that mass starvation seems to be imminent in Nigeria as well as Biafra as a result of the forced withdrawal of the Red Cross, whether he can say if it is still the position of the Canadian government that all Canadian relief aid should be channelled through the Red Cross.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. I am sure, like the Leader of the Opposition, other members of the house and all Canadians, we are deeply distressed by these recent events. From the news available to us, it appears that on both sides political and military considerations are taking precedence over the lives of innocent people. On Friday the Prime Minister sent a message to General Gowon of the F.M.G. in which he reminded the Nigerian head of state of the deep and continuing concern of the Canadian people for the innocent suffering as a result of the conflict.

We are consulting with other interested governments concerning what should be done under these circumstances. We have been in touch already with the Canadian Red Cross and this afternoon I shall be seeing a representative of Canairelief to discuss his views. We are, of course, not yet in a position to formulate our policy for the future because there are some elements of uncertainty which we would like to clarify first.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his general statement of position. I should like to ask him what action, if any, the government of Canada proposes to take in addition to these conversations with other countries, which should have been held a long time ago. What proposals is the government of Canada making to other countries with regard to this very depressing situation?

Mr. Sharp: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the conversations that have been going on between the Canadian and Nigerian governments, we have been pressing upon the Nigerian government the importance of doing everything possible to facilitate relief. The house may recall that General Gowon had assured the Prime Minister's representative, who called on him some months ago, that he would authorize daylight flights. No response was received, from Biafra and it now appears that there are objections by both sides to daylight flights, except under very qualified conditions. In respect of what we can and would like to do in the future, the government again is looking at its policy.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question. I asked the minister whether the government of Canada is making any proposals in the course of its conversations with other countries to meet the very depressing situation. Is the government of Canada making any proposals and what are those proposals?

Mr. Sharp: What we would like, and what I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would like, is to have relief shipments resumed. This is the purpose of all our representations to the Nigerian authorities, to the Red Cross and to the other agencies concerned as well as other governments who share with us the burden of providing relief.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether, in the course of his consultations with other governments, he has discussed action through the United Nations on a humanitarian basis to relieve this horrendous situation or whether he has discussed with the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom as well as other interested governments a united front to protest against the affront to humanity involved in the kicking out of the Red Cross from Nigeria.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the government has not as yet settled upon a course of action because, as I said earlier, there are some uncertainties still to be cleared up. It is not clear yet whether the Red Cross will be able to operate.

Until these are cleared up I do not think we can decide exactly what we should do. But so far as the Canadian government is concerned we want to do what the hon. gentleman suggested and what all members of this house and all the people in this country would like to do. We would like to do everything possible to see that innocent lives are not sacrificed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that many Canadians, as the minister says, are terribly interested in this vitally important matter, can he advise what if any channels are now available for aid from Canadians to this strife torn area.

Mr. Sharp: As I now understand the situation, at the present time neither the Biafrans nor the Nigerian authorities have been able to agree upon a procedure for sending relief by air. Discussions are still going on with regard to delivery by land and by sea but none of these has as yet resulted in an agreement between the two parties. So at the present time I cannot say whether or not the charity of the Canadian people can be made available to the people, of Biafra. There are facilities available to Nigeria.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether the Canadian government has as yet protested to the Nigerian government about the fact that the Red Cross has been expelled by the Nigerians from relief activities in the area.

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I said on Friday the Prime Minister sent a very special message to General Gowon following up previous contacts with that government.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, in the meantime are the bold and brave countries of the world still supplying arms to Nigeria and Biafra while this inhumane tragedy unfolds?

Mr. Sharp: As the hon. gentleman knows, Canada is not supplying any arms, has protested publicly against this practice and has urged everyone to stop the supply of arms.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FINANCE

STUDY BY INVESTMENT DEALERS OF TAKE-OVERS—REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT AND HOUSE COMMITTEE INQUIRY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. It arises out of the statement he made earlier today in which he said his officials have been in touch with the Investment Dealers Association regarding the studies which that association is initiating. Can the minister give the house any idea how long this study is likely to take and whether or not any action by the government is contingent upon the receipt of the report arising out of this study?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The answer to the second part of the question is, not necessarily. The answer to the first part of the question is that I will consult with the Investment Dealers Association. At the moment, I do not have at my fingertips the length of time they expect to take. I should point out, as I did in my report, that they have indicated they will not, while their study is going on, agree to transactions which would involve further takeovers.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that any subsequent action taken by the government would have to be retroactive, to apply to Merrill, Lynch and Associates, and in view of the fact that some decision would have to be made fairly soon, has the minister set in his own mind some date at which a decision will be reached concerning government policy in respect of the takeover of Canadian financial institutions, and when he will be making that policy known to the house.

Mr. Benson: I should point out that the constitutional position of the government is that we cannot prevent companies incorporated in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and so on from being taken over by other companies except by some over-all legislation which is not in the process of being prepared at the present time. The action the government could take would be along the line of limiting access to the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister when he expects to reach a decision on this matter and whether he will be announcing it to the house.

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Benson: As soon as possible and yes.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the widespread interest in this question and its importance, would the minister facilitate the establishment of a committee of the house to make a systematic inquiry in the key sectors of the economy which seem to be of vital importance in connection with Canadian control?

Mr. Benson: There is a committee of the house which I think would be appropriate for this purpose. The workload that committee has ahead of it in the immediate future is I think heavy, but I will certainly give attention to the suggestion.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): What attention will you give to its report?

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—POSSIBILITY OF RENEWING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who has been conferring for the past two months with the Secretary of State for the United States regarding the extradition of Hal Banks. Can he bring the house up to date as to the results achieved by those conversations, up to and including his talk with the secretary of state in Washington last week?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the situation.

Mr. Hees: How long does the Secretary of State believe this delaying action will protect Mr. Banks from the law and the government from the embarrassment of revelations about contributions to the Liberal party, which he will undoutedly make when he comes back to Canada? Is there no answer?

An hon. Member: There was no question.

Mr. Hees: Perhaps I should direct that supplementary question to the Minister of Justice who has a vital interest, Mr. Speaker.

LAYING OF CHARGES IN OFFENCES INVOLVING USE OF L.S.D.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question of national importance which affects the youth of our nation, particularly those who have been visiting national parks in Canada. There has been a considerable amount of trafficking in a new chemical which contains l.s.d. and dozens of young people over the holiday were on various "trips", involving lawlessness in Banff and other places in Canada. Can the minister now assure us that the new act is in force, so that this chemical will be covered, enabling the police to lay charges against those traffickers and thereby protect the youth of our nation?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in the amendments to the Narcotics Control Act and the Food and Drugs Act to which royal assent was given last Friday which will provide law enforcement authorities with some effective control over the distribution and use of l.s.d.

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to ask a supplementary question because the information I have is that more than 100 youths were affected in Banff. Will the minister take it upon himself, through his department, to carry out an investigation in Banff to make certain that this new chemical which contains large amounts of l.s.d. is covered by the new law in order that the youth will be protected?

Mr. Turner: I am looking to my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare for confirmation of what I have said. The new substance which has been drawn to the attention of the hon. member for Calgary North containing l.s.d. was the cause of some concern both to the Department of National Health and Welfare and to the Department of Justice for some time. It is covered. I would imagine that the administration of justice on a daily basis in these two national parks would now best be left to the Attorney General of Alberta.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I was replying to the hon. member for Calgary North I may have misled him in my final reference to the provincial attorney-general. The hon. member knows that prosecutions under the Narcotic Control Act and the Food and Drugs Act are undertaken by the federal Attorney-General.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PUBLIC SERVICE

MEDICARE—DISCONTINUANCE OF EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION IN PROVINCES IMPLEMENTING PLAN

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether he can advise the house that a decision was taken and has been implemented by the government to discontinue its employer's contribution to the cost of basic health programs under G.S.M.I.P. in the case of members of the public service of Canada residing in any province which is implementing the federal medicare plan on a compulsory annual fee basis, such as in Alberta?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, that is a quite complicated question and I will take it as notice.

RESEARCH

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF SCIENCE POLICY

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussions the President of the Treasury Board has had recently with the examiners from O.E.C.D. who pointed out the lack of research and development in Canada and indicated that multi-national control of much of Canadian industry is responsible for it, and in view of the statement made by the Science Council regarding its dissatisfaction with our science and research development program, will the minister make a statement to the house about government policy in the field of science before the house rises for summer recess?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure there will be an occasion within the time limit to do this. I will point out that three of the assumptions made by the hon. gentleman appear to be wrong. In the first place, the Science Council of Canada is not dissatisfied with the quality but rather the quantity or quantum of research and development in this country. The O.E.C.D. examiners likewise were not dissatisfied with the quality or, even to some degree, the quantity. In their view we were doing a satisfactory job on a relative basis in relation to other countries at which they looked. I repeat, I do not know that there will be an occasion to make such a

statement, but if there is I will be glad to do so because I think this is a very important topic, indeed.

Mr. Lewis: I was not suggesting anything about the quality in respect of dissatisfaction. We are all talking about the amount which is being spent and the amount of research and development being done in Canada. May I ask the President of the Treasury Board whether the government is reducing or refusing to increase, which ever may be the case, its appropriations for research and development, and whether as a result of that there is a likelihood of loss of scientific personnel to Canada in this area?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question asked by the hon. member is of very wide scope. I allowed the first question because the hon. member was asking whether a statement would be made on motions. I suggest the matter should not be pursued from there.

AIRPORTS

OTTAWA—LANDING FEES CHARGED AT UPLANDS

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is of an urgent nature. Is the Minister of Transport aware that as a result of non-competitive landing fees charged by his department and assessed against international flights, air carriers have cancelled their intention to use Uplands airport as a refuelling stop, resulting in extensive loss of revenue to the local economy?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the allegations. I am not at all sure they are correct, but I will be glad to look into them and make a detailed report to the hon. member.

GRAIN

BOX CARS REQUIRED FOR DELIVERY OF MINIMUM QUOTA

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Transport had any assurance from the railway companies that they will be able to provide the necessary box cars to enable all grain producers in western Canada to deliver a minimum five bushel quota before the end of the crop year which ends the 31st of this month?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I do not know that I can answer the question categorically, Mr. Speaker. I can say that this is a matter which involves both my department and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. We are having conversations daily with the railway companies with a view to bringing about the result to which the hon. member has referred.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister will discuss this matter with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and report to the house before the end of the week?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TORTURING OF GREEK POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the Canadian government will look into the detailed report smuggled out of Greece, and presented to the Commission on Human Rights in Strasbourg, which indicates that 15 women political prisoners in that country were tortured by Greek officials? If it is discovered that the report is authentic, will the government take the appropriate action to denounce this inhumanity which is quite inconsistent with the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations, to which both Canada and Greece belong?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I can answer the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, but the second part is hypothetical. I will certainly investigate the charges that have been made.

AGRICULTURE

DAMAGE TO FARM ECONOMY THROUGH ESCALATION OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he received a telegram from the 80,000 member Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in the last few days to the effect that escalating interest rates are seriously damaging the farm economy and that money required for agricultural productive purposes should be made available at lower cost? If he did, what was the minister's reply to this important representation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I have not received the telegram, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

DOGFISH—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN CANADIAN AND JAPANESE OFFICIALS

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry tell the house whether the subject of dogfish and their disposition, is on the agenda of current meetings in British Columbia between the Minister of Fisheries and Japanese officials?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure this is a matter of urgency. If it is, perhaps the hon. member would like to return at ten o'clock this evening.

Mr. Perrault: Ten o'clock.

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.—LICENSING OF FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, notice of which has been given. It concerns the position taken by the Department of Fisheries, which is having a very detrimental effect on revenues in the port of St. John's, and arises out of licences which the department has authority to issue to foreign vessels to use Canadian ports.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would like to join the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour and return, not tonight but tomorrow night.

PRICE STABILITY, INCOMES AND EMPLOYMENT

REQUEST FOR MEETING OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—SITTINGS DURING RECESS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and concerns government order No. 91 standing in his name. Does the government intend to proceed with the establishment of the Parliamentary Committee on Price Stability, Incomes and Employment before the adjournment of the session, so that this committee can sit during the recess?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council answered this question some days ago.

Mrs. MacInnis: I wonder whether the minister would repeat his answer, Mr. Speaker, because we missed it over here.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MAINTENANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE STANDARD

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport with respect to the question asked last week by the right hon. member for Prince Albert regarding the lack of facilities and services on Canadian National Railways. I received representations over the weekend with regard to this matter. Is the minister now in a position to give the house a statement as to what Canadian National Railways intend to do about this deplorable situation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have initiated inquiries with the railways. They are both preparing answers, and I hope to have them to pass on to the house later this week.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NATURAL GAS—ANNOUNCED PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has his attention been drawn to the announced increase of about 20 per cent in the price of natural gas as a result of increased shipments to the United States? If the minister's attention has been drawn to this matter, does he intend to refer it to the prices and incomes commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have not noticed the reports, Mr. Speaker. I will be happy to look into them. I think this is a matter which properly falls within the purview of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and I will bring it to his attention.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's responsibility for consumer prices in Canada and the serious effect that such an increase would have on consumer prices generally, is it the minister's intention to make representations before the National Energy Board?

Mr. Basford: I would like to look at the reports first, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT

ADEQUACY OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of

Transport. In view of the serious tie-up in ferry traffic over the holiday weekend between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, is the department now prepared to put on sufficient crews to properly man the boats which should be operating, instead of their being tied up at the docks?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at the time the arrangements were made in this respect I gave an assurance that if it should develop that changes were necessary, we would be very pleased to look into them. If there be need to implement them, I undertake again to do that.

HARBOURS

CHURCHILL, MAN.—TOUR OF PORT FACILITIES BY RUSSIAN DELEGATION

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the Hudson Bay Route Association has requested that a Russian delegation, including senior officials of the Russian ministry of marine presently touring ports in the St. Lawrence area, also be shown the port facilities at Churchill, is the minister prepared to arrange for such a tour?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubts whether the question can be asked at this time.

FISHERIES

DAMAGE TO EQUIPMENT CAUSED BY DRAGGERS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries. Would he advise whether the minister has received a report from his officials regarding draggers interfering with the operations of fishermen in northwestern Newfoundland, and if so, could he advise what action the minister is undertaking?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer this question now, so that I do not have to answer it at ten o'clock. We have received a report from the Department of Fisheries vessel m.v. *Garria Bay* which is on duty in the area. The captain has reported to our district director in the area that they have been patrolling at night when the draggers have been endangering the nets of fishermen. There has been very little interference, if any. Our district director is going up there this weekend to make personal contact with the people who have made the complaints. We should have a further report at that time.

FINANCE

DISCUSSION OF INTEREST RATES WITH CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Can the minister report to the house the results of the meetings he was to hold with the chartered banks near the end of June concerning interest rate levels and monetary matters?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the meeting was a private one. The matter of interest rates has been referred to a parliamentary committee. I trust that representatives of the banks will be appearing before that committee, as well as the governor of the Bank of Canada and other witnesses.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was the prime loan rate of 8½ per cent announced last Friday, one of the results of that meeting?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker.

SPORTS

HOCKEY—MANAGEMENT AT MAPLE LEAF GARDENS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Has the minister completed the investigation of Harold Ballard and Stafford Smythe and their relationship to Maple Leaf Gardens? If so, what charges, if any, will be laid?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This also is a question which might very well be considered and debated at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Gilbert: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION AGENCIES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board concerning one of his investigative stepchildren, the task force on information. Can he advise

whether this task force recommended the establishment of a network of local information agencies across the country, and has the government come to any conclusion on this important matter?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the report of the task force is not, of course, made to me. However, I have read the same newspaper article as the hon. member and I think it appears from that article that the task force has not yet completed its report.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will it be the intention of the government to make the report public when it is presented?

Mr. Drury: As I mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, it would not necessarily be my decision whether or not it should be made public. Until such time as the report is received, it will be difficult to decide whether it should be made public.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO ENSURE SAFETY MEASURES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the coroner's jury recommendation concerning the C.N.R. derailment near Toronto that there be a replacement of locking devices on railways switches because of the inadequacy of present devices, and their recommendation for an increase in inspections of the track in the New Woodbine area, has the minister initiated any action to ensure that positive steps are taken to implement these recommendations?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated in the house on a number of occasions the actions that have been taken with regard to the whole question of rail line safety. These are being pursued in the manner I outlined.

Mr. Skoberg: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the recommendations of the coroner's jury in this regard, has the minister taken positive action in this direction?

[*Later:*]

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the President of the Privy Council. Could he indicate to the house whether or not he intends to call for discussion item No. 68 on the order paper regarding the cancellation of the Newfoundland passenger rail service and the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): We have announced the two remaining items to be dealt with in the balance of the session before the summer adjournment and we will stick by that announcement.

TERMINATION OF NEWFOUNDLAND SERVICE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport. As this is the last day of rail passenger service in the province of Newfoundland,—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. McGrath: —and as the government has decided to go against the unanimous wish of the people of Newfoundland by disallowing a number of appeals against this decision—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot make a speech; he can only ask a question.

Mr. McGrath: I was merely trying to preface my question, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Transport, who delivered the *coup de grâce* yesterday on behalf of the government, is this: Is it now government policy to abandon all rail passenger services in Canada that are not a paying proposition?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course the hon. member is asking the minister to make a general statement on policy. The question as asked is not in order.

INCOME TAX

DELAY IN PAYMENT OF REFUNDS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the very widespread impression that tax refunds are much slower than usual this year, I ask whether it is the policy of the department to slow up the payment of these refunds or withhold them in order to preserve the cash position of the government?

Official Languages

CONSUMER CREDIT

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING LEGISLATION

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and I think that this one is really for him. Now that the truth-in-lending bill has become law in the United States, enabling consumers to know at the outset exactly what their credit purchase will cost, and in view of the fact that a Senate-House of Commons committee recommended such legislation for Canada in February, 1967, does the government plan to introduce such legislation to protect consumers and if so, when?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, most provinces have already enacted truth-in-lending legislation. Some two years ago the regulations under the Bank Act were amended to provide truth-in-lending under the act. There were further discussions on this subject at the last federal-provincial conference on consumer affairs two months ago, and there seemed to be very little suggestion at that time that there needed to be amendments in the existing structure of the truth-in-lending legislation.

Mrs. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question. I think the minister missed my second "in view of", that is in view of the fact that the Senate-House of Commons committee recommended such legislation for Canada in February of 1967, does the government plan to introduce such legislation to protect consumers, and if so, when?

Mr. Basford: It seems, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the supplementary question is argumentative.

• (3:50 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.

The house resumed from Friday, June 27, consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported, (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill and motion No. 6 (Mr. Baldwin).

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, when this matter was last debated we were discussing the amendment to clause 38 in the name of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). We are in favour of the principle of clause 38 which safeguards the effects which the act might have on the rights and privileges of all languages other than the two official languages. But on examining carefully the original clause 38 and the amendment, we came to the conclusion that the original clause was broader in scope and more satisfactory than the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River.

I find myself somewhat embarrassed at entering into a legal discussion with the hon. member for Peace River, and I can assure the house that I will not prolong the legal aspect of the discussion. I would like to point out that clause 38, as presented by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and approved by the special committee, provides that nothing in the act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege with respect to any language that is not an official language. The house will note the words "legal or customary right" and the addition of the words "or privilege". The amendment of the hon. member for Peace River, however, refers to the right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages and says that right shall not be restricted in its natural development in any way.

It will be observed that the words "legal and customary" are not included in the amendment, nor is any reference to the privileges that may have developed in relation to languages other than the two official languages. Lawyers and legal experts have been discussing for many centuries and in many volumes the precise meaning of the word "right" as against "privilege", and the refinements of what constitutes rights and what constitutes privileges. However that may be, it appears fairly obvious to us that the addition of the word "privilege" may widen the scope, and the omission of this word may narrow the scope of this very healthy and worthwhile clause. I think all members of the house unanimously agree that the clause seeks to protect the rights of those who speak a third language. It is also to be noted that the amendment refers to the right to speak one language only. There may well be, and probably are, broader rights with regard to language than merely the right to speak a language. Once again, it seems to us that the

amendment, or the interpretation we put on it at any rate, is a restriction rather than an expansion of the original section. For that reason, we reject it.

In our view there is another difficulty with the proposed amendment to clause 38 which refers to the right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages, which shall not be restrained or restricted in its natural development in any way. I do not know whether the hon. member for Peace River explained this when I was not present in the house, although I do not think so, but we are puzzled by what is meant by the development of a language in a natural way. I hear a voice from the back giving me some advice, but I could not understand it. In any event, it is our view—much as we agree with the general sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Peace River and our colleagues over here—that clause 38 as originally drafted is preferable in form, broader and less restrictive than the amendment. For that reason we cannot support the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given me during the debate on this very important legislation—on the official languages, Bill C-120—to make a few remarks on amendment to clause 38.

Clause 38 is designed to guarantee the rights and privileges of languages spoken by Canadians who are neither of English nor of French origin.

I think I understand very well the feelings of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I also received from several Canadians letters expressing their doubts and their fears in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, clause 38 drafted and introduced in this house by the government says:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this Act with respect to any language that is not an official language.

[*English*]

There were celebrations commemorating Canadian confederation yesterday and during the weekend preceding July 1, and I am sure many members have taken part in many interesting, exciting and stimulating events. I have come to this chamber fresh from Toronto where yesterday, and the whole of the last weekend, we have had a very stimulating and exciting time. During that time, thousands of Canadians viewed the exhibits in metropolitan Toronto's international caravan. This caravan displayed the arts and crafts of Canadians of various ethnic origins. More than 33 so-called "world cities" showed us the richness of the Canadian mosaic. I have had the privilege of speaking to many of the participants and organizers of this caravan, and I should like publicly to express words of commendation to the people of the Community Folk Arts Council who organized this event. In particular, I should like to mention Mr. John Fisher, Mr. Leon Kossar and Stephen Vojtech who were among the animators of this exciting event, which showed to all of Canada the rich cultures which this country possesses. It was very different from the dull celebrations which took place in Ottawa yesterday as reported by the Canadian Press in one of the Toronto daily newspapers. I think, for example, that the program which took place in the National Arts Centre did not reflect the multicultural, pluralistic Canada which exists. I think too the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) would do well to find out all the circumstances under which this program was organized.

Let me state that I support the principle of Bill C-120 which will make English and French the official languages in matters having to do with the parliament of Canada, the courts and the public service, as well as federal agencies serving the Canadian people. I think this bill is long overdue and that Canadians of English and French origins might have expected such a measure a long time ago. However, many doubts and fears about this bill have been expressed by Canadians of other than English and French origins. They would like more assurances from the government as far as the future of their languages and cultures are concerned. There is a danger that while avoiding the United States melting-pot we might fall into another disaster, that of two melting-pots. I think it is the duty of the Secretary of State to enunciate what is really the policy of the Canadian government as far as the development of Canadian culture is concerned.

Today, 30 per cent of Canadians are neither of French nor English origin. They have contributed tremendously to the development of the nation. Their children and their grandchildren of tomorrow will be citizens of this country, and they have the right to expect a statement of policy as far as their mother languages and cultures are concerned. In my view, more attention should be paid to the

development and preservation of the languages and cultures of Canadians who are not of English or French origin. All too often the assistance which comes from the Department of the Secretary of State amounts to a pittance in terms of the promotion of ethnic cultures. I should like to appeal at this stage of the debate to the Secretary of State to reassure all Canadians as to the development of a cultural policy.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask the hon. member a question? I take it from his remarks that he is in sympathy with the amendment we are discussing. I should like to ask him whether he intends to support it.

Mr. Haidasz: I am awaiting further assurance from the Secretary of State with regard to the development, preservation and promotion of the other cultures and languages. I realize that the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism has not made its report on the other languages and cultures in this country. However, in order to dispel the fears and doubts expressed by some Canadians, I hope it will be possible for us in this chamber to hear from the Secretary of State once again the assurance he has given in other places.

Mr. Aiken: I appreciate the hon. member's forthright answer.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I can be very brief in my remarks this afternoon. May I indicate at the outset that I am heartily in favour of the amendment to clause 38 which has been advanced by my hon. friend from Peace River. It is one with which I am sure every member who understand the mosaic aspect of Canadian cultural and linguistic development will sympathize. Indeed, I would like to have put forward the amendment myself.

Listening to the hon. member who has just spoken, I thought his remarks could fairly be interpreted as an endorsation of the amendment. One of the unhappy aspects of the debate so far has been the government's reluctance to accept any amendments either from its own supporters or from members of the opposition dealing with the more discriminatory features of the bill. These shortcomings have been brought out in earlier contributions which I have made to the discussion. However, from the point of view of the new Canadianism which operates with particular force in the western provinces, and in some of the larger metropolitan communities, little has been done by legislative action to remove those discriminatory features from the legislation.

I feel that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend would have this effect. Clause 38, in its original form, says that nothing shall be done to derogate from or diminish in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this act with respect to any language which is not an official language. At the same time, the clause does nothing in a positive sense to recognize what has become a major fact of life in our Canadian mosaic. I refer to the enrichment that has come from the recognition of the contribution of new Canadians from many countries of Europe, indeed from many parts of the world, and also of the creative force that they have contributed in making Canada a nation which over the years has been the cynosure of hope from the standpoint of goodwill and tolerance.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The amendment proposed accentuates the positive and not the negative. Perhaps I can indicate how this is so and how the original clause 38 is improved immensely. Clause 38(2) as proposed in amended form reads:

> The Governor in Council may by order in council enter into an agreement with the government of any province which has been authorized by legislation so to do, for the purpose of encouraging natural development of any such minority language especially as regards the use of such language in matters of education.

In other words, the amendment is suggesting not only that there be the negative stance of doing nothing to remove what has been achieved thus far; it also includes the positive approach, namely that there be official encouragement in the bill of the further development of the cultural and linguistic mosaic that has become a distinctive part of many sections of Canada, particularly, as I have already indicated, western Canada and the large metropolitan, urban communities.

Perhaps one of the most dynamic communities in this regard is the city of Toronto, which since the end of world war II has become one of the great centres of cultural diversity in this nation. The hon. member who has just spoken referred to the dynamism of this new spirit of Canadianism that marked the celebrations in that city as recently as yesterday.

I am afraid that the government of Canada, as it exists at the present time, is not at all cognizant of this important fact in Canadian

cultural development. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), in speeches that he has made on these matters over the past few months, has referred to cultural deserts that exist in various parts of Canada. That is a phrase that is very heavily laden, of course, with value judgment. There has never been any indication of what parts of Canada are included in the minister's designation as cultural deserts. There is a strong feeling in western Canada that theirs is the area that has been described in such discriminatory terms by the Secretary of State. I think I can say that with some justification, following the events that took place just a week ago in the province of Manitoba. It was quite obvious that the good citizens of Manitoba, a province that enjoys a cultural diversity that is second to none in Canada, was not in agreement with the stance, the posture and the program of the government of Canada with respect to the recognition of the cultural rights of that part of this country, or for that matter in agreement with the more basic issue, of course, that of the economic rights of the province of Manitoba.

The city of Winnipeg is one of the larger urban centres of Canada. There, we have a bicultural and bilingual community that has existed on the banks of the Red River almost since the beginning of confederation. But in the midst of this bilingual and bicultural community we also have this new fact of Canadian confederation, the Canadian mosaic that is now recognized by almost everybody, except this government, as one of the most progressive and hopeful aspects of our continuing progress toward national unity. In the city of Winnipeg as well as in rural parts of Manitoba there are radio stations broadcasting in other languages, such as German and Ukrainian. This is in response to the demand of a large segment of the population of Manitoba for the preservation of their rights in this respect. The ethnic communities concerned have voluntarily paid the expenses incurred in preserving their cultural identity.

In Manitoba there is also a strong ethnic press that has been thriving to a growing extent as a result of the onward march of this mosaic concept. This ethnic press recently suffered a severe economic setback, one which extends across the board to weekly newspapers and other publications of this kind, inasmuch as the new postal rates for small publications of this sort were set so high that it will be difficult for the ethnic press to survive.

This is where the discrimination, of which the government does not even seem to be aware, arises. On the one hand, the government provides cultural assistance to English and French-speaking minority groups wherever they exist in Canada; on the other hand, the government completely ignores, and in fact discriminates against, the efforts of the other ethnic groups to preserve their own identity as a creative force in the great Canadian cultural and linguistic mosaic.

As I have already indicated, subsection (2) of clause 38 as proposed in this amendment accentuates the positive. It makes legislative provision for encouraging this development, rather than merely taking a status quo approach to the question. Not being a lawyer, I am not too sure of the meaning of the term "status quo" but I once heard a definition to the effect that status quo was Latin for the mess we are in. I am not sure whether that is the correct definition. Be that as it may this proposed subsection does not take a static approach but rather a dynamic approach. As I have said, if the government has been unaware of the cultural dynamism that exists in Manitoba and the other western provinces, I am sure that the message has come through loud and clear as a result of the events of last Wednesday. The Liberal Party in the province of Manitoba has been sunk almost without trace, as it deserved to be under the circumstances.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): What about the other parties?

Mr. Dinsdale: I hear a comment from across the way, what about the other parties? I presume the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is referring to the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am just suggesting that the undertaker also got buried.

Mr. Dinsdale: I thought they did quite well under the circumstances. As a matter of fact, the New Democratic Party is doing exceedingly well these days. There have been further defections from the Liberal to the New Democratic Party of which the hon. minister might not be aware. One of the leading Liberals in that province—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I think he is far from the subject of the amendment before the house.

Mr. Lewis: He is more interesting though, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I was merely trying to clarify the interjection by the Minister of Justice in relation to a very important event that took place in Manitoba last week.

There is a very fundamental point I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members of this house with respect to the cultural rights of Canadians across the country. I refer, of course, to the basic rights of our first Canadians, the Indians and Eskimos. I refer to them at this time, Mr. Speaker, because a statement was made in the house within recent days to the effect that the Liberal Government in Ottawa intends to completely ignore their responsibilities in this respect. Over the relatively short period of five years, they are going to hand over to the provinces the responsibility for looking after the long neglected rights of the Indians. Bearing this in mind, I think the amendment before the house becomes all the more important. It provides the legislative authority for the government in Ottawa to encourage the natural development of any minority language, especially in so far as the use of such language relates to education at the provincial level. I believe this is perhaps the most telling argument I can use in urging the hon. members who support the government to vote for the amendment which would remove some of the more discriminatory aspects of the clause as it applies to other minorities in this country.

This is my final word on the matter at this stage. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been criticizing the press for failing to get the message through to the people of Canada. I suppose this would be his explanation of what happened in Manitoba last week. Someone has said, I think with a good deal of wisdom, that it is not the medium that is at fault so far as government action is concerned, it is the message. I trust the message has been received loud and clear and that we will have the support of the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and all of their colleagues in removing this element of discrimination which is causing a growing feeling of alienation in western Canada and is leading to a protest that can only be compared to that which existed in the 1920's and 1930's.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with the amendment posed by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). As I read his amendment, it has two objects. The first is to provide a written guarantee in the statute that the natural development of any language other than an official language shall not be restrained or restricted. The hon. member uses the words "restrained" and "restricted". The second object of the amendment as I read it is to assist the provinces in encouraging natural development of any such minority language, that is to say any language other than English or French especially with regard to the use of such language in the matter of education.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

From the tenure of the speeches of the hon. members for Peace River, Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) and now the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), the amendment is put forth in the belief, and this is the allegation of the hon. members who spoke, that minority groups in this country which are not of British or French origin feel that somehow they are being discriminated against by the provisions of the official languages bill.

This amendment is very similar in form and content to the one proposed before the special committee by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). As hon. members know, at that time we dealt with it very thoroughly and the arguments relevant and pertaining to the amendment were discussed. In order to deal with it on the floor of the house, I have to repeat some of the words I addressed to the special committee.

When I was in western Canada negotiating with the western Attorneys-General, and on other occasions, I found great concern. I believe this concern is largely as a result of misunderstanding of what this bill is really about. There is great concern that the bill discriminates against those seven million or eight million people who are of neither English or French stock, and that this in effect sets up a type of second class citizenship. I said in committee, and it was expressed in far more eloquent terms before the special committee by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), that this bill in no way alters the relationship of citizenship in this country. As far as this government is concerned there is and always will be, and certainly this is not being altered by the bill itself, only one class of citizen in this country.

Those who have come to this country from other nations as immigrants have found themselves in a position where they have had to accept the facts as they exist. Those who

have come from Europe, Asia and other continents find that there are two languages in general circulation and having general recognition in official and governmental circles. Depending on the part of the country into which they immigrate, they choose either English or French. The riding that I held before it was redistributed out of existence by the commissioners prior to the last election, Montreal-St. Lawrence-St. George, in which the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) grew up when he first came to this country, had at least 45 different language groups. Depending on the language, depending on the associations of the parents and the traditions of a group within the Canadian context, immigrants and their children opted for either English or French.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Most of the Italian community in Montreal opted for French. Practically all of the Greek community opted for English. Of those Canadians of Polish origin, some opted for English and some for French. The same applied to those Canadians of Hungarian origin. In other parts of Canada, and particularly western Canada, the great wave of immigration that populated the west and contributed to making Canada a great country, opted for the English language. The problem is that this is the way the immigrants found the country. This is the way the country is, and there is nothing in the bill or in institutional bilingualism which in any way deprives any of these groups of their own language, or their cultural and community traditions. As a matter of fact, in order to make that perfectly clear clause 38 of the bill is quite categoric:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this act with respect to any language that is not an official language.

The wording in this clause is deliberate. I want to say, in the strongest terms to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), that we accept the fact that his amendment is a sincere attempt to meet the problem that its sponsor sees of reassuring those groups in Canada that are neither of French nor British origin, but through you, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to him that the wording he submits does not achieve any improvement upon clause 38. On the contrary, we have the feeling that the wording proposed by the hon. member for Peace River would inhibit, restrict and curtail rather than enhance the provisions of clause 38.

The problem is that in an attempt to reassure the groups which the sponsors say feel are discriminated against, the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River may raise the very questions that it attempts to resolve. The first paragraph of the amendment reads:

> The right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages shall not be restrained or restricted—

This implies that there is something restricted at the moment, that there are present restrictions in being, and the inference in the amendment is that there may be some restrictions that do not exist at the moment. On the other hand, clause 38 as it now stands is quite categoric and positive in saying that no right, no custom, no privilege, whether enshrined in the law or not, shall in any way be diminished or derogated from by the coming into force of this bill.

I pose this question to the house: Would the amendment proposed cover the present recognition of the right of a person to the assistance of an interpreter if he does not understand or speak the language of a court before which he appears? Certainly, it is more doubtful under the wording of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River than it is under clause 38.

As the hon. member for York South said of this aspect of the amendment in the special committee, and I hope he will pardon me if I quote him:

> I suggest to him—

That is to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk).

> —that the language of the present clause 38 is much wider and it provides much better protection than his subclause (1) for precisely the kind of thing he has in mind. I am confident that the present clause 38 gives much more protection because it is not limited in any way.

Clause 38 is a blanket provision because it does not imply, as the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River does, that there may be present restrictions, and we believe that the purposes sought by the hon. member for Peace River and the other sponsors of the amendment would be better obtained under the categorical provisions of clause 38.

Let us look at the second object of the amendment which is to authorize the Governor in Council, by order in council, to enter into an agreement with the government of any province for the purpose of encouraging the natural development of what is called a

minority language which, within the definition of the amendment, is a language other than French or English.

Mr. Lewis: After the province has passed legislation.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): After the province has passed legislation. First of all, we believe this paragraph of the amendment is out of context in that the bill deals with official languages and this amendment deals with those languages that are not official. Further, it contemplates federal legislation in a matter dealing with education which might well, if spelled out within the context of this bill, involve us in a constitutional problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is always open to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), in the course of the administration of his department, to enter into an agreement to enhance the natural development of any cultural or minority group in this country. We believe that imposing this type of structure goes beyond the scope of the bill and would trespass in rather specific terms on educational matters.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will be finished in about 30 seconds. If this legislation receives the approval of the house, we count on the co-operation of hon. members to dispel any misunderstanding, particularly in western Canada, that there is anything discriminatory in its provisions relating to any cultural or language group in this country. We believe that clause 38 grants a blanket, over-all, complete protection to any Canadian in this country whose mother tongue is neither English nor French, and does it in a positive, categorical way, whereas the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River is more restrictive, is narrower, might well trespass on difficult constitutional ground and would not achieve the results he hopes to achieve but rather would provoke more questions than answers.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): I would like to ask a question relating to the second part of the amendment.

Does the minister want to suggest that the federal government would interfere in an area of provincial jurisdiction, namely education, were a province to decide the adoption of legislation relating to education, and more precisely to languages other than French and English? Would the federal government interfere directly in the field of education if, after such legislation is passed, it were to conclude agreements in order to help that province offer to other minorities a better education in a language which is neither English nor French? Is the minister of the opinion that such action on the part of the federal government would amount to interference in a provincial jurisdiction, since the provincial legislation would already have been passed?

• (4:30 p.m.)

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): That depends again on the terms of the agreement between the province and the federal government. I cannot anticipate all the circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a question because many members of parliament have received letters from Canadian Indians whose native tongue is not one of the official languages. Some of these people, particularly in the province of Quebec, are concerned because rightly or wrongly the missionary penetration in these areas has been by English speaking people, so they speak their native tongue and the English language but do not speak French. They are a little worried about this. In view of the terms of this bill and the fact that the affairs of the Indians are being turned over holus-bolus, to the provinces, they are concerned that perhaps there is to be a different kind of penetration in this area.

Mr. Dinsdale: That is a good question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The question is so hypothetical I have difficulty answering it.

Mr. Dinsdale: It is not hypothetical to the Indians.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister says it is hypothetical, but with the greatest respect I say the Indians do not think that. Does the minister expect that an Indian who speaks a native tongue would have to change to English or French, particularly the senior Indians? Is there any thought that they will have to switch languages?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If I remember and understand the declaration of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern

Development (Mr. Chrétien), I believe he suggested a good deal of consultation between the federal government and the provinces and between the federal government and the Indian bands will be required. But so far as I know, that consideration did not enter into the government's deliberations.

Mr. Dinsdale: Obviously.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the house ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): All those in favour of the said motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded vote on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the house would consider reverting to the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), which was deferred because it was thought advisable to proceed with the other motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

That Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by inserting therein, next following clause 34 thereof, the following new clause:

34A. Where an individual, department or institution is aggrieved by a report or recommendation of the Commissioner, or by a decision made by him or other person or authority acting upon his report or recommendation, the individual, department or institution may appeal in respect of such report or recommendation on a finding of fact, a question of law or a matter of the merits to a superior court of record within thirty days after the individual, department or institution is first informed of the report or recommendation; the court may proceed by way of hearing or review and shall make such order therein as the court deems just and such order shall be final.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before commencing the main argument in respect of my motion I should like to request two small changes in the drafting of the amendment. In the fifth line where it reads "in respect of such report or recommendation" I should like to add the words "and decision". Also, in the eighth line where it reads "informed of the report or recommendation" I should like to add the words "and decision". This would mean that there would be an appeal in respect of the report, recommendation and decision. I wonder whether the house would allow this change.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I shall come immediately to grips with my amendment. It adds a new subclause to clause 34 to cover the following points. Where a Canadian citizen, a department of the federal government, an agency of the government or an institution, which means a Crown corporation or ordinary corporation—private enterprise—feel themselves aggrieved, I believe there should be an appeal when the commissioner makes a report in a particular area and makes a decision as a result of the report. In other words, I feel that where an individual or executive of a department or any agency of the government or any Crown corporation feel themselves aggrieved by a decision made by the all-powerful commissioner, they should have the right of appeal. I think this would affect the rights of Canadian minorities, even the French Canadians, more than English Canadians. I should like particularly to come to grips with what the minister said in his argument.

• (4:40 p.m.)

When he was dealing with the powers of this almighty commissioner, the minister said, as recorded at page 367 of the committee report:

The commissioner is merely an investigator and therefore there would be no reason for an appeal.

All during the minister's speech today he was flattering another member of parliament, and he got some support from the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) in that regard. I should like to read two quotations from the very able speech delivered by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), which appear at page 10347 of *Hansard* of June 17.

He was dealing with this subject of appeal and he said:

It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to stress the importance of this official who is to be the commissioner of our official languages. What I think I should stress is the importance of our having some control over this man who is charged with such an important task. The way he performs that task will affect the destiny of Canada and touch the lives of a great many Canadians. It is in this area that I take exception to this bill. I take exception to the power that parliament has vested in this one man who is to be the commissioner of languages.

Later, on the same page we find this:

I know that the government spokesman in the committee said that the commissioner is not conducting a court, and I agree it is not a court.

I am going to show that I agree it is not a court, but I also intend to show that his powers are as great as, if not greater than, any court in the land. In fact, they are certainly greater than those of the Chief Justice of Canada. The hon. member for Cardigan then said:

But I do not agree that the powers of the commissioner are quite as frivolous or trivial as the minister would have us believe. I should like to put on the record a statement made by the Minister of Justice during the hearings on this bill in committee, as reported at page 367 of report No. 5. This is what the minister said the commissioner is empowered to do:

"The commissioner is an investigator."

The hon. member then made a comment and went on to quote the minister as follows:

The minister continued:

"He proceeds in a purely administrative fashion; his object is not to prosecute or lay charges, or to assess blame or guilt. His job is simply to ensure that the departments of governments, as institutions, are fulfilling the purposes and the spirit of this proposed act. It is not his function to decide or to adjudicate upon the rights or obligations of any individual. It is just not his duty and not in his power."

I was not a member of that committee, although I did appear on several occasions. The hon. member for Cardigan then continued as follows:

I should like to compare that with the statement made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) when he appeared before the same committee and spoke of the powers of the commissioner. This is what the Secretary of State had to say as reported at page 35 of report No. 1:

"The specific task of the official languages commissioner, as I see it, is to make sure that the provisions of the law are enforced, that nobody is lagging behind, that there is truly an effort to enforce this bill as efficiently as possible within the delay set by the bill for the government, in the last clause."

[Mr. Woolliams.]

So I say at the outset that we have two different positions taken. The first was taken by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) on the one hand, who has graciously piloted the bill through for the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), and the other—

Mr. Pelletier: Would the hon. member accept a question? Will he read the sentence following the quotation he has read from what I said before the committee?

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to be able to read it but I have my speech prepared and typed. If the minister said anything different, I am quite prepared to let him read it because I would not want to put anything on the record which might mislead in respect of anything he did say, or misrepresent his ambition in respect of the implementation of this act.

Mr. Pelletier: The first reference is—

Mr. Woolliams: The minister will have an opportunity to make a speech. All we have heard from him so far has been one or two comments. Let me continue with the quotation I was referring to before I flushed out the minister.

If the minister believes the commissioner is merely an investigator, then his function I suggest is similar to that of a police officer or any other person acting in the capacity of a detective—we know what a detective does, he investigates—who investigates some complaint when someone reasonably believes there has been a violation of some law. The police go out and investigate when they reasonably believe there has been a violation of the Criminal Code. When you hired a private detective to find out what was going on in the bedrooms when adultery was the only grounds under the old law of divorce, he investigated. That is what an investigator does.

Let us see what kind of function this little old investigator has. Let me ask these simple questions. Can an investigator, a police officer or a detective under the law of Canada summon witnesses? Can the R.C.M.P. summon witnesses? Can these investigators compel witnesses to come in and give oral and written evidence under oath? The answer is no. If they did, any statement taken in that way would be declared inadmissible by any court of competent jurisdiction.

Can an investigator force a person to produce documents against his will without a

search warrant? Remember, this is just a little old ordinary investigator! Can an investigator administer oaths to witnesses, like a court, while in the process of investigating? What a hue and cry would have gone up in Canada if the R.C.M.P. when investigating in respect of narcotics in Banff, last week end, had called all these youths together and said: on the bible, you are going to swear what you have been doing; what you have been sniffing and what trips you have taken. People would have said that was the greatest invasion of civil rights ever seen in Canada.

Could an investigator hold hearings? Did you ever hear of an investigator holding a hearing in camera locking the doors and pulling down the blinds? Could he then admit evidence under oath and by affidavit in accordance with the rules governing a court of record? That is what this investigator can do. He can use all the powers of any court in the land. This Commissioner has even greater powers than that. He can hear evidence that is not admissible in any court in the land. According to this Minister of Justice, in his suave manner and able argument, this is just merely a little old investigator.

Could an investigator demand that a person complained about confess by affidavit, indicating at least some culpability? If the R.C.M.P. or the city police did that, the statement or affidavit, as the able lawyer knows, would be inadmissible because there would immediately be a voir dire. He knows what would happen. Could an investigator hold a hearing in his private office, in camera without the person who is complained about—sort of a star chamber attack on an accused person—being present or even notified? The hon. member for York South goes along with this. He says the Commissioner is merely an investigator.

This is the kind of power this man has. He can summon witnesses; he can call evidence; he can hold hearings in camera; he can admit affidavits; he can seize documents without a search warrant, yet he is merely like the R.C.M.P., just a casual little old investigator. There is no appeal from that kind of power. We have heard niceties and arguments from the minister in respect of all these acts which are basically judicial procedures. I have sat here for days listening to him talk about the difference between judicial or ministerial acts and judicial procedures. That is straight hogwash, and I am going to quote from the Supreme Court of Canada to show that where a power, whether or not it is administrative, is identical to the powers of a court and where human rights and civil rights are affected there should be some form of appeal.

I wish there were more French Canadians in the chamber listening to me. They are a minority in Canada. What would happen to this nation if—and I hope it does not happen—one government elected with a majority of 150 seats appointed one of these investigators, who then started to run slipshod over the minority of French Canadians in this country? As a trial lawyer, and as a man who believes in civil rights in this nation, I would be the first to raise my voice. I cannot believe the argument the minister has brought in as a red herring, that there is nothing wrong. He suggests that we put this bill through and appoint this almighty and powerful investigator, with all the powers of the courts and the right to go to work on this nation.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: Could a policeman search a place of business without a search warrant? Could he search a government office, a Crown corporation or a government agency without a warrant and without notification, like the S.S. storm troopers used to do all over Germany and all over Europe? In this case, all the investigator will lack is a bicycle. The storm troopers always travelled around on bicycles.

The minister has referred to him as a straight investigator.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: How straight?

Mr. Woolliams: After all these procedures, this all powerful and bilingual God makes recommendations and reports and follows through like the Secretary of State—who is not here now—to see whether someone is acting on the report. He then makes a decision, yet the minister says there should be no appeal from that decision. The minister suggests there is no need for the right of appeal, even though the investigator has that much power. As a matter of fact, it will likely be the same minister or the same head of a department who will make the decision. The commissioner will be entitled to use all the force at his command to find out why his recommendations have not been followed; yet the government says this man is merely an investigator and does not make any decisions. He comes to a decision when he investigates a matter and makes a recommendation in his

report. His recommendations will affect individuals in this country. The decision is made by a department of government. What will the C.B.C., which is a grandiose agency of the government, say if the investigator is allowed to go through all their documents, hear witnesses, take affidavits, hold hearings in camera and change those things which the C.B.C. feels should not be changed? How will the C.B.C. react in this situation? Does the C.B.C. know this bill gives that kind of power to this little, old investigator? Let us consider clause 31 (2) of the bill, which is to be found at page 18 and 19. It provides as follows:

> Where the commissioner is of opinion
>
> (a) that the act or omission that was the subject of the investigation should be referred to any department or other institution concerned for consideration and action if necessary—

This clause refers to an act or omission. That is all the judgment of a court is; it is all the order of an administrative board is. The clause continues:

> (b) that any act or regulations thereunder described in paragraph (b) of subsection (1) should be reconsidered or any practice described in that paragraph should be altered or discontinued, or
>
> (c) that any other action should be taken—

The commissioner will be given the power to act as a result of recommendations he makes in his report. Action spells decision; decision means judgment, or in the case of a board, an order. I emphasize the danger to any minority group in this nation when power is handed to a man who is called an investigator. The commissioner will be all-powerful, chosen by an all-powerful cabinet with an all-powerful majority. Citizens of Canada will be subject to decisions of the commissioner without the right of a hearing. Clause 31 (2) (c) continues:

> —the commissioner shall report his opinion—

I point out that this is what he shall do.

> —and his reasons therefor to the Clerk of the Privy Council and the deputy head or other administrative head of any department or other institution concerned and may in his report make such recommendations with respect thereto as he thinks fit, and, in any such case, may request the department or other institution concerned to notify him within a specified time of the action, if any, that it proposes to take to give effect to his recommendations.

What will happen if a deputy minister refuses to do what the commissioner tells him to do in his recommendation? I am concerned about how these decisions will affect the citizens of my nation. Under the provisions of the bill the livelihood of a Canadian can be taken away by the judgment or decision of one man. In my opinion, this principle is much more dangerous than any we can think about. Surely, the right to hold one's job, to work, to obtain promotion, is the human and civil right of every Canadian. I have some knowledge of jurisprudence, and in my reading of this bill I cannot see that safeguards are written into it for Canadians.

Parliament has been described in glowing terms by the Minister of Justice as the highest court in the land. No one denies this. But this is not a court in which justice is handled expeditiously. If an individual or the head of a department is aggrieved and has to come to this wise institution for a decision, what will happen to his family and his livelihood while parliament moves, since it moves so slowly? How long will it take an individual, a department head, a C.B.C. employee or an employee of Canadian National Railways to obtain justice from this court? God help Canadians! Parliament is a place in which many political influences are exercised. I ask hon. members to just think of the hanky-panky that goes on in committees. Members of the house do things for political reasons.

Mr. Baldwin: Especially the Liberals.

Mr. Woolliams: This is the reason we have an independent judiciary in this country; we need a court to act above politics, a body to do a job without the prejudice which results from political reasoning. I should like to quote from the Ottawa Law Review, Volume 12, page 72, of the fall of 1967 as follows:

> Thus, the real argument is not whether the executive, for example, is exercising legislative or judicial powers which properly belong to parliament or the courts (for no kind of power belongs to any particular authority) but whether the power is being exercised by the authority best suited to exercise it and whether the exercise is sufficiently controlled by political and legal action.

In other words, what is the best body in this democracy of ours to exercise a judicial decision, undertake a review or hear an appeal—parliament, or the courts? The late President Roosevelt wanted a bill passed to increase the number of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States so that the law would be interpreted as he saw fit. That may be right or wrong, but the fact is that the courts are independent of political influence. This institution may be a court, but it is involved with politics. The minister is a political beast; I am a political beast; everyone in this institution is, if he is honest with himself.

Mr. Pelletier: I am not.

Mr. Woolliams: With the exception of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), who says he is not political.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): And I am not a beast.

Mr. Woolliams: As Griffith and Street state, Parliament is not suited for the job of looking after justice, because it lacks independence. By the time a decision has been made some deserving Canadian's job has been on the line, his career is at an end, his university training, his skill, experience, etc., have been thrown in the wastepaper basket.

What will this do to scientific research in this nation? If a French-Canadian scientist is removed from his job because he refuses to speak English, we are denied the talents of this great man. He has no appeal; he is in the hands of this simple, little, old investigator appointed by a very powerful cabinet.

An hon. Member: Time!

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "Time". I can understand that my hon. friends on the government back benches are not interested in civil rights. They have been told by their party to rush this bill through and it does not matter what happens to Canadians.

What will this policy do to the economic decisions of the nation which must be made by dedicated public servants? I do not take this situation as lightly as hon. members opposite. How would the press like this kind of treatment? How would C.B.C. employees like it? How would C.T.V. employees like it? I ask again: Will the employees of the C.B.C. like it? We shall wait and see. May these people have some protection? There should be an appeal to a superior court so that justice not only will be done but will appear to be done. The powers and decisions which will emanate from this commissioner will create real fear in the hearts and minds of all men and women dedicated to the public service. There are approximately 70 federal seats west of the Great Lakes. There are 74 federal seats in the province of Quebec. We talk of national unity; that is the great candy that is always held in front of the Canadian people. There cannot be national unity for one side of the country and not for the other.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I speak for western Canada. People in that part of the country demand justice. Westerners should have an equal opportunity in the Public Service of Canada. They demand justice for the dedicated citizens of Canada in the public service of our country because our universities in western Canada have produced some of the great scientists, lawyers and politicians of our nation just like any other parts of Canada. If they fail to receive this kind of justice, the movements toward separation will grow stronger. I am certain that western Canada, with its some 70 constituencies would ask for the right to appeal. Without it, masses of people of all races and cultures will be discriminated against and science, economy and politics will suffer. This nation will never be able to remove the pockets of poverty in its great urban centres if we cannot compete economically with the rest of the world.

At the flick of an eye in the United States the Canadian stock market descends into the basement and our interest rates ascend into the attic. To remain independent, a nation must receive the best advice in all fields from dedicated men and women in the public service, who must not be discriminated against. Why should a hearing be held in camera? Is that the kind of justice to which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is accustomed? Why should a complaint be made against any person or any department without that person being represented by counsel or without being present?

I wish to quote now the late Mackenzie King, a member of the Liberal party, and I am sure members of that party will agree with these words. They relate to the law which the all-powerful commissioner will be able to implement:

> Now let us come to another point, which I wish particularly to stress. I refer to the right set out in Magna Carta that no man shall be dispossessed of his rights without the lawful judgment of his peers under the law of the land; not the law as made by the Governor in Council, not the law as made by some unnamed and as yet unexisting body, but the law of the land as known to everyone. It is an essential principle of liberty and freedom that the law of the land should be known, that it should be so known that every man as he runs may read. The law should not be something which is to make its appearance in the *Canada Gazette* after some board or Governor in Council, not parliament, has passed a regulation; it is something that should appear in the statutes of the country.

The kind of law that is going to be implemented by the commissioner is not even published in the *Canada Gazette*; it is a secret law. No one knows how the commissioner will exercise his powers, and I challenge any great lawyer or parliamentarian here to tell

us how much power this commissioner will have. We do not know. I should like to read a statement made by Mr. Powers at a time when a number of public servants were arrested because they were allegedly spying for the socialists. They were held in custody without counsel, without a hearing, for days on end by a secret order in council. What did that great Liberal, "Chubby" Powers, have to say? I want to read this to the Liberals here. It reads as follows:

> As for me, brought up in an atmosphere wherein a framed photograph of Magna Carta was on almost every wall, accompanied with a warrant for the execution of Charles I, and steeped through my reading in the traditions of the martyrs of liberty and freedom, I cannot wish to turn back the pages of history 700 years and repeal Magna Carta. I cannot by my silence appear to approve even tacitly what I believe to have been a great mistake on the part of the government. If this is to be the funeral of liberalism I do not desire to be even an honorary pallbearer at the funeral, and I do not wish by not taking part in this debate to give silent approval to the procedure which has taken place.

The Magna Carta says that every man will have a fair hearing. It says that nobody will be held in custody without counsel and that if a complaint is made against a person, he is entitled to be heard. But this bill takes away these inherent rights which this nation and other nations have enjoyed for 700 years. The commissioner can call in a person against whom the complaint is made one quarter of the way through the hearing. If this is to be the just society, then God help the nation and God help justice.

I wish to emphasize therefore that every citizen, every department and every institution should have the right of appeal from the reports and recommendations of the commissioner, or the decisions flowing from the reports made by him, to protect the livelihood and the civil rights of every Canadian. Let me put the following questions to the house. Who can say here today that the language commissioner will be totally free from chicanery? Who can say that he will exercise proper administrative discretion according to natural justice? Who can say that he will always exercise the discretion given to him under the act in a fair, just and legal manner? He hears evidence, good or bad; he holds a hearing; he swears witnesses; he demands documents, and he makes a decision. All this can be done in camera without the public being present and without the person who is accused of any violation of the statute being present. It seems to me that this is in contravention of our civil rights.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The Minister of Justice can argue legal niceties as much as he likes. Men before him, men now, and men after him will use this method, but legal terminology does not determine people's rights. It is as the late prime minister Mackenzie King said: Men and women in Canada must know their rights so well that as they run they may read.

My real concern is for the average men and women in Canada who have no knowledge of the law, whose livelihood will be affected and whose children's education may be brought to an end because some all-powerful officer may make decisions. Their only remedy is to hope that some day parliament will rectify some inequalities. What kind of justice would parliament dispense, made up of politicians, of which I am one? One only has to examine the power of the state in expropriation laws to find out how little justice a citizen receives. When the great state moves, the citizen is squeezed and his civil rights are usurped.

The legal nicety to which I referred is the minister's statement that since the commissioner does not have the power to make judicial decisions there should be no appeal. But I say to him that if the decision that is made, whether it be administrative or judicial, has the same force and effect as a judgment made in a court or a judgment of an administrative board, then those persons who consider themselves aggrieved should have the right of appeal. Why does the minister oppose natural justice? What is he afraid of? If he ignores this plea, never again will he be looked upon as a great reformer. Why do the promoters of this legislation fear appeal? Why do they fear a public hearing? The great dictators of Europe gave no right of hearing to six million people who met death without a defence. The discretionary power was executed in an administrative fashion, but let us remember that these people were executed as effectively as a convicted murderer who dies on the scaffold, the only difference being that they had committed no crime against society with the exception of belonging to a different race and a different culture.

Now, I should like to refer to some of the cases in connection with the administrative law. I want to deal with a case in the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not think time will permit me to read the decisions of Mr. Justice Rand and Mr. Justice Abbot, who sat here in the distinguished position of minister of finance. Let us consider the facts in the Roncarelli versus Duplessis case, if administrators can be trusted. There was a

man who belonged to the Jehovah's witnesses sect. He had a liquor licence from the provincial government but because he believed in a certain kind of religion and because he had bailed out of jail some people who belonged to that sect, they took away his licence to sell liquor. Suppose there were no appeal from that decision, what would happen then? The only reason an appeal was possible in his case was that under the great Anglo-Saxon traditions, an appeal can be made to the Supreme Court of Canada in a case where a decision is contrary to natural justice and where civil rights are eroded and usurped. The ruling was that no administrator, no premier and no powerful executive could cancel a man's licence because he held a certain religious beliefs.

• (5:10 p.m.)

That is the kind of law I want to see in this nation, not the kind of law set out by one man with all this power. This is why we need provision for appeal. Incidentally, the case to which I have just referred is cited in S.C.R. 1959 at page 123. Mr. Justice Rand said:

To deny or revoke a permit because a citizen exercises an unchallengeable right totally irrelevant to the sale of liquor in a restaurant is beyond the scope of the discretion conferred upon the commission by the Alcoholic Liquor Act.

The judge went on to point out the danger inherent in such a situation. Mr. Justice Abbott said he was shocked to find the act being administered in such a way. But I would have been even more shocked if there had not been the right of appeal to the Supreme Court against this kind of erosion of a man's civil rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: There is, of course, developing in the British courts a line of law which holds that when the scope of an act has been exceeded there is always the right to appeal to the courts on the grounds that natural justice has been denied. Viscount Kilmuir had this to say after reviewing the operation of powerful administrative boards in Great Britain:

We are firmly of the opinion that all decisions of tribunals should be subject to review by the courts on points of law. This review could be obtained either by proceedings for certiorari or by appeal.

If tribunals act in a judicial capacity and make errors in law, Viscount Kilmuir recommends that the decision may be quashed by order of certiorari in England.

The courts in Scotland do not, however, exercise this jurisdiction to quash a decision for error of law on the face of the record. Moreover, an application to quash a decision on this ground is quite different from an appeal on a point of law.

In the former case the court can only quash the decision, while in the latter case the court may substitute, or in effect substitute, its own decision. Again, in the former case, the court must find the error if it can, on the face of the record. It cannot look at anything else. In the latter case the court can in addition look at the notes of the evidence given before the tribunal if the point of law is whether there was evidence on which the tribunal could in law have arrived at its decision.

But here, as the Minister of Justice so ably stated, where an act is interpreted as being an administrative act, not a judicial act, there is no right to quash the decision of a board, as was done in the case to which I have just referred involving the cancellation of an individual's liquor licence.

These special remedies which exist in the law are good. But they depend upon astute and able lawyers if they are to be effective. Why can the procedure not be simplified so that whenever an individual or an agency of the government feels aggrieved there is the right of review by a judge. If the judge says he believes the commissioner acted in accordance with the principles of law and natural justice, there will be no problem. But if the commissioner goes beyond the scope allotted to him, a remedy will be possible. It is only by granting this right of appeal that the rights of Canadians can be protected. This is why Viscount Kilmuir, after holding hearings throughout Great Britain, said the only thing to do was to give the right of appeal to individuals, to agencies, to Crown corporations, or anyone else affected.

I agree with this recommendation. All lawyers—and the Minister of Justice is no exception—fear today that an all-powerful state is infringing on the rights of individuals. The only way to safeguard the rights we now enjoy is by writing into our laws provision for appeal to an independent judiciary. Otherwise we may find, in this case, that the livelihood of many an individual in the public service is in jeopardy. No one can say that the points I have raised in this regard are not worthy of serious consideration. The other day the Secretary of State said I had made an emotional speech. Well, I have spent days and nights reviewing this situation and reading what has been said about it. Whenever I read decisions and recommendations by the courts I find they all reach the same conclusion. The courts are now holding that the rules or principles of natural justice are in themselves a sufficiently independent criterion of review as

to provoke their intervention without there being any question of excess of jurisdiction.

In the case of Ridge v. Baldwin in 1964, the House of Lords held that the decision of the Watch Committee of the Town of Brighton to dismiss the chief of police and so deprive him of the right to a pension was null *ab initio* because he was not given an opportunity to be heard. In this case, the highest judicial authority in England formally declared that the violation of the rule of natural justice is a separate and independent criterion which the courts may use as the basis for review of the legality of administrative acts or decisions of a judicial or quasi judicial character.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) says, if I understand him correctly, that we in this country have labour boards from whose decisions there is no provision for appeal. Mr. Speaker, there are statutes so numerous that it would take me all night to enumerate them, which do give the right to appeal. Let us consider the famous case of Calgary Power v. Copithorne in 1959. Calgary Power had expropriated a certain amount of land, and there was no right of appeal provided. The courts held that because the terms of the statute had been exceeded the decision could nevertheless, be appealed. But what ordinary citizen can afford the luxury of justice in such cases? Let me show hon. members how much justice can cost. Eighteen men stand charged in Calgary for bookmaking. The preliminary hearing lasted ten days—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much.

If each of the accused is represented by a lawyer, what does it cost to get to trial? The evidence in the preliminary hearing costs $2,000, so, those court reporters want $2,000 from each of the 18 accused. So, it would cost at least $36,000 to get into a court of justice in this country. The point I am making is this: where one has to rely on special, prerogative rights and remedies, the situation becomes both expensive and complex, requiring highly skilled and efficient lawyers. I say to the Minister of Justice and to the Secretary of State that what we need is a simple right to appeal, so that when a report or decision is made which adversely affects any individual, whether French speaking or English speaking, such a person, if he feels aggrieved, may have his case reviewed by a judge. If he has been wrongfully dismissed, he could be reinstated by that same judge. Then, whether he is a scientist, or an economist, or a medical specialist, Canada will not be denied the benefit of his skills, and we can move toward the affluent society to which we all look forward on the basis of the resources available to us. We can learn to compete in world markets with our wheat, our oil, and our industrial products.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

• (5:20 p.m.)

I end with these words. I hope the Minister of Justice is not going to say that this is only an administrative decision. I do not care whether the decision is made by a board, a court or an individual; if that decision carries the weight of a judgment that affects the human rights of Canadians, particularly the right of a Canadian to make a living, then the person concerned should be heard. The door should be open to him. No decision should be made in camera. He must have the right to counsel, and he must have the right to the best counsel available.

If this government denies these privileges to Canadian citizens, it is doing them the gravest injustice. The principle of the bill, I endorse. The principle itself is good. Why destroy this great principle by denying Canadian citizens the right to be heard in the way I have suggested? I warn Canadians, and particularly French Canadians, that without this right of appeal it is they who stand to lose.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) but I must say that his speech this afternoon was a rerun in colour of a speech he made on an earlier occasion in this house with regard to an earlier amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) which related to clauses 28, 29 and 30 of this bill. My remarks will be brief because I should like to refer Your Honour and other hon. members to the reply that I made on a rather enthusiastic evening to the hon. member for Calgary North, to be found on page 10363 of *Hansard* for June 18, and which dealt in substance with the powers of the official languages commissioner, the

nature of his duties and the sanctions he has at his command.

In concluding his speech the hon. member said that he does not want any Canadian citizen to have his civil rights adversely affected by any decision carrying the weight of a judgment and affecting those civil rights. Nor do I. I will not take second place to the hon. member—indeed, he would not expect me to—in his support of civil rights in this country. It is because no decision of the official languages commissioner does have the force or weight of a judgment that every argument adduced by the hon. member this afternoon is absolutely irrelevant—and I say that with the greatest respect—to the scope of the bill and the powers of the commissioner.

Let me summarize as briefly as I can what it is the official languages commissioner does. First of all, he is not a court. He performs an investigatory or fact finding function. He in no way can attach a sanction or penalty to any individual, whether within or without the public service of Canada. His job is to ensure that the departments and agencies of the government are meeting the spirit and letter of the law, the official languages bill.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister would not dare permit a question at this point.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member will appreciate that I should like to keep my speech coherent, and this does become difficult when he puts a question.

Mr. Horner: Deal with line 41 of clause 28.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The official languages commissioner has as his function, and his sole function, to ensure that departments and agencies of the government fulfil the spirit and letter of the law. His sanction against those departments is limited to a report that is made to the deputy head of the department; to a report that is made to the minister of the department; and if no action is taken on a particular investigation, to a report that is made to parliament itself. Under clause 33 and clause 34 of the bill he has a duty to report on an annual basis to parliament.

What the hon. member is suggesting to the house is that this administrative function of comparing the operation of a department or agency of the government with the requirements of the bill ought to be reviewed by a court of law. This is an institutional situation affecting policy and administration. Surely, we do not want to have the administration of government at an institutional level referred to the courts or reviewed by the courts. What is the position vis-à-vis individuals? I said on an earlier occasion that this commissioner has no power to fine, no sanction or penalty to impose. He decides no rights either for or against any member of the public service or agency of government.

Mr. McQuaid: He recommends.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He makes a report to parliament. So far as any recommendation he may make is concerned, any public servant, any member of a department or agency of the government, has the right to be heard and, if necessary, to be represented by counsel; and this is adequately set forth in clause 28.

With regard to the rights of an employee of the government or a public servant being indirectly affected by a report, which after all is directed to the department concerned, through the department to the deputy head, and thence to the minister of that department, that employee has his rights protected under his collective agreement with the public service and as set forth under statute in the Public Service Employment Act. Those rights are in no way forfeited or restricted, and they are protected by the present law and by collective agreements.

That is my reply, in brief, to the hon. member. May I refer the hon. member for Calgary North to the speech he heard two weeks ago. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the government, the complete answer to his contention that a judicial review or an appeal is necessary here is that the hon. member has misread the functions of the commissioner. The commissioner in no way exercises a quasi-judicial function or a judicial function. Therefore there is no scope in the bill for a judicial review in the courts. That is quite clear.

I am quite familiar with the Roncarelli case to which he referred dealing with the role and function of the police in regard to individual rights, penalties and crimes.

Mr. Woolliams: And loss of licence.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No loss of licence is created by this bill. There is no penalty attaching to an individual member of a department; nowhere in the bill is there that provision.

May I summarize the argument once again? The hon. member has misread the scope of the commissioner's powers. With the greatest

respect he has misread the duties of the commissioner as set out in the bill. They relate to government departments. So far as individual rights are concerned, these are preserved under collective agreements and under the Public Service Employment Act, and they are in no way jeopardized by the provisions of this bill. The hon. member has altogether misread the commissioner's powers.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Calgary North rising to pose a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The minister said he was familiar with the case law, particularly the Copithorne case. In that case, a cabinet minister acting on behalf of the Alberta cabinet made a decision in regard to a man by the name of Copithorne which affected that man's rights. As a result, the decision was appealed on the ground that the executive had gone beyond its powers.

I should like to ask the minister this. Assume that a deputy minister loses his job or is demoted; or perhaps he is discriminated against. Surely, such a person has the right to appeal and to say that the commissioner, or the executive, or the minister concerned, has done something that is against the law of natural justice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I do not know whether the minister wants to answer the question first, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: He cannot answer it.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The question turned into a speech.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, we in this party made it very clear that we do not think this is a perfect bill, or that we approve of all its principles. We want it to work. We have also made amendments. We felt that the failure to give a person the right to a public hearing in the case of an adverse report was a serious defect of the bill. We pointed this out to the minister, but he did not agree with us.

I must say that, although I listened to the predictably eloquent speech of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), I was not convinced by it. In my judgment, the amendment is unnecessary. If it did anything, it would militate against a satisfactory working of the act. The reason the amendment is unnecessary was indicated by the hon. member for Calgary North. As a lawyer, he is naturally familiar with this. He pointed out that if the commissioner exceeds the authority given to him by the statute, if he declines to exercise the jurisdiction given to him, if he disregards the rules of natural justice or elementary fairness, he can be restrained by the courts by motions, writs or other processes that the court has.

The granting of the right of appeal is a very different thing indeed. The right of appeal means that even while the commissioner is still acting under the authority given to him, still acting in perfect fairness, the appeal can be dragged out for years. This would tie up the effective working of the commissioner and the act. One of the main reasons the appeal is inappropriate is the reason given by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) a while ago. There is no such thing as an inherent right of appeal to the courts from every administrative tribunal, as was suggested by the hon. member for Calgary North. Quite the contrary is the case.

This is a matter that has been the subject of controversy for decades. In many cases the rights of appeal are being limited to the major items covered by such things as a prerogative writs, yet the amendment before us grants a right of appeal without any finding of fact, question of law or matter of the merits. This right would take something away from the commissioner appointed under this act and put the effective administration of this act in the hands of the courts. As much as I respect the courts, I want to make it clear I think they are entirely unsuitable tribunals for this particular purpose. When the Norris-LaGuardia bill, which confirmed or certified the rights of collective bargaining by unions, was passed in the United States, the process blew up because there were rights of appeal given. The appeals in relation to that matter were before the court for four years, and at the end of the four years the union was no longer in existence. There are many such cases. I think this is pre-eminently a case where the decisions of administrative tribunals should not be subject to appeal through the courts of the land.

As I have stated, the courts have their function. If there is a disregard of jurisdiction, unfairness, a breach of fundamental rights, they can be called into question in the courts which will consider every finding of

fact by the commissioner and give an expression of opinion on the merits. The right to appeal to the courts would invite chaos and, I suggest, the destruction of the effective purpose of the act. I do not have the slightest hesitation in saying that this administrative tribunal is not the sort that lends itself to a general right of appeal. Like the minister I do not want to take second place to anyone who might be concerned with individual human rights and rights of appeal. I say the right of appeal is not a right that has to be preserved or is required to be preserved in this particular case.

I find it odd, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member himself was not convinced of his case at the proceedings of the special committee on the official languages bill. I have the official transcript, No. 4, of the minutes of proceedings and the evidence taken on June 10, 1969. It appears, as reported on page 305, that the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) moved an amendment in similar form which read:

(2) Any person who considers himself aggrieved by an investigation, a report, or a recommendation of the Commissioner may appeal in respect thereof to a judge of a superior court of record within sixty days of the day he is informed of the report or recommendation.

That amendment, in substance, is the same as we have had presented to us here today. In the course of the discussion, my colleague the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), made a number of objections to the amendment which I would like to read into the record because they represent my views on this subject, and I endorse them then. I quote from page 307:

Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the reasons which moved Mr. McQuaid to think in the terms of this amendment; however, I cannot support it for the following reasons: first for the reasons given by Mr. Stanbury and Mr. Cantin that—and it seems to me that there should not be anything in the law which suggests that the Commissioner has any authority other than that of an administrative officer making an inquiry to report to the authorities, with the competence to make a decision—anything in here that suggests that he does anything else, something from which you can appeal, is to suggest, I think, something that is not within the confines of the law.

Secondly, it seems to me that if this law is to work, that the responsibility is on the Minister and all the people under him in a department. It is on the management of the public corporations and the agencies; they have to be held responsible by the Members of Parliament in the end result.

Thirdly, I do not think that the court is the forum for this kind of thing. I am a lawyer and I show the courts the respect they deserve, in particular instances; however, I do not think that a court is a place for this kind of thing.

The Chairman: Do you have a supplementary question or a point of order?

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order. We might save some time, and Mr. McQuaid and I were discussing this. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Lewis; I am not trying to interrupt; we can save time. If you would hear Mr. McQuaid, now, you would save a lot of speeches, because he is prepared—I think the point is well taken. You are really into an investigation. You cannot appeal an investigation in the sense, because it then becomes an administrative act of someone to take some action on something.

The Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. Woolliams. Mr. Lewis is agreed. Mr. Matte, could we go now to Mr. McQuaid? Mr. Matte may want to say something afterwards on the subject,—

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sure my distinguished friend does not want to misrepresent the facts. When I was talking about a decision, I said I did not believe there should be a right of appeal from an investigation; with that I agree. If the hon. member reads my amendment, he will see there was no amendment of that kind or calibre moved in the committee.

I am talking about a recommendation which goes to a deputy minister and upon which he makes a decision. From the decision or recommendation of the deputy minister, or any agency or person, which flows from the report of the commissioner, there should be a right of appeal. I agree that you cannot appeal an investigation by the police. They may say there is nothing here or there may be something here. I am talking about an appeal. I want that clarified because I saw my friend from York East (Mr. Otto) smiling. He thinks the member for Calgary North has put himself into an untenable position.

Mr. Brewin: Is that a point of order?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, it is a point of order. The hon. member would not want to misquote me in any way. I took the same position in the committee as I take now, and have always taken, with reference to an appeal from a decision.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has made a somewhat vehement point of order. So far as I am concerned it is no point of order, but apart from that I can see no substantial difference between the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) in the committee and the present amendment. It dealt with the right of appeal, and I had not quite reached the punchline in this. I quote:

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Chairman, I think I am convinced that this is not a necessary amendment—

Apparently convinced by the hon. member for Calgary North.

—I am prepared to withdraw it. I can see now, although I must confess I did not see before, that the reason we are sitting here is to be enlightened.

And so the amendment was withdrawn. I cannot speak with the emphasis and the volume of the hon. member for Calgary North, but I can say that there is not the slightest doubt in the world that the amendment he advised his colleague, the hon. member for Cardigan, to withdraw was in substance the amendment that is now before the house. At that time they did not see any merit in it, and I suggest there is no merit in it now. I suggest it should be defeated.

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to rise on another point of order, Mr. Speaker. I say this, as the minister and others have said, that this is the highest court in the land and it is entitled to an interpretation. I am not going to be unkind, even though the hon. member referred to my volume. I might be unkind and refer to his tone, but I point out that the amendment I moved today is an amendment in relation to decisions. It is different from the previous one. It was drawn up by a draftsman and myself. It had nothing to do with the group of people who sat on the special committee. I asked my party could they accept it, and a party decision was made accepting it. I am not going to be misquoted and misrepresented. If the hon. member wants to get nasty, in return I would ask him to put his voice on a tape and if it hasn't got a bit of a squeak in it, then there isn't a squeak in this house.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two about this amendment and I shall not be loud or long. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is doing an honourable job in piloting this piece of legislation through the house, a piece of legislation in which he does not really believe. I commend him for the job he is doing, and I point out that his heart and soul are not in it. That is clearly evident from the reasoning and the logic that he has been using. The minister would be the first to admit that the bill gives the commissioner the right to report. Does not this bill give this commissioner the right to report to the government, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would invite the hon. member to address his remarks through the Chair.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Mr. Horner: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I got a little carried away, and I wanted a clear cut answer to the question I was posing. I think the Minister of Justice would agree that the commissioner does have the right to report to a member of the cabinet, but we have not been told to which minister. I am sure also the Minister of Justice will agree that the commissioner reports from an inquiry held in private. In other words, his opinion is based on a private inquiry held about somebody or some department. It is hard to say whether the opinion he reaches is based on valid or invalid premises, since the inquiry itself has been held in private. If it is based on invalid or false premises it should be immediately disregarded, but how can the public judge if the inquiry is in private.

Time and time again, the minister has said that no action will be taken on the commissioner's reports which will be laid before the public, and that the onus will be on the government and the public to determine whether or not action is really necessary. But how will the public be in a position to know whether action is necessary when the reports are based on private inquiries? It has often been said that justice must not only be done but it must appear to be done. How can it appear to be done in these cases when inquiries are held in private? A few minutes ago the minister spoke about the individual's rights which are written into the bill, and said that these rights were included in clause 28. They are not. The only rights written into clause 28 are the rights of the commissioner. This clause states that if the commissioner, at any time during the course of an investigation, deems that there may be sufficient grounds for making a report that may adversely affect an individual he shall give that individual an opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism.

By contrast the amendment proposes the right of appeal. Nobody can convince me that we should not establish the right of appeal, particularly when opinions are formed on the basis of a private investigation that may condemn an individual. The commissioner has the right to report, recommend and condemn. Lest the Minister of Justice take exception to that let him read line 41 in clause 28. I start reading at line 40 as follows:

—a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism.

• (5:50 p.m.)

That is clear enough. The commissioner may make a report that may be adverse to or may offer adverse criticism of an individual or a department. Whether the minister likes it or not, the fact of the matter is that the minister's opinions will be formulated in private and the accused person or persons will have no right of appeal because that right is not written into this bill any place. I challenge the minister to stand in his place and say in what line of what clause the right to be heard is written into this bill. There is a right to be heard in clause 28 if the commissioner really wants to hear the person, but that is the only clause which deals with such a complaint. The rights of an accused person or a department are not written into this bill in any place. The evidence is gathered in private. The individual is condemned in private and the public and the government will judge him. He has no right to recourse whatsoever under this bill as it now stands. To me it would seem that the opinions may be formulated on a pretty invalid and false premise. I suggest the public should be present to witness and judge whether or not the premise on which the opinions were formulated was sound, and in fact represented what actually happened in respect of the administration of the department or the carrying out of the person's responsibility.

I believe this is a very important amendment. I shall not become involved in the judicial question of whether or not an appeal should be allowed from an administrative tribunal, but I believe that right should be written into the bill somewhere. Whether the appeal is to the supreme court, to the minister, to the cabinet or to parliament itself, there should be the right of appeal. The evidence should be gathered in public and the person should have the right to be heard, period, and not "if". A few minutes ago, the minister said about three times that the individual has this right. Nowhere in this bill is he given this right. The commissioner may—and I emphasize the point because I believe it is extremely important—if he feels someone is adversely affected grant a public hearing. This is not good enough. Knowing the Minister of Justice, I realize he cannot stand up in his place and wholeheartedly support the position of his government on this bill because his heart and soul is not in this administration. He is just doing yeoman service for an all-powerful commissioner and giving no rights whatsoever to the individual. I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I need no more than the three or four minutes left before six o'clock. I am sorry the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has had to leave. I rise mainly to deal with his alleged point of order and to say also—I am sorry to say this in his absence—that the good natured jocular remark of my friend the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) did not justify the boorish retort of the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: —for Calgary North. The hon. member for Calgary North can speak in volume or by squeaks or in any other way he likes, but the fact is that the amendment which the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) withdrew on the advice of the hon. member for Calgary North before the special committee is precisely the same amendment which is now before this chamber. When he says he is being misrepresented, it is he who is misrepresenting the situation. No one is misrepresenting him.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Cardigan before the special committee, which my friend the hon. member for Greenwood read, stated that any person who considered himself aggrieved by an investigation, a report or recommendation of the commissioner may appeal to a court. The amendment we are now discussing says that where an individual, department or institution is aggrieved by a report or recommendation of the commissioner or by a decision made by him or other person or authority acting upon his report, and so on, they may appeal. It is true that the hon. member for Calgary North has now added the word "decision" and taken out the word "investigation" which was in the amendment with which we dealt before the special committee, but in his amendment he has included an appeal from the report and recommendation of the commissioner as did the hon. member for Cardigan in his amendment.

That is the guts of the thing. The appeal from the action of the minister or department which is suggested in the amendment now before us is irrelevant to this bill. That appeal is relevant to the normal channels of grievance procedure. A person who is aggrieved can still go to court. The law cases contain many examples of people going to court when they think they are aggrieved. I

say, despite the volume, or whatever, of the hon. member for Calgary North, the fact is that in substance the same amendment came before the special committee. The hon. member for Calgary North agreed with me that it was a bad amendment. The hon. member for Cardigan agreed with both of us that it was a bad amendment and withdrew it. To have it back here is just sheer silliness, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my view the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

It being six o'clock this house stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 3, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING TIME ALLOTMENT—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: Order. A point of order was raised yesterday by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in respect of a notice of motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) dealing with proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the house. Other hon. members, including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) supported the contention that the minister's motion should not be accepted by the Chair for purposes of transfer to government orders pursuant to Standing Order 21. The President of the Privy Council argued in support of the government's position. At the conclusion of the procedural debate I undertook to study the arguments advanced in the course of the discussion and to make an early ruling.

Stated briefly, the problem is whether the government can set down a motion that follows substantially the terms of a committee report presented to the house, but the concurrence of which has not yet been moved by the committee chairman. I must remind hon. members that the Speaker can only rule on points of order and questions of procedure. The decision to be made at this time is whether it is procedurally in order to transfer the minister's motion for debate. During the discussion yesterday serious questions of principle were raised by hon. members who questioned the propriety of a government motion which, if proceeded with, might in effect block the discussion of a motion to concur in the report of a standing committee.

It has been suggested that the government's motion as it now stands is in contempt of the house; and that the Chair, on its own initiative, should determine that the house will consider the proposed rules changes within the framework of the committee report rather than under the heading of the proposed motion. I am not convinced that the question can be considered by the Chair in those terms.

Generally speaking, hon. members who have taken part in the procedural argument in opposition to the government, have based their objections on the rule of anticipation. It is of interest to note that while the British practice in reference to this rule is sufficiently clear, the same cannot be said about Canadian precedents where attempts have been made to apply the rule to our own Canadian practice. The difficulty stems from the fact that the British Commons' standing orders include a specific rule on this subject. Standing Order 11 of the British House of Commons is as follows:

> In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the house within a reasonable time.

In our own house, we have attempted over the years to develop a practice which has no support in our own standing order and where British precedents are not always relevant. If hon. members will study May's definition of the rule, they will see that the rule relates to discussion or debate of a matter already set down, and not to the setting down itself of an item of business on the order paper.

Campion's third edition, at page 180, indicates that the anticipation rule applies to the discussion by anticipation of an order already set down by the house. But, there is nothing in our rules and no precedent in Canadian parliamentary practice to prevent the setting down of more than one bill or motion dealing with the same subject. No precedents have been quoted by hon. members who took part in yesterday's procedural debate that could support the contention that the minister's motion cannot appear on the order paper along with a notice of motion to be moved in similar terms by a committee chairman.

What we are concerned with at the moment is whether the minister's notice of motion can be transferred for debate under government orders. Standing Order 21 is perfectly clear on this point. The rule is as follows:

> When any other government notice of motion is called from the Chair, it shall be deemed to have been forthwith transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders in the same or at the next sitting of the House.

Once the motion has been transferred for debate under government orders it becomes the government's decision and the government's responsibility to decide whether it will proceed with its motion. It is at that point that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) has been at liberty for several days to proceed with his motion. Indeed, he could move it later this day if he wishes to do so.

On the other hand, that notice of motion cannot be used to "block" consideration of the government's notice of motion. It is suggested that the question of priority should not be confused with the rule of anticipation.

At this time the notice of motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has priority because of its present position on the order paper. If the hon. member has not moved his motion when it is called later today, the Chair will have no alternative, at the appropriate moment in our proceedings, but to order that the notice of motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council, be transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 21.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS SIGNED BY CANADA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table in French and English a number of international agreements which have recently been signed by Canada, subject to ratification or have entered into force in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton? Stands.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Gatineau? Stands.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING TIME ALLOTMENT

On the order: Government notices of motions: June 26, 1969—The President of the Privy Council:

That the Standing Orders of the house be amended by adding the following new Standing Orders immediately after Standing Order 75:

75A. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the house, states that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to allot a specified number of days or hours to the proceedings at one or more stages of any public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

75B. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the house, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation; provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

75C. A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the house at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the house or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 21 (2) this notice of motion is transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders later today or at the next sitting of the house.

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSULTATION ON IDENTITY OF COMMISSIONER AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether he will assure the house that the National Indian Brotherhood or some other representative of the Indian body will be fully consulted about the terms of reference and the identity of the commissioner proposed to be appointed, in place of a full claims commission?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I met with the members of this National Indian Brotherhood last Thursday and I discussed the problem with them. I told them that finally the appointment of a commissioner was the responsibility of the government but that I was open to their suggestions regarding possible applicants and that if they did not make any, I would advise them of the appointee selected by the government.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: When will the commissioner be appointed and under what authority? In other words, will he be appointed under the Public Inquiries Act, some other statute or some other authority?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner will be appointed as soon as possible, I hope, and the appointment will come under the federal Inquiries Act.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: I take it that means under the Public Inquiries Act. Is it a fair summary of the proposed duties of the commissioner that he will decide whether or not there is to be a claims commission and, if so, what claims would be permitted to go before that commission?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner's duties will be announced upon his appointment, and we will table a copy of the order in council in the house.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he would consult with his colleagues in the government to determine whether he might be prepared to consider his basic premise in respect of the operation of the commissioner, so that the commissioner might be an agent of the Indian people rather than an agent of the government?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner will be nobody's agent but a man appointed by the government of Canada to represent all Canadians, including parliament and the Indians themselves.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ADMINISTRATION TRANSFER—DISCUSSION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE BEFORE APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could he tell us if his offer to transfer the administration of Indian affairs to the provinces has been accepted by all Canadian provinces?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, this is not a short term policy. We shall enter upon numerous negotiations with the Indians and the provincial authorities. In fact, I intend, beginning this week, to visit the various provincial capitals in order to meet the leaders of Indian organizations and of provincial governments.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister assure the house and the country that all proper complaints which the Indian people may have as to breaches of treaty of one kind or another will be the subject of consideration by the commissioner and by the parliament of Canada in due course?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, in the terms of reference, it will be established of course that the government intends to abide by the treaties and any claim from the Indian people as regards treaties shall certainly be considered by the commissioner.

[*English*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the

intention of the government to continue making the treaty payments, or will this be a matter for negotiation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we do not intend now to discontinue the payments we are making to the Indian people under the treaties.

[*English*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the terms of reference under which the commissioner will operate be discussed in detail with the Indians before the commissioner is appointed and given his duties to perform?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Indians and their claims, we have been discussing such matters with them for a year. However, the final decision always rests with the government which must assume responsibility for the decision.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Témiscamingue wish to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

SUBMISSIONS BY CAUGHNAWAGA IROQUOIS—REPRESENTATION ON COMMISSION

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister.

Could he tell us first of all—my question is twofold—whether the Caughnawaga Iroquois have made representations asking to come under either the federal government or the provincial government?

Secondly, have the Caughnawaga Indians asked to be represented on the commission with a view to submitting claims to or dealing with the federal government? Finally, and this is vital, do they wish to come under provincial rather than federal jurisdiction?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we intend to have discussions with all Indians in every province, including the province of Quebec. When we go to the province of Quebec to negotiate, we will meet with the leaders of the Quebec Brotherhood of Indians and those of the provincial government.

[Mr. Korchinski.]

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR OUTLINE OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION—RIGHTS OF ST. REGIS RESERVE INDIANS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. If the minister is not prepared to give the house an idea of the terms of reference of the commission, is he not prepared to give the house a brief description of the function and task the commissioner is to perform?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition had taken the trouble to read the government's statement on its policy concerning Indian affairs, he would have found there some most useful information.

[*English*]

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In connection with the government's new policy on Indian affairs, can the minister give his assurance that nothing will be done to limit the existing rights and privileges of Indians residing on the Canadian side at the St. Regis reserve and working in plants on the United States side?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, since the matter of customs duties and the free crossing of the border by Indians come under the Minister of National Revenue, I think the question should be put to him.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification. In connection with the situation where a reservation straddles the international boundary, could the minister make a statement on motions or persuade his colleague the Minister of National Revenue to make a statement that will clarify the matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, that matter is the responsibility of the Minister of National Revenue. I will inform him of the hon. member's representations.

[*English*]

RESEARCH

REQUEST FOR CESSATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. It arises out of the report on chemical and biological weapons

prepared by a committee of 14 at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations and released by the Secretary General of that organization. In view of the terrible consequences of the use of such weaponry as indicated in the report, would the Prime Minister consider ceasing immediately the defence research activities in this field now carried on at Shirleys Bay and Suffield, Alberta?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): It might be well to remind the house that any use of this research would be merely for the purpose of defence. This being said, however, I should like to state that a few weeks ago I reported to the house that I asked that this question be reviewed by the government, so that we may have a better understanding of what is going on in this area in Canada. This review is not yet completed.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the report of this committee of experts on the research into the alleged defensive measures is not likely to be very useful, and in view of the appeal of the Secretary General of the United Nations for a treaty banning the use of such weaponry, would the Prime Minister be prepared today to state the government's intention to support that appeal and to support any initiatives taken to arrive at an agreement on the use of these weapons.

Mr. Trudeau: Under the Geneva protocol these questions are already being discussed. There is a difference of opinion among the countries concerning the meaning of biological and bacteriological warfare and whether or not bacteriological warfare includes biological warfare. This is the point of contention among the signatories to the protocol. However, Canada's position has been, as the hon. member suggests, to favour a greater restriction of the use of such weaponry, and our representatives on the disarmament committee have been instructed to proceed accordingly.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE—TRANSFER OF MATERIALS ACROSS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question which I wish to direct this time to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On June 23 last I asked the minister to inform the house as to how the materials used in the research at Shirleys Bay and at Suffield, Alberta, got there and how they were transported from one point in Canada to another, if that is where the material comes from, or from the United States to these points in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not remember exactly when the hon. member asked the question. My recollection, however, is that I had thought, at least to myself, that that question might be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Lewis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister said at that time that he would inquire into the matter. In fact, he said that he would have to take the question as notice. Perhaps he has some information which he can give us, without doing violence to the rules.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer I have is very simple, and that is that the Minister of National Defence will answer the question tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: That is passing the germ.

[*Translation*]

WATER RESOURCES

REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION ON HYDRAULIC DEVELOPMENT—EXPORT OF WATER TO U.S.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Can he tell the house if he intends to introduce at the next session a bill on Canada's water policy? If so, does he intend to consult the provinces on that matter before hand?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I doubt that it is in order to ask the Prime Minister for information on the bills which may be introduced at the next session. I fear that if we allow this kind of question, we will unduly prolong the question period. Moreover, if the hon. member feels there is any urgency to his question, it might be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rephrase my question and ask the Prime Minister whether the Canadian government was represented at the conference held in Banff, Alberta, last week, with respect to the export of water to the United States?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will have to inquire about that, Mr. Speaker, but as far as I know, the Canadian government was not represented at a conference held in Banff last week.

[*English*]

GRAIN

BOX CAR DISTRIBUTION—EXTENSION OF CROP YEAR

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the statement by Mr. E. K. Turner of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that a shortage of boxcars was holding up the flow of grain to space in the terminals at the Lakehead and Vancouver, can the minister report to the house on the action being taken to alleviate this condition?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I think the best thing I could do to answer this question would be to read the message sent on this subject by the chief commissioner of the Wheat Board to the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. In his telegram the chief commissioner says:

> Would advise that railways have been concentrating on provision of box cars to lowest quota points and will continue to do so until end of crop year . . . Would further advise that both railways currently have a very substantial number of cars under load to lakehead and Pacific coast and are spotting cars for additional loads each week to the full unload capacity of the terminals . . . With a heavy export movement out of Pacific coast for the next few weeks and a good volume of grain to be moved from the Lakehead east, we are still hopeful that adequate terminal space will be available to accommodate the five bushel quota and that this target will be reached by August 1.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Bearing in mind what the minister has just said about the situation at the terminals, will he tell the house whether he has given favourable consideration to the request to extend the present crop year until such time as a five bushel quota can be delivered? This question has been asked before, but I put it to the minister again because of the special circumstances prevailing in the current crop year. This is a matter for special consideration.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, you would say that the question is hypothetical.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Baldwin: So is the transport of a lot of the grain.

[Mr. Laprise.]

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Will the minister tell the house specifically what action is being taken by the Wheat Board or through his department to require the railways to provide sufficient cars to fill the space in the Saskatchewan Pool terminals at the Lakehead and in Vancouver? The minister's statement is in direct variance from that of the president of the Saskatchewan Pool. Is the minister misleading the house, or is his information not sufficiently up to date?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, my job is to impress the importance of these matters upon all concerned. We have questioned the railway companies and I am told—I am informed—that the position is as stated. As to the Wheat Board, we are in touch with them all the time. If the hon. member wants to deny that my information is right, it is up to him to do so, but to my knowledge a maximum effort is being made at the present time by all concerned.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): May I ask whether the minister is still acting as co-ordinator and controller of the movement of grain in western Canada, as he indicated he was doing earlier this year?

Mr. Pepin: I am sorry; I was answering a comment I overheard from the hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Horner: Important place, Crowfoot.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): I will repeat my question, then. Is the minister still acting as co-ordinator and controller of the movement of grain in western Canada, as he indicated earlier?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do that every day. I intend to be in Winnipeg on Monday next, performing this function.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dean Gundlock (Lethbridge): A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is he being informed, or is he being told?

WHEAT—U.S. DISREGARD OF I.G.A. MINIMUM—WASHINGTON MEETING

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): In view of reports that the United States, following subsidized sales of French wheat, is considering suspending certain clauses of the International Grains Arrangement, or even disregarding the minimum price provisions of that agreement, can the Minister of Industry,

Trade and Commerce inform the house whether the United States is keeping the Canadian government informed of any new approaches it may be making with regard to the International Grains Arrangement?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the co-operation we are receiving from that country is very good. Largely as a result of this I am in a position to say that a meeting will be held next week in Washington at the ministerial level, attended by Canada, Australia, Argentina the European economic community and the United States. The purpose of the meeting is to review the world wheat marketing situation and to see what can be done about strengthening co-operation among wheat exporters to resolve the problems that have arisen in regard to wheat prices.

Mr. Gleave: A supplementary question. Might I ask the minister again whether he or the government would give consideration to establishing a floor price for wheat at the International Grains Arrangement minimum in order to protect the grain farmer from the effects of undercutting the prices presently established, and from other possibilities that may be envisaged as a result of the United States statement?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, this idea and many others are being examined by the government.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister who will represent Canada at the proposed meeting in Washington next week to discuss the whole question of the International Grains Arrangement?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I will be, accompanied by members of the Wheat Board and Canadian government officials.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, again in respect of wheat.

Since a socialist majority has been elected in Manitoba, are the prospects for the sale of wheat any better, especially in the socialist countries of the world?

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

DISPUTE BETWEEN B.C. TELEPHONE AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Is it the intention of the minister to intervene constructively in the serious and disruptive dispute between the British Columbia Telephone Company and its employees?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this strike is unfortunate inasmuch as this is the first time in almost 50 years that there has been a strike in this particular industry in British Columbia. Both parties are aware that mediation services are available and when they feel it necessary to ask the Department of Labour for assistance they will probably do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot on a supplementary.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour regarding another labour condition on the west coast.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question does not appear to be supplementary and I will return to the hon. member in a moment.

POLLUTION

EXHAUST FUMES FROM VEHICULAR TRAFFIC

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to compliment the minister of health on his courageous and successful stand against the dangers of cigarette smoking. I should like also to ask the minister about other dangers in our environment, and specifically to ask him what steps he is taking to prod his laggard colleagues into compelling filtration of harmful exhaust fumes emitted by road vehicles.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking for a statement of a general nature that should normally be made on motions.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Would the minister undertake to make a statement on motions, before the house adjourns for a recess, in order to bring the house up to date on the situation

concerning summer employment for students? I ask this question because it has been asked before in the house, and also in view of the fact that during the last few days the problem has been greatly aggravated by grade 13 students being put on the labour market. Would the minister bring the house up to date on this question by making a statement on motions, and would he also give us details of any emergency plan that he has for employing these students?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider making a statement next week. I will consider the matter very carefully.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that on May 23 last the minister spoke to the Canadian Vocational Association and talked of a plan prepared by his department as a result of the work of a special task force, will he outline to the house at the same time what this plan is, so the house may be fully aware of what plans, if any, the government has with respect to summer employment?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the statement is made I will be happy to include every relevant consideration in the statement.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

APPEARANCE OF ORGANIZATIONS BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEE—CONSIDERATION OF WOODS REPORT

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I understand that yesterday the veterans affairs committee agreed to consider the Woods report in September, prior to the house resuming. I wonder whether the minister will give us an assurance that all veterans affairs organizations that wish to be heard will be heard by the committee at that time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I bring to the attention of the hon. member that this question relates to the internal management of the committee, and the question may not be asked in those terms at this time.

Mr. McKinley: Then would it be possible, Mr. Speaker, to ask the chairman of the committee whether the organizations that wish to be heard in regard to veterans affairs could be heard at that time when the committee sits?

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, it was the recommendation of the committee that an invitation be extended to all interested veterans organizations to appear before it.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—ROLE OF CANAIRELIEF AND RED CROSS—U.N. DISCUSSION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs which arises out of the minister's meeting yesterday with officials of Canairelief. I am wondering whether he is able to announce any positive conclusions which might have been reached at that meeting.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I had a very useful discussion with Dr. Johnson and the other gentleman who came with him from Canairelief. Dr. Johnson made certain suggestions to us about ways in which we might work together in order to try to get relief supplies resumed to Biafra, and we are studying these suggestions. Altogether I think it was a constructive meeting and I am hopeful that there will be some results.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in dealing with this question the minister said on a couple of occasions that there were still elements of uncertainty that needed to be clarified by the government before it could determine its future policy on matters, and specifically in regard to relief. Can the minister indicate to the house the nature of these uncertainties and when they might become clarified so that some very important action can be taken in this desperate situation?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, one of the most important uncertainties, for example, is the role that the international committee of the Red Cross will play in the provision of relief in Nigeria and Biafra. So far the International Red Cross has been carrying on in the Nigerian territory—that is, the federally controlled territory—and I am still hopeful, and I think that all hon. members will share my hope, that an arrangement can be made for the resumption of relief by air.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when the situation does clarify itself, whether he would consider, if the house is still in

session, making a statement on motions in view of the very great interest in this matter both in this house and in Canada?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Following upon my reading of some of the minister's statements I should like to ask him whether he can advise if the government is now giving consideration to the suggestion I made last September, namely that Canada as a member of the United Nations take an initiative in having inscribed upon the provisional agenda of the General Assembly the whole question of Nigeria-Biafra, which situation seems to be deteriorating before our eyes?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman and the house know, we have been discouraged from taking any initiative in the United Nations upon the advice of the Secretary General. However as a result of the most recent stoppage of relief in that area a new situation arises, and I certainly would not rule out any type of action that might be useful being taken.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it is necessary that relief efforts to Biafra-Nigeria be resumed, has the government considered following the suggestion Senator Kennedy made a couple of weeks ago. He suggested that the United Nations might convene a relief conference in Geneva, perhaps, at which the disputants and other interested third parties might agree on regulations governing some relief program.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, that might turn out to be a useful method of proceeding. Nonetheless I would think it would be much more useful if those countries providing the relief were to get together. They could put the most effective pressures on both sides in this conflict.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NATURAL GAS—ANNOUNCED PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Yesterday I asked him if he would look into rising prices of natural gas in the west. It seems that demand in the United States for Canadian gas is forcing the price of our gas up, and making it too expensive for Canadian consumers. Has the minister had a chance to look at the report I alluded to? If so, what action will he take on behalf of the consumers of Canada?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to find the report the hon. member referred to. I believe my office has asked him to supply me with a copy of the report he referred to yesterday. I understand that the National Energy Board expects to hold hearings this fall on applications for additional export licences. At such hearings the board is bound to take into account the need to ensure adequate supply for Canadian consumers. It would of course take into account the effect on Canadian prices.

If the hon. member will supply me with a copy of the report he mentioned I will be glad to refer it to the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan, who has jurisdiction over the National Energy Board.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the serious situation that will prevail in Canada as a result of increased gas prices, is he contemplating taking with respect to natural gas an action similar to that taken with respect to the price of copper, when copper prices were going up in international markets? On that occasion he indicated that he would take effective steps to make sure that the price of copper did not rise excessively, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker.

FARM MACHINERY

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF BARBER REPORT

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he advise whether the long awaited report of the Barber Commission on the price of farm machinery will be tabled in the house before it adjourns for the summer recess?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not have this report in my hands yet. After I receive it I shall go through the customary procedure of considering whether it is to be tabled in the house.

Mr. Southam: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise us when we may expect to get this long awaited report?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend talks of a long awaited report I wish to say that in March and April several aspects of the inquiry were reported on by way of interim reports. There has been therefore no undue delay. Dr. Barber's commission has reported on certain aspects that were inquired about in this house earlier this year.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

NEGOTIATIONS TO PURCHASE FOUR STAR COLLIERY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion who reports to this house for the Cape Breton Development Corporation. Is it the intention of the corporation to expand its holdings in Cape Breton through the purchase of Four Star Colliery? Are negotiations in progress towards that end? If the minister does not have the answer at the moment perhaps he can take my question as notice and reply on Monday.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, may I take that question as notice and reply later.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the Prime Minister's office will be putting out an itinerary of his western visit. I ask this question to enable us to prepare a friendly reception for him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Korchinski: It will be a friendly reception even though it may not be too elaborate. We do not have too much money out there.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

INTENT ON INSTRUCTION TO SEEK CONCURRENCE IN COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton in his capacity as chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. Since the hon. member as chairman of the committee was instructed by a majority vote to seek the concurrence of the house in the third report of that committee, may I ask if he is going to carry out that instruction?

[Mr. Southam.]

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of common knowledge that the report made by this committee has been attacked from the very moment of its tabling as a report from one side of the house only. I have already commented on this, and at an earlier stage indicated that in my opinion this is an unfair attack. As to the action which should or can be taken, in the light of all that has developed I must say now that one will have to await the outcome of events.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Blair: I say to my hon. friend that if he will continue to sit with us in the house he will find out what action shall be taken.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member does not intend to carry out the instruction of the committee will he call another meeting of the committee, so that we can decide what course we should take?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

NATIONAL PARKS

NOVA SCOTIA—ACCEPTANCE OF LANDS ON NINETY-NINE YEAR LEASE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are having difficulty in obtaining straight answers from the government.

An hon. Member: Let's have some straight questions from the opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: Keep it up. Keep it up. May I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In negotiations or discussions going on with respect to additional parklands in Nova-Scotia, is the minister prepared to accept a 99 year lease from Nova Scotia, the lease to be entered into under terms similar to those prevailing with respect to the Gaspé park agreement recently entered into?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition has asked a question similar to one which was asked on another occasion, at which time the Chair was prompted to suggest that the question might be placed on the order paper.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEPT ILES, QUE.—PROTECTION OF NATIVE PEOPLE IN R.C.M.P. ACTIVITIES

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which is related to a clash last week between the native Indian people of Sept Iles, Quebec, and the R.C.M.P., provincial police, wardens and others. Will he take steps to preserve and protect the native Indian people of this area and make sure that they retain their right to hunt and fish?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this problem arose between the Indians of Sept Iles and the provincial authorities about the administration of justice. I have asked the officials of my department for a report on this situation in order to get better acquainted with the facts.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since many reports indicate that these flair-ups are likely to continue and grow in future, may I ask the minister to ask his colleagues to take steps in order to preserve law and order in the area on behalf of the native people?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the administration of justice within provincial boundaries is the responsibility of the provincial government.

[*English*]

COMBINES

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL—REQUEST FOR HOUSE STATEMENT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has he yet received the report of the Economic Council of Canada on combines and competition. If not, and if he receives the report before parliament adjourns, will he assure the house that he will make a statement on it here?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, so far I have not received the report although I had hoped to receive it in June. The hon. member is waiting for it with just as much interest as

I am. All we can do is hope the council reports as quickly as possible. If the house is sitting when I receive the report, then naturally I will be making a statement as soon as I receive it.

Mr. Baldwin: In Vancouver, no doubt.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

AGREMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS OF QUEBEC AND GABON

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to thank the Prime Minister for his visit to the Joliette constituency last Monday evening, when he attended a play starring the lovely Louise Marleau.

In view of the agreement signed yesterday between the government of Quebec and that of Gabon concerning a university centre for sciences and health, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he considers that agreement acceptable by the government?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the question as asked can hardly be considered in order. The hon. member might wish to rephrase it.

Mr. La Salle: I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like the Prime Minister to indicate to the house whether the Quebec government was free to sign the agreement yesterday, or if it should have asked Ottawa for permission to sign it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will perhaps agree that he is asking the Prime Minister to express an opinion on a constitutional matter, and I think the question is out of order.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the honourable and learned Minister of Communications. It is in reference to the minister's announcement re the Name-the-Satellite-Contest, replete with misspellings, which indicates that he is sending posters to the 8,000 post offices still left in the country. Can he advise how he is publicizing this intriguing contest to those many thousands of Canadians who have already lost their post offices?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Business of the House

GRAIN

ALLOCATION OF BOX CARS TO THE LAKEHEAD AND VANCOUVER

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce which is the result of earlier exchanges. In view of the fact that there is some 10 million bushels of space available at wheat pool terminals at the Lakehead as of yesterday, that the terminal at Vancouver is half full, and that there is no backlog of cars at those facilities, will the minister advise what action is being taken by the railroads or by his department to double the allocation of railway rolling stock for those terminals?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will investigate the two situations described by my hon. friend.

TRADE

WHEAT—SALE TO SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRY

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is it true that an important sale of wheat has recently been made to a South American country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to advise the hon. member that it is not in order to ask the minister to confirm or deny allegations.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I think it will be found that there is agreement to take at this point the four deferred votes on amendments Nos. 2, 3, 6 and 5 which are to be found on the notice paper, page iii, with respect to the official languages bill. If this is agreeable it could be made an order of the house, with the prospect of completing the report stage of the bill this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council. At the same time it will be recalled that the Chair had indicated to hon. members that these deferred votes would be taken after all the motions had been considered by the house. In view of the suggestion made in previous debate, on which some hon. members might rely, I think we should proceed with the new suggestion of the President of the Privy Council only with the unanimous agreement of the house. Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, July 2, consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The house will now revert on the taking of deferred divisions on motions Nos, 2, 3, 6 and 5, standing on the deferred divisions paper, in that order.

The question is on motion No. 2, Mr. McQuaid:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting subclause (1) of clause 14 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) As soon as possible following the completion of each decennial census, or, in the case of the decennial census taken in the year 1961, forthwith after the coming into force of this act, the Dominion Statistician shall prepare and send to the Clerk of the Privy Council a return certified by him showing the population of each of the provinces and census districts in Canada, categorized according to the official languages spoken as a mother tongue by presons resident therein as ascertained by that census, and as soon as possible thereafter the Governor in Council shall, pursuant to Part 1 of the Inquiries Act, appoint not less than twelve persons, being representative of residents of the several provinces, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, as commissioners to constitute a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board for the purpose of conducting an inquiry as described in section 15."

The house divided on motion No. 2 (Mr. McQuaid) which was negatived on the following division:

• (3:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Dionne
Alexander	Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Alkenbrack	Downey
Asselin	Fairweather
Baldwin	Flemming
Beaudoin	Gauthier
Bell	Gilbert
Benjamin	Gleave
Bigg	Godin
Broadbent	Harding
Burton	Hees
Code	Horner
Comeau	Howard (Skeena)
Crouse	Howe
Danforth	
Dinsdale	

Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rynard
Saltsman
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—71.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brewin
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Olson
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—128.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment because I am opposed to the principle of the bill.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 3, Mr. McQuaid:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting clauses 28, 29, and 30 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"28. (1) An investigation by the Commissioner under this act shall be conducted in private except as otherwise provided for in subsection (3).

(2) It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing but he may allow any person or any department or other institution concerned in an investigation, and shall allow any person or any department or other institution complained against in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

(3) The Commissioner shall not make a report or recommendation in respect of any person, department or other institution so complained against until that person, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint and has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in public or in private as that person, department or other institution may elect.

(4) Parliament may,

(a) of its own volition, or

(b) upon the recommendation of the Governor in Council, regulate the procedure to be followed by the Commissioner in the exercise of his powers and duties.

(5) The Commissioner may direct that information relating to any investigation under this act be received or obtained, in whole or in part, by any officer of the Commissioner appointed as provided in section 21 and such officer shall, subject to such restrictions or limitations as the Commissioner may specify, have all the powers and duties of the Commissioner under this act in relation to the receiving or obtaining of such information.

(6) The Commissioner shall require every person employed in his office who is directed by him to receive or obtain information relating to any investigation under this act to comply with any security requirements applicable to, and to take

Division

any oath of secrecy required to be taken by, persons employed in any department or other institution concerned in the matter of the investigation.

(7) The Commissioner has in relation to the carrying out of any investigation under this act,

(a) the powers of a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act; and

(b) the power, subject to such limitations as the Governor in Council in the interests of defence or security may prescribe, to enter any premises occupied by any department or other institution of the parliament or government of Canada and carry out therein such inquiries within his authority under this act as he sees fit."

Mr. Speaker: Does the house wish to proceed with this division without the call of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 3 (Mr. McQuaid) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Gilbert
Gleave
Harding
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
La Salle
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Saltsman
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—63.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Olson
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—138.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment because I oppose the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 6, Mr. Baldwin:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by

deleting clause 38 thereof and substituting the following:

"38. (1) The right to speak a language other than either of the two official languages shall not be restrained or restricted in its natural development in any way.

(2) The Governor in Council may by Order in Council enter into an agreement with the government of any province which has been authorized by legislation so to do, for the purpose of encouraging natural development of any such minority language especially as regards the use of such language in matters of education."

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Does the house wish to proceed with this division without the call of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 6 (Mr. Baldwin) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Bell
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
La Salle
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacLean
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Woolliams—47.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orlikow
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch—156.

Division

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment as I oppose the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question now is on motion No. 5, Mr. Woolliams:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by

Division

inserting therein, next following clause 34 thereof, the following new clause:

"34A. Where an individual, department or institution is aggrieved by a report or recommendation of the Commissioner, or by a decision made by him or other person or authority acting upon his report or recommendation, the individual, department or institution may appeal in respect of such report, or recommendation or decision on a finding of fact, a question of law or a matter of the merits to a superior court of record within thirty days after the individual, department or institution is first informed of the report, or recommendation or decision; the court may proceed by way of hearing or review and shall make such order therein as the court deems just and such order shall be final."

Mr. Speaker: Does the house wish to proceed with this division without the call of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 5 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Bell
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Hees
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
La Salle
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Woolliams—47.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Hellyer
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Skeena)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orlikow
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch—148.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment as I oppose the principle of the bill.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. McIntosh: I will sit down when I want to. You can't make me.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INCOME TAX

PROPOSED COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER REFORM

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we might have consent to revert to motions for the purpose of putting forward a proposal with regard to income tax reform.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Certain discussions have taken place with respect to the possibility of a joint parliamentary committee on income tax reform being established. If the house is generally agreeable, perhaps the following could be made an order of the house:

That a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, to be known as the joint parliamentary committee on income tax reform, be appointed to consider government proposals for the reform of the income tax, with powers to report its observations and opinions thereon from time to time, to send for persons, papers and records, to sit during sittings and adjournments of the house, to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;

That 12 members of the House of Commons, to be designated at a later date, act on behalf of the house as members of the said committee, seven of whom shall be required for a quorum;

That when a quorum is not present, the chairman of the said committee be authorized to proceed with meetings for the purpose of receiving and printing evidence; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that house to unite with this house for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, perhaps a word is necessary by way of explanation. Why are we to have a committee on income tax, when earlier statements from the government were to the effect that they were concerned with tax reform in general?

Mr. Benson: The white paper will deal with the subject of corporate and personal income tax.

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to raise a point of order with reference to this announcement. The minister is saying, in effect, that it does not matter whether or not there is a quorum, that if one little Liberal is present the government will get its decisions. That is the philosophy behind the announcement. The committees are nothing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that the motion is to be put. Is there no agreement, or is there agreement? There is no unanimous agreement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan) moved:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting subclause (4) of clause 40 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(4) In relation to the appointment and advancement in employment of personnel the duties of whose positions include duties relating to the provision of services by authorities to members of the public, it is the duty

(a) of the Public Service Commission, in cases where it has the authority to make appointments,

(b) of the authority respectively concerned in the cases of the Canadian Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and

(c) of the authority concerned in all other cases, to ensure that, in the exercise and performance of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed upon it by law, due account is taken of the purposes and provisions of this Act, subject always to the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit as required by the Public Service Employment Act or any other Act of the Parliament of Canada respectively applicable to the Canadian Forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the authority concerned in all other cases."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a plainly worded and easily understood amendment, and I do not propose to take much of the time of the house in presenting it. It is submitted largely to clear up ambiguities which we contend exist in the bill as now drafted, as well as in the amendment submitted to the committee and to the house some time ago.

If we refer to the original Bill C-120, the bill which received first reading on October 17, 1968, we find that clause 9 was apparently considered to cover all the services which the

government had in mind. The clause at that time said that every department and agency of the government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada had the duty to ensure that the services provided by them were provided in the two languages in areas where this was necessary.

• (3:50 p.m.)

For some unexplained reason the minister saw fit to bring in an amendment of his own. Strangely enough, he amended the interpretation clause of the bill. Naturally we wonder why this provision was not included in the interpretation section when the bill was originally drafted. The interpretation section of a statute is, of course, a very important section, and ordinarily the draftsman of a bill is very careful to include in the interpretation section an expansion of all of the words in the bill that he thinks require explanation.

However, clause 36 was amended by the minister in order to bring the members of the Canadian forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police under the provisions of the bill. I have wondered why clause 9 of the original bill was not considered wide enough to include members of the R.C.M.P. and the Canadian forces. Clause 9 provided:

> Every department and agency of the government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or crown corporation—

And so on. They were the bodies originally included in clause 9, but in its wisdom the government apparently felt that an additional clause had to be brought in to make sure that members of the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were included in the provisions of the bill, and therefore were subject to the provisions of every clause in the bill. Since the government saw fit to take this step, I do not think we can take objection to it.

The government also decided to amend clause 40 by adding an additional subclause 4. Subclause 4 provides:

> In relation to the appointment and advancement in employment of personnel the duties of whose positions include duties relating to the provision of services by authorities to members of the public, it is the duty
>
> (a) of the Public Service Commission, in cases where it has the authority to make appointments,
>
> (b) of the authority concerned, in all other cases, to ensure that, in the exercise and performance of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed upon it by law, due account is taken of the purposes and provisions of this Act—

[Mr. McQuaid.]

These are the important words.

> —subject always to the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit as required by the Public Service Employment Act.

That clause was designed to establish and to protect—and I think it effectively does so—the merit principle, and to make it applicable to those who fall within the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act. However, I hasten to point out that members of the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police do not fall within the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act, at least in most respects. The Public Service Employment Act, which is chapter 71 of the 1966-67 Statutes of Canada, provides in section 2 (2):

> For the purpose of being eligible to enter competitions and for the purposes of sections 11 and 13, the following persons shall be deemed to be persons employed in the Public Service, namely:
>
> (a) members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police;
>
> (b) members of the Canadian forces;—

I ask the house to note that these members of the R.C.M.P. and the Canadian forces are deemed to be employed by the public service only for the purpose of being eligible to enter competitions and for the purposes of sections 11 and 13. Section 11 of that act provides:

> Appointments shall be made from within the Public Service except where, in the opinion of the Commission, it is not in the best interests of the Public Service to do so.

That section has nothing to do with merit. If the members also examine section 13 they will find it has nothing to do with appointment according to merit. The section of the Public Service Employment Act that deals with merit is section 10, and specifically by that act members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the armed forces are excluded from the provisions of that section. The only sections of the act that do apply to members of the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are sections 11 and 13.

Our contention, Mr. Speaker, is that members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the armed forces should be afforded the protection given other public servants under the Public Service Employment Act. Since they are going to be governed by the provisions of the official languages bill, the principle of merit so far as promotion is concerned should certainly be made applicable to them. All we are asking the house to do is to clarify the terms of the bill so there is no shadow of

doubt that the members of the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have the same protection as that afforded to members of the public service under the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act.

During the deliberations of the special committee the government draftsmen themselves agreed that the Public Service Employment Act does not apply to members of the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Mr. Thorson, an employee of the Department of Justice who I understand did much of the drafting of the bill, when speaking to a very similar amendment introduced in the committee which dealt with the same point, had this to say as reported at page 248 of committee report No. 3:

The reservation at the end—

That is the reservation in regard to merit, as required by the Public Service Employment Act.

—ensures that the principle of selection according to merit is maintained in those circumstances—

I ask the house to note these words.

—where it now applies by law.

The principle of merit does not apply by law to members of the armed forces and the R.C.M.P. under the terms of the Public Service Employment Act. Mr. Thorson continued:

To take an illustration, Air Canada, a Crown corporation makes its own appointments and promotions, and does not come under the terms of the Public Service Employment Act.

The principle of selection according to merit, which is found in the Public Service Employment Act, simply does not extend to Air Canada, and indeed parliament itself has never considered it appropriate to attempt to extend the merit principle to all of the bodies to which this law would apply. Examples of this are the armed forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the many Crown corporations.

The only reason I submit this amendment for the consideration of the house is to protect those members of the armed forces and the R.C.M.P. who cannot come here to protect themselves. We feel it is our responsibility to see to it that the principle of merit applies to these men as well as to other public servants, and I am sure the government will agree that this is our responsibility. This is all the amendment is seeking. I realize the government considers the amendment unnecessary in that these men are already protected; the minister will probably reply that the words in subclause (4) of clause 40, "of the authority concerned, in all other cases", meet this point. We say that it is not absolutely clear. We say that there is some doubt about the meaning of the following words of clause 40(4):

• (4:00 p.m.)

—subject . . . to the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit as required by the Public Service Employment Act.

If we were sure that members of the armed forces and the R.C.M.P. came within the Public Service Employment Act, we would be satisfied. As matters now stand we suggest seriously that the wording of the clause is ambiguous. For the life of me I cannot see why the government refuses to accept an amendment which will clarify that ambiguity. If the government accepts the amendment, those who sit on this side of the house will be much more satisfied. I am equally certain that members of the armed forces and the R.C.M.P., who could be adversely affected by the present wording of the clause, would also be satisfied.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the reason for the original amendment which was accepted by the special committee to clause 40 of the bill, that part now being clause 40(4), was to satisfy those people, particularly in western Canada and in the Atlantic provinces whose views were reflected by their provincial governments, that nothing in this bill as it is will change the principle of nation-wide recruitment to and promotion in the federal public service and the federal agencies of government. One of the concerns I encountered when discussing the bill with the Attorneys General of the four western provinces and with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia was that this bill would effectively exclude from the Public Service of Canada young men and women from those parts of the country where English was the dominant language and where there was little opportunity for them to learn or practise French. They feared that this bill would exclude from the Public Service of Canada English speaking candidates from the western and Atlantic provinces.

We have added clause 40(4) to make it quite clear that the principle of merit now found and contained in section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act is in no way over-ridden, repealed, or affected by the passage of this bill, and that merit as defined in

the Public Service Employment Act will continue to govern the recruitment and promotion of public servants in Canada. That is the purpose of the clause.

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows me well enough to be sure that I will entertain all questions at the conclusion of what I have to say. Certainly I have made it clear in speeches in the national capital, western Canada and elsewhere that I will not hold office in a government that adopts legislation which in any way limits recruitment to the Public Service of Canada to one or two provinces because there happen to be in those provinces facilities to help one learn and speak a second language.

Mr. Woolliams: In that case you had better resign now.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am satisfied, and I introduced figures at the second reading stage of the bill to illustrate this quite conclusively, that since 1965-66, since the policy of bilingualism in the public service was adopted by the former Pearson administration, the number of recruits from English speaking provinces not only has not decreased but has increased in great measure.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would not want the minister to mislead the house. I think he should check his records. I think he will see that what was referred to previously was the number of applications from each area. I do not think the house has been told how many of those were accepted. There is a great difference between those who apply and those who are accepted. The difference between applications and recruits is the difference between black and white.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, not only am I prepared to stand by the figures as to the number of applications that were received and accepted, but I am also willing to produce those figures. The figures bear me out not only as to the number of applications made but also as to the number of applications accepted from western Canada and the Atlantic provinces. They bear me out quite conclusively.

Surely for the sake of national unity we want a public service that reflects in its make-up every region and province of this country. The Public Service Commission is sensitively aware of this problem and intends to continue to administer public service promotion and recruitment to the public service in such a way as to ensure that the public service properly represents all regions of Canada.

The hon. member referred to clause 36(3) of the bill and the amendment which was proposed by the government at the committee stage. That amendment was accepted. That amendment said that any reference to any of the institutions of the government or Parliament of Canada shall be deemed to include the Canadian Forces and Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In other words, the word "institutions" shall be deemed to cover those bodies. We said at that time that we believed that "institutions" as found in clause 2, the declaratory clause of the bill, and in other clauses is clear enough but that in order to satisfy doubts we were quite willing to have it spelled out. In the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, at any rate, nothing in clause 36(3) which was added to clause 36 in committee changes the purport or intent of the bill.

Having laid down a little background, Mr. Speaker, I now want to analyse the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). As I divine his object, and I am basing my opinion on what he said this afternoon in the house and what he said earlier before the special committee, he wishes to spell out in the bill a requirement that the definition of merit not be supplanted in the selection of personnel of the Canadian Armed Forces, the R.C.M.P. and federal agencies by any addition to the definition already inserted in the Public Service Employment Act covering those employees to whom that act applies. In other words he is saying, "You have a merit principle which applies to those agencies and departments that are covered by the Public Service Employment Act. Section 12 of the act applies to them. But you have not covered those agencies of the federal government to which that act does not apply."

Mr. Woolliams: That is quite right.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member for Cardigan is saying, and I hope I am putting his words fairly, that "we want to ensure that the merit principle applies to other agencies, namely the armed forces and the R.C.M.P."

• (4:10 p.m.)

The amendment which was proposed by the government at the committee stage in relation

to clause 40(4) was a clarifying amendment in the sense that we wanted to make it perfectly clear that the fact that the official languages bill was a later bill in terms of time to the Public Service Employment Act could not be interpreted by the government, or by anybody looking at this bill, as an implication that anything in the Public Service Employment Act had been amended or rescinded. In other words, we merely continued and restated the merit principle as it appears in an earlier statute, the Public Service Employment Act, to ensure that nothing in this bill will derogate from it.

There is no amendment made to the Public Service Employment Act by reason of the official languages bill. The purpose of clause 40(4) is merely to protect the merit principle as beyond the scope of this bill and to ensure that nothing in this bill can be construed as an amendment to the earlier act. It does not change the merit principle in the Public Service Employment Act, nor does it extend the merit principle to the other public agencies of government not covered by the Public Service Employment Act. Therefore the existing clause 40(4) is a saving clause and it does nothing more.

In so far as it preserves the present legal situation it will ensure that the merit principle, where it applies, remains. There are several areas of the government service where the merit principle does not apply, where parliament in its wisdom to date has said that the merit principle shall not apply within the definition of section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The cabinet, for example.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will take that riposte as being well meant.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Present company excepted.

Mr. Horner: And only at the present time.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is a fairly fluid situation, as my hon. friend says.

As the hon. member for Cardigan knows, this subject was discussed at some length in the special committee and it was pointed out that there is no special requirement as to merit for the Canadian forces, the R.C.M.P. and those other agencies that do not presently come under the Public Service Employment Act. Parliament has not extended that requirement specifically to them.

Not all bodies apply the same standards as are imposed upon the Public Service Commission by the Public Service Employment Act. The armed forces have their own selection standards, and I will not go into the nature of them at the moment. Air Canada has its own standards, and the R.C.M.P. has its standards. They may not correspond to "merit" as currently defined in section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act, and it is not the purpose of this bill either to extend or restrict the merit principle. The purpose of this bill is not to interfere with the merit principle as presently found in the statutes of Canada. This is merely a saving clause.

Where merit applies today under the Public Service Employment Act it will not be interfered with by this bill. Where it does not apply, then of course it is up to parliament when reviewing the statutes relating to the armed forces, the R.C.M.P., Air Canada, the C.N.R. and other agencies of government not currently covered by the Public Service Employment Act to decide in its good judgment whether that merit principle ought to apply.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the purpose of this bill is not germane either to restricting or extending the merit principle but only to ensuring by way of clarification, and by way of a saving clause, that the merit principle so far as it now applies in the statutes of Canada will not be interfered with, we recommend to the house at this report stage that the amendment be rejected. I suggest that it is ill-conceived and that it would convert clause 40(4) into more than a saving provision. It would not clarify. It might well confuse the whole issue as to whether or not, to use the words of the hon. member for Cardigan, we were extending the merit principle by indirection into other statutes regarding other institutions of government that are currently not covered by the Public Service Employment Act.

If parliament in its good judgment in the days and years ahead wishes to analyse the recruiting, hiring and promoting practices of these other agencies of government, parliament should directly set its attention to it and not do it indirectly by way of a provision that would confuse the statutes of Canada. That is the reason we suggest to the house that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the minister's argument with great interest he has left me with the impression that this clause really does nothing. If so,

why have the clause in the bill at all? Why not just leave it silent?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Because a lot of concern was expressed in western Canada and the Atlantic provinces that the merit system was in some way being derogated from by this bill, we wanted to make it perfectly clear that where the merit principle applied nothing in this bill derogated from the provisions of section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act where that act applied.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words—

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, during his remarks the minister indicated that he would answer a question that the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) was going to put to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I did not see the hon. member for Cardigan rising, and I have recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is agreeable we could probably recognize the hon. member for Cardigan.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I agree gladly.

Mr. McQuaid: In his speech the minister repeatedly said, and I copied down what he said and have it here word for word, "merit as currently defined in the Public Service Employment Act." Where does he find merit defined in the Public Service Employment Act? Nowhere is merit defined in that act that I can see.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will try to find it for the hon. member. So far as I can recall it is defined in section 12.

Mr. McQuaid: I have the act here and all section 12 says is:

> The Commission may, in determining pursuant to section 10 the basis of assessment of merit—

It speaks about merit but does not define it.

> —in relation to any position or class of positions, prescribe selection standards as to education, knowledge, experience, language, age, residence or any other matters that, in the opinion of the Commission, are necessary or desirable having regard to the nature of the duties to be performed, but any such selection standards shall not be inconsistent with any classification standard prescribed pursuant to the Financial Administration Act for that position or any position in that class.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that does not define merit. This is what bothers me. Where are we going to find the definition of merit?

I now come to my second question. On May 20, as reported at pages 8840 and 8841 of *Hansard*, the minister gave figures showing the total number of university candidates who applied for positions with the Public Service Commission of Canada for the years 1966 and 1969. Of those who applied in those particular years, how many were accepted into the public service and from what areas did they come?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am looking for the appropriate document because I made that inquiry myself. I am perfectly willing to table it at the third reading stage if the house would be good enough to allow me to intervene when I get the document.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to appeal to the minister to give further consideration to the proposal made by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) in the motion that is now before the house.

Mr. Woolliams: I knew the hon. member would support it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) says he knew I would support this motion. I suppose he probably relies on the fact that I frequently have something to say about retired civil servants, and almost every time I do I mention retired members of the R.C.M.P. and retired members of the armed forces. I do so because I have learned in my studies in that field having to do with the pensions of these various groups that it is not enough just to say retired civil servants and assume that this includes the rest. If one wants these other groups included one has to say so. I believe, therefore, that that principle applies in this instance.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Even though the Minister of Justice, I thought, argued that subclause 4 of clause 40 really was not necessary, I congratulate him for having it included in the bill when the bill was in the hands of the special committee. It seems to me the other clauses that have been quoted today do leave some ambiguity, and that it is a good idea to make it clear in this bill that the merit principle in the federal public service will not be interfered with because of the operation of this

legislation. Therefore it seems to me it is simple and elementary logic, if one is to take that position with regard to those in the public service, and inasmuch as clause 36(3) of the bill says that the institutions of Canada include in addition to the federal public service, the R.C.M.P. and the armed forces, that protection for these other groups ought to be included in clause 40(4). If the saving clause is necessary at all—there is some doubt about it but I rather think it is necessary—I suggest it ought to be applied to all three groups that have been mentioned in clause 36(3).

Another argument the minister has against the motion of the hon. member for Cardigan is that in his view it would make new law rather than simply write in a saving provision. I find it difficult to follow that argument because all the hon. member for Cardigan asks is that these other personnel, those in the R.C.M.P. and the armed forces, be given the protection of the merit principle as required by the Public Service Employment Act or any other act of the parliament of Canada respectively applicable to the Canadian forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and so on. Surely that is clear. The hon. member for Cardigan is not writing new law. He is not writing a new merit principle. He is not saying there shall be for the R.C.M.P. or the armed forces a merit principle they do not now have. He is saying that in so far as they have the protection of the merit principle under some of the sections of the Public Service Employment Act or any other act of the parliament of Canada that is on the books, that protection shall be guaranteed to them under the provisions of this bill.

As I say, in this case we are not arguing with the minister over something that he is dead against. As a matter of fact, as he himself said it was he on behalf of the government who brought in the amendment to the bill which resulted in new subclause 4. If my colleague the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) had not had to leave, I am sure he would be standing on his feet saying he had something to say about urging it to be brought in.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, Mr. Speaker. I had considerable co-operation from the hon. member for York South, for which I am grateful, but this amendment was introduced by me and my colleagues as a result of the representations I received while I was in western Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I will let the hon. member for York South speak for himself when he returns. It may be with regard to some related clause that he was active, as I am sure he was. At any rate, this is a principle which the minister has accepted. He is the father of the amendment which put subclause 4 into clause 40. Since he was prepared to agree that it should be there for the sake of those in the public service generally, I believe the same protection ought to be provided to those other two groups that are referred to as being included in the institutions of the parliament or government of Canada in clause 36(3).

As I say, we are not arguing with the minister over something to which he is violently opposed. We are discussing a matter of detail in an area where there is a wide measure of agreement. We know what we are seeking. I think the minister ought to consider this matter and should be willing to accept the amendment now before us in the name of the hon. member for Cardigan.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, as far as this motion is concerned, I should like first to clear up a few things which, I think, are tremendously important.

In my opinion the amendment contains certain assumptions which we precisely want to get rid of, in this country, because they seem to convey the feeling that French Canadians are unable to assume certain functions, particularly in the Canadian Armed Forces and in the R.C.M.P. In fact, one would believe that within these two organizations, French-speaking Canadians should not be granted too generous a share.

If we analyze the reasons which brought about the introduction of a bill on official languages, we notice that it is precisely because it has never been agreed that French-speaking Canadians should have their fair share in the country's administration.

And when we seriously consider what this bill stands for, we feel that it is quite useless.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Occasionally, competence in a given field makes an individual bilingual. I should like to illustrate this by giving a few examples.

In a bilingual district, in an area where the great majority is either French-speaking or English-speaking, if the head of the R.C.M.P. cannot understand the other language he is an incompetent. This amendment, just as the original clause of the bill, seems to minimize the importance of this. Is there anything more

annoying, than having to deal with policemen, with detectives who cannot understand you?

Early in the session one of my colleagues was arrested by the Ottawa police, as always English unilingual.

I say it is inadmissible that, in the capital of a country where at least 40 per cent of the population speaks French, one should not be arrested in his own tongue at least.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not recognize bilingualism as an element of competence in bilingual districts, this bill is absolutely worthless. It will change nothing and bring nothing new to this country. Even now, this is roughly what we hear in Quebec. Of course, at this stage in the province of Quebec, the situation is well understood and people smile at our quibbling, at our hesitations about a problem which should have been settled not in 1969, but in 1867. We are already 102 years late and we still have doubts about the importance and necessity of establishing bilingualism in the public service of our country.

Mr. Speaker, even that bill was not required to take those steps. Instead of bringing about divisions, instead of trying to convince Canadians that the problems of the country were being settled through a bill on official languages, the government should merely have enforced section 133 of the constitution. To establish bilingualism wherever it is required in the public service, that bill was not required at all. It is obvious that steps should have been taken a long time ago.

If in a municipality, like, say Maillardville, in British Columbia, there are 5,000 or 10,000 French-speaking post office users, obviously the postmaster there should understand and speak French. And if there is a member of the R.C.M.P. on duty there, again it is obvious that he must understand those who come under his authority. All that could have been accomplished without introducing a bill. They want, with the help of a bill, to create in the province of Quebec the impression that Canada is becoming bilingual. It is not true. There are still many reservations. This will not be a step forward but backward.

Therefore, I agree with the minister's statement that there is no need to define anything as that constitutes a kind of insult to the French Canadians. Some people are afraid that French Canadians might become members of such organizations, afraid that they might be appointed to certain positions because they have a better knowledge of both languages and, with an amendment like this one, those people would like to prevent such a thing. I would hate to suspect the motives of the hon. member who is introducing this amendment, but when you have taken the trouble to study the problems of the country as well as the development of the French fact in Canada, you are able to guess pretty well the motives behind this proposition.

The aim is to maintain at all costs this situation thanks to which those who only speak English have always precedence over those who are bilingual. That is aberrant! The question of proficiency is only a face-saving device. Of course, French Canadians will never match the proficiency of their counterpart if the yardstick is the majority of the country.

Our laws are democratically conceived for the country as a whole according to its general frame of mind. It is therefore always difficult for those whose mother tongue is not English to display the same proficiency as that of their English-speaking countrymen since they have a different mentality. The problem is not there.

I shall go as far as to say that the problem of national unity will not be solved by such a bill. On the contrary. It will only breed dissension without fostering in the least the unity of the country. The French Canadians, and the Quebecers in particular, will not feel happy until they have a share in the management of the country. In other words, the bill should not be a bill on the official languages but a bill concerning the participation of the Quebecers, of the French Canadians in the management of public affairs. They should assume at least one third of the administration of the whole country. This is what the French Canadians want and they will not back out as long as they do not get it.

Mr. Speaker, however harsh these few remarks may sound, they are true because what will have been changed by the official languages bill in a few years since nobody will be transferred. For the time being, the government does not want to create fear. Nobody will be transferred. Everything will remain as it is and in a few years there will be bilingual employees whose mother tongue will be English. Then, the French Canadians, the Quebecers, will be excluded or almost so from the administration.

If we take into consideration all the Crown corporations or the government departments, everything that is related to the federal administration, the participation of the

French Canadians as such is about from zero to 2 or 3 per cent at the most.

One needs only to review the questions put on the order paper by my colleague, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), to ascertain the truth of such statements. And that is what the French Canadian wants to change. He no longer wants to have a 2 per cent participation in the administration of this country when he makes up one third of the population.

The bill before us, with all the reservations it contains and amendments that clarify them, instead of fostering unity, is causing a final division. When Quebecers understand the uselessness, the futility of this legislation, they will say: We knew that there was nothing to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand that some members of this house fail to grasp the true problem that now exists in Canada, that one can insult part of the population with such amendments. I read between the lines, and I see that the competence of the French Canadian is questioned. That is one of the purposes of this amendment.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it may happen that the major criterion of competence is precisely and exactly that a person is bilingual. So, if the enforcement of this legislation is not seen in its proper light, we might end in a blind alley.

Having sat on the special committee on official languages, I have heard with my own ears what the hon. member who moved the amendment had to say and he even stated categorically that French Canadians in provinces other than Quebec were against this bill.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. McQuaid: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. member correctly, that I said in committee that our party does not want any part of this bill? Is that what he said?

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: I did not say that the party was against this bill but that, according to you, the French-speaking minority outside Quebec was not interested in bilingualism and, consequently, was not interested in giving approval to this bill concerning the official languages.

I could refer to the proceedings—

[*English*]

Mr. McQuaid: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny ever having made such a statement in committee or anywhere else.

Mr. Woolliams: Or this party.

Mr. McQuaid: I would ask the hon. member to point out specifically where I made such a statement. If he cannot point it out, I would ask him to withdraw the remark.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, if I had in hand the report of the committee, I could read what the hon. member said then. It is, I believe, in Proceedings and Evidence No. 4. I recall that the hon. member for Matane (Mr. de Bané) flared up at that statement of the hon. member.

Anyhow, we are faced with an actual situation, and we are trying to answer the problem by means of solutions likely to foster national unity. Since this is one of the ostensible purposes of this official languages bill, in order to be logical, we must act accordingly, that is make sure that this bill really promotes bilingualism in the civil service. Furthermore, we must avoid including so many reservations in the implementation of that principle, because sooner or later the consequences of this bill, which will foster division instead of unity, will be realized.

If those possibilities are seriously taken into consideration, we must be deeply convinced of the need to turn down those amendments, which imply no more and no less that French-Canadians are unqualified in some areas, and consequently, that care should be taken so that competence takes precedence over bilingualism.

Mr. Speaker, there will always be plenty of reasons for claiming that French Canadians are incompetent. The creation of bilingual districts for the specific purpose of providing adequate services for minorities does not matter. However gifted and intelligent an individual may be, Mr. Speaker, if he is unable to make himself understood by those he must work with, then he is incompetent.

If the purpose is to fight discrimination, it is important not to jeopardize, by this policy of reservations, an effect which in the long run could prove beneficial, if only the government would move forward and forget its fears. It is too late to be afraid. If that is our aim, let us simply establish bilingualism in

the entire federal public service. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that it could have been done without introducing an official language bill because it was not necessary to establish bilingualism.

Under the constitution, even if it is a little out of date, the federal government should have preserved the rights, prerogatives and privileges of the minorities in provinces other than Quebec, but it never did.

In the present framework of the constitution, the only thing to do was to take our responsibilities, and there would have been no problem. The introduction of such a bill succeeded in scaring a major part of the country and it is now up to the minister and the government to patch things up.

[*English*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might have the consent of the house to reply now to the question put to me just a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member asked me whether I would produce figures to complement those I introduced on May 20 at second reading stage, which are found at pages 8839, 8840 and 8841 of *Hansard*. At that time I produced figures to show the comparison in the number of applications from university students to the public service of Canada in the years 1966 and 1969. I said they had doubled and that in 1965-66 there were 4,000 applications from university students of Canada and this year there had been 9,000. As will be found on pages 8840 and 8841, I listed the number of applications by universities.

I am prepared to table the figures for the year 1968-69 of the number of applications, the number appointed and the number of those appointed who were, in the opinion of the commission, bilingual, and to break those down in the form in which they appear at pages 8840 and 8841 of *Hansard*, by universities. Before doing that, in reply to the question asked I think I would be entitled to recite some of the more significant figures and let the rest of the table speak for itself.

The total number of applications as a result of the university recruitment programs in

1968-69 was 8,719. Of that number 410 were appointed, and of that number 140 were bilingual. These figures are broken down in this way: administrative trainee group, number of applications 4,013, number appointed 135, number of bilinguals 62. Foreign affairs group: number of applications, 1,746; number appointed, 54; number of bilinguals, 21. Social-economic groups: number of applications, 776; number appointed, 63; number of bilinguals, 19. Biophysical groups: number of applications, 1,440; number appointed, 126; number of bilinguals, 30. Applied science groups: number of applications, 744; number appointed, 32; number of bilinguals, 8. The total of all groups: number of applications, 8,719; number appointed, 410; number of bilinguals, 140.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The university breakdown speaks for itself. The total number of graduates appointed was 410 in 1969, and 140 were bilingual. This is broken down university by university in the same order in which I tabled it on May 20.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate have passed the following bills without any amendment: Bill C-194, an act to amend the Patent Act, and Bill C-207, an act to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic region.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Income Tax—exemption increases in budgetary proposals; the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault)—Fisheries—dogfish—discussions between Canadian and Japanese officials; the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath)—Fisheries—St. John's, Newfoundland—licensing of foreign vessels.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and motion No. 7, Mr. McQuaid.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in supporting this amendment, and taking into consideration what the minister said, I think it may be well to refer briefly to what the Public Service Employment Act really says. I should like to read three of the sections. Section 10 reads as follows:

Appointments to or from within the Public Service shall be based on selection according to merit—

In that regard I think the minister was right.

—as determined by the Commission, and shall be made by the Commission, at the request of the deputy head concerned, by competition or by such other process of personnel selection designed to establish the merit of candidates as the Commission considers is in the best interests of the Public Service.

Section 11 reads:

Appointments shall be made from within the Public Service except where, in the opinion of the Commission, it is not in the best interests of the Public Service to do so.

Section 12 emphasizes this and reads as follows:

The Commission may, in determining pursuant to section 10 the basis of assessment of merit in relation to any position or class of positions, prescribe selection standards as to education, knowledge, experience, language, age, residence or any other matters that, in the opinion of the Commission, are necessary or desirable—

For promotion.

All we are asking here is that members of the Canadian Armed Forces and members of the R.C.M.P. be protected in the same way because, as I understand the wording in the Public Service Employment Act, they are not included and do not have the same protection as those in the public service. Surely that is not too much to ask. I have spoken to members of the R.C.M.P. across the nation and have found there is real fear that there will be some discrimination with regard to promotion, particularly of those who have not had the opportunity to learn and to become fluent in both official languages.

I agree with the last speaker who said that everyone should have the right to be arrested in his own language. I think there is some merit in that. I believe it would be very difficult for a member of the R.C.M.P. from the province of Quebec who spoke only French if he were sent to Banff for the summer, just as it would be very difficult for an English speaking member of the R.C.M.P. to be sent to the province of Quebec.

Mr. Pelletier: No, no.

Mr. Woolliams: The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) disagrees. I like to have his attention because he will not speak on this bill. He wants the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to be his mouthpiece. Be that as it may, I will proceed with what I am saying. I think it would be very difficult.

When my good friend says that my party is against bilingualism, I would remind the house that before the Secretary of State had even been heard of the late R. B. Bennett was the first prime minister to put the English and French languages on the dollar bills of Canada and, flowing from that decision, all the doments that came from all departments of government were printed in both the languages. So I think we have to get some of the history straight. Second, a former prime minister, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), brought in simultaneous translation in the House of Commons. Before that time those of us who were not totally bilingual had to guess what was said. Some hon. members shake their heads, but that was before they left other parties to join the Liberal ranks and take advantage of that great opportunity.

When someone suggests that men such as myself who believe in Conservative principles may be against bilingualism, they are historically incorrect and incorrect in so far as our philosophy is concerned. The Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has stated over and over again where he stands on the bill.

An hon. Member: What about Diefenbaker?

Mr. Woolliams: Every Member of Parliament has a right to his own views. I know that people from different regions hold different views. I listen to my good friends, the French Canadians, I like to hear them speak

and I learn a lot about their province and their philosophy. I do not always agree with them, and I am sure they do not always agree with the westerners, but all we ask of them is that they show the same tolerance toward the west as the west shows them. My city of Calgary, for instance, encourages this relationship through the chamber of commerce by being the twin city of the city of Quebec. However, I do not wish to go off on a tangent; all I wanted to do was to set the record straight.

Mr. Orlikow: What a record!

Mr. Horner: You should not talk about records. You did not even stand up and vote; you left the house.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not want to get into an argument with my friends. All I can say is that I was here until ten minutes to six last night and I would be the last one to make a personal attack on any member of the hon. member's party.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): That was after you left, Eldon. Be honest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: I was not here when the attack was made on me.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): That is your own fault.

Mr. Woolliams: He did it deliberately.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I think one might call that a lie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being five o'clock the house will proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills, notices of motions (papers), public bills. However, before proceeding I understand the hon. member for Champlain wishes to speak to a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, in order to be fair to the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) whom I seemed to attack a while ago, if you will allow me, I might quote the statement he made in the official languages committee, which is as follows:

We must realize that there are some areas in Canada—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but this hardly constitutes a point of order. If there is a point of order or a question of privilege, it lies with the hon. member for Cardigan to raise it.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, there is agreement on this side of the house to waive private members' hour and to proceed with the consideration of Bill C-120. I suggest that this might be done if there is unanimous agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: May I digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to thank the Parliamentary Secretary for his courtesy in making that suggestion so I could continue my remarks.

All we ask is that members of the armed forces and members of the R.C.M.P. be accorded the same protection that is given to people employed in the public service. As I was saying, there is a real fear among members of the R.C.M.P. and members of the armed services that the fact that they are not totally bilingual may affect their promotions.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The greatest skill that is necessary is scientific knowledge. The Public Service Employment Act says that the commission may, in determining assessment of merit in relation to any position or class of positions, prescribe selection standards as to education, knowledge, experience, language, age, and so on. Knowledge is certainly of great importance so far as those who serve in the armed forces and the R.C.M.P. are concerned. Experience is certainly of great importance. If a person has the necessary knowledge and has served in the R.C.M.P. or in the services for 15 or 20 years, and there is a certain type of promotion open for which he is suited, then surely he has the necessary qualifications. All the amendment is asking is that the position of those who have been omitted should be safeguarded. I agree that language would be important, depending upon where the service is to be carried out.

The minister's main argument seems to be that clause 40 really added nothing by way of rights but simply spelled out what the rights were. Clause 40(4) says:

In relation to the appointment and advancement in employment of personnel the duties of whose positions include duties relating to the provision

of services by authorities to members of the public, it is the duty

(a) of the Public Service Commisson . . . and

(b) of the authority concerned, in all other cases,

to ensure that, in the exercise and performance of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed upon it by law, due account is taken of the purposes and provisions of this Act, subject always to the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit—

All we are saying is that the two classes of persons to whom we have referred should not have been omitted. Acceptance of the motion would give them the psychological security that those in the R.C.M.P. and in the Canadian Armed Forces need. Why not give them the same protection as is spelled out in the Public Service Employment Act?

The minister tells us the amendment would not really change the law. But I feel that if there were a disposition to include this provision for the safeguarding of those who serve in the Canadian Armed Forces and the R.C.M.P., no one would oppose it.

It seems to me, though, that under the new rules every opposition amendment, regardless of its merits, is voted down unless it has had the prior approval of the government or of the standing committee. We saw this happen this afternoon and we shall see it again with regard to the amendment now before us. What we are really doing in the House of Commons nowadays is playing games. Can the taxpayers afford to keep us here playing games when what we do has no effect? The government is saying: We shall run the country and we shall not listen to any suggestions put forward whether they have merit or not; we shall ram our legislation through, and we shall bring in further new rules so as to stop the opposition getting across to the people what is really going on in this country.

An hon. Member: Stop playing games.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) I should like to second almost all what the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) said earlier about a situation that has been going on in Canada for quite some time.

I also wish to say that I agree with him that it is highly frustrating to be arrested by a constable or to be admonished by a unilingual peace officer in a city such as Ottawa which, of course, should be bilingual. The hon. member for Champlain will nevertheless agree that there is some progress in this field and that we should give enough time to the new generation of public servants to acquire a reasonable knowledge of the second language, which they never had the opportunity to learn.

I would say to the hon. member for Champlain that bilingualism applies even to federal members of Parliament, because they must serve the whole Canadian population. I would hope that the hon. member for Champlain and all his colleagues who are not yet bilingual, who are as yet unable to understand the observations directed at them by peace officers, will themselves take courses in English as soon as possible, to set the example and to become truly bilingual.

In order to really prove to the hon. member for Champlain that I am not prejudiced about it, I would like to quote what he wanted to quote a while ago but could not because he was not allowed to do so, when he attributed to the hon. member for Cardigan words he would have said during a meeting of the special committee on official languages.

I draw it from page 231 of report No. 2. I checked with the hon. member for Champlain to see whether these were the words he alluded to, and he said yes. Here is the text which I will read in the hon. member's tongue to assure the house that I change nothing.

Someone had said that in Canada, everyone might not be in favour of bilingual districts, and the hon. member said this:

[*English*]

Mr. McQuaid: May I be permitted to answer that? I think we have to recognize that there are areas in Canada particularly in western Canada Mr. Pelletier—

An hon. Member: And in Quebec.

Mr. McQuaid: —and probably in Quebec too—but I am referring now particularly to the west—where 10 per cent of the people are French speaking. Now, these people are violently opposed to having a bilingual district established in their particular area. They feel that they are progressing satisfactorily among themselves the way they are, and are not anxious to have a bilingual district established. Surely such people have a right to be heard—or, at least, have their expressions and views put forward to the advisory board. There is nothing wrong with that, is there?

[*Translation*]

That is the text alluded to by the hon. member for Champlain, and I am one of those who think that bilingual districts may not be the best formula. It should not be inferred though that English-speaking Canadians living in Western Canada, are opposed to the principle of official bilingualism. If they have restrictions concerning

bilingual districts, it would not be proper to infer that they are opposed to the principle of official bilingualism. I think that, on the contrary, if a poll were taken, it would be seen that the great majority are in favour of official bilingualism.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised to note that a bill on official languages which answers an aspiration as basic as that of national unity as well as that of a group of people as large as the French-Canadian group, who want to live on an equal footing with English-speaking Canadians, should be the subject of so many precautions.

I am happy to note that, for the most part, my colleagues in this house are in favour of the principle of this bill. They have said so openly. However, although there is no direct objection to the principle, the discussion drags on and many precautions are taken, a great number of distinctions are made and an infinite number of constitutional concerns are put forward. And many subtle definitions, complaints and restrictions are made; in short, we are trying by all sorts of means to put so many buffers that, for all practical purposes, the bill finally becomes inoperative. No one dares attack it directly.

Some civil servants might suffer injustices on account of this legislation. Compulsion certainly exists since some people will have to learn French. In some quarters, some even say: You should not get carried away, you, the Quebec people; you are still the inhabitants of a conquered province. Since constitutional matters are added to that, let us settle them before we pass any legislation on official languages.

We are also told: Other ethnic groups are entitled to their own language. Large ethnic groups will have to be treated on the same footing as the French-speaking Canadians.

It is being said also: For all practical purposes, the Commissioner of Languages will become some kind of dictator in this field. All sorts of things are being said, Mr. Speaker, with an almost machiavellian subtlety which barely hides the desire to neutralize this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if somebody talks about injustice in the public service, I should like to remind those who are against this bill that French-speaking Canadians have been suffering injustice and discrimination for 200 years in the public service.

If anybody says that employees of the public service are compelled to learn French, I shall point out that for 200 years we have been compelled to learn English and we have learned it.

To those who remind us that we are a conquered nation, I say that this is an incident in an insignificant war and that no people endowed with a modicum of feelings and of pride will reconcile itself to centuries of subjection without sporadic outbursts, such as those which are happening at present in the province of Quebec and in the rest of this country, in order to obtain full equality with all other Canadians. In my opinion, this is not a serious argument; it is an insult to French-speaking Canadians.

• (5:10 p.m.)

To those who put forward the constitutional red tape, I say, Mr. Speaker, that men are not made to serve the law but that the law is made to serve men.

When it comes to fulfilling as basic a need as that concerning respect for a given language or religion, for instance, no constitutional red tape can ever be more important than this essential need, the existence of which must be urgently recognized.

Other ethnic groups also have rights, Mr. Speaker. We know that and we treat them well. We have welcomed them to Canada and given them all the rights enjoyed by Canadian people. When they came to this country, they knew they would have to choose between two official languages, French and English. They are allowed in addition to keep their own mother tongue in their schools, and no law prevents them from continuing to use it in their relations, with the members of their family or ethnic group.

Finally, all the other objections that are put forth are, to my mind, fictitious, and seem to have no other purpose but to confuse the issue, to throw dust in people's eyes and to keep the Canadian public from understanding well the reasons for this legislation.

A while ago I heard the member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) asking hon. members, in particular the French-speaking group, to be tolerant and to understand the aspirations of Canadians of foreign or English origin who live in Western Canada. For 200 years now, we, in Quebec, have set the example of respect for English-speaking citizens; we have given them their schools, we have heard them in their own tongue in our courts, in our municipal assemblies, in our provincial legislature.

We have proved our tolerance and what we want now is not tolerance but justice. We are

one of the founding peoples and we want to be treated, throughout the country, throughout the ten provinces, like other Canadians and, in particular, like the English-speaking Canadians whose equals we want to be.

We have been tolerant, but at this time the young people of my province and even the middle-aged and the older people protest against that kind of prejudice which excluded from the civil service our French-speaking people because they had an inadequate knowledge of the English language, and prevented them from being promoted. Now those times are gone by. We have taken the trouble to learn English and we want to have access to those promotions. We demand that all the others do as we did. Let them learn the second language if they want to be paid with the money collected from our taxes. We have been thinking about it for a hundred years.

We have been persecuted and not more than 25 years ago we were still scornfully urged to "Speak White"! We have borne that for 200 years, Mr. Speaker.

When our number was sufficient in some provinces, when, after Canada was ceded to England, we were promised that our sacred rights would be respected, we had to finance our schools with our own money after paying taxes for the English schools which were closed to us.

For 200 years, we were kept outside the public service which was financed with the taxes we were paying. We were forced to learn English and we did learn it.

None the less we have dealt well by the English Canadians. We have served in the wars fought by Canada in which many of our sons gave their life.

If at the present time separatism is prevailing in Quebec, the fault lies with some fanatics who oppose this bill, as they opposed the adoption of the Canadian flag, who object to French Canadians being put on an equal footing with all other citizens. They are the agitators and the fomenters of separatism in this country. We are trying to get across to them that the young people will not be treated as colonists, slaves or second class citizens. And those who refuse to understand it might bear the responsibility of seeing the fabric of confederation being torn apart and this country divided into several factions.

When I see them rise and protest against the excesses of our separatists, against the excesses of those who, in our country, are showing prejudice—there are some everywhere—and who demand integral unilingualism, or who do not want equal treatment for English-speaking and French-speaking students in the Quebec schools, I feel that they should be the last ones to denounce such a situation, because they are responsible for it or because they are the sons of those who are responsible.

We, in the province of Quebec, who are federalists, who are not afraid to show our convictions and our principles anywhere in Canada, who have for many generations respected all the Canadians living in our country but who did not speak our language, we, in Quebec, who forced ourselves to learn English, even in areas where we did not need to, have the right today to ask the remainder of the country to respect us and to follow the example which we have given for 200 years.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I object to all those amendements which are mere window-dressing to try to prevent the passage of that bill which is quite relevant but perhaps somewhat late, as stated by the hon. member for Champlain.

And when I hear the hon. member laughing and lightly discussing the matter, say that it is because of such narrowmindness that we will continue to see those divisions in Canada.

If Quebec ever separated from the rest of the country, the hon. member and all those who are like him would be held responsible and would have to account for their actions to the rest of the country.

[*English*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words at this time partly as a result of the interjection made a few moments ago by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). The hon. member suggested that because I was not here when the vote on second reading of the bill took place I was afraid to put my position on the record. For the information of the hon. member may I tell him I was not here because the premier of the Conservative government of Manitoba saw fit to call an election, and as a citizen of Manitoba I thought I ought to play a small part in that election.

I spoke on this bill on May 26, and at that time I made my position very clear. I want to quote one paragraph—

Mr. Horner: You are supposed to be speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member says that I am supposed to be speaking to the amendment. I can assure him that I will be no more out of order than he and his colleague from Calgary North have been repeatedly out of order during the last couple of days. On that occasion I said, as reported at page 9071 of *Hansard:*

> Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this bill, I realize that contained in it is one of the most important principles which the people of this country must face up to and resolve if our country is to survive. The deputy leader of our party, speaking on second reading of the bill some days ago, put the position of our party very clearly as one of support for the bill. I shall support this bill.

My hon. friend and colleague, the former member for Selkirk, who will be premier of Manitoba in a few days, in speaking on the principle of the bill on October 17 of last year, as reported at page 1498 of *Hansard* had this to say:

> I find the resolution easy to support in spirit, intent and in purpose. I find it laudable. The only thing I would add is that what we are being asked to do by this resolution we should have done years ago.

It seems to me that in this debate some hon. members have attempted to re-enact the fight that took place during the election campaign in June, 1968. By opposing this bill some hon. members think they are mobilizing the support of those who harbour anti-French and anti-Quebec sentiments. I suggest to those hon. members, particularly to those hon. members from Manitoba who voted against the bill at second reading, that it is best to forget about the election of June 25, 1968.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Aiken: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, neither the hon. member now speaking nor the hon. member who preceded him have mentioned the amendment, other than in passing. I suggest that this is not a general debate on the official languages bill. We are considering a specific motion to amend. Unless hon. member's remarks are confined to the relevant points at issue, we shall be here until Christmas.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I agree with the hon. member. Hon. members ought to confine their remarks to the amendment being discussed. I know that great latitude has been given to hon. members this afternoon in the debate on the amendment, but I hope that from now on hon. members will

kindly confine their remarks to the amendment before us.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Horner: Read the amendment. It might help you to think.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the last person in this house I am likely to take advice from is the hon. member for Crowfoot. I suggest that he has strayed from the matter being discussed more often than anyone else. I do not question your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I intend to confine my remarks to the amendment. However, since Your Honour has, so to speak, pulled me up after other hon. members have enjoyed some latitude, I cannot help being a little resentful. I will take the opportunity on another occasion to say what I want to say about this bill and about the feelings of the people of Manitoba in regard to it. May I say that I shall join my colleagues in supporting this amendment, it being one of the few moved by members of the official opposition that does not negate the spirit of the bill. In clear form it spells out the basic intent of the bill. No doubt the hon. member for Crowfoot will range far and wide in speaking in support of the amendment. If I do as he does, I hope I may be in order. I conclude by saying that I shall support this amendment.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to revert to routine business for a moment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is that agreed?

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have been acting as house leader for my party and I have been given no notice of any amendment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with an amendment. The hon. member wishes to present the report of the special committee with respect to certain private bills which we hope can be dealt with tomorrow. I hope the house will permit us to revert to routine proceedings.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the hon. member be permitted to move any motion the committee instructed him to move?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wishes to present certain reports.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

Fifth and sixth reports of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders—Mr. Givens.

[*Editor's note: Text of foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceeedings.*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and motion No. 7 (Mr. McQuaid).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands reserved.

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 40, the following subclause 5:

"(5) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this Act, provided that the applicant has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language."

• (5:30 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, may I say at the beginning of my remarks that I intend to do what Your Honour instructed the hon. member who preceded me to do. I shall confine my remarks to the subject matter of this motion. If anyone cares to check the record he will find that the speech I made yesterday on another amendment was short, succinct, entirely in order, and dealt specifically with that amendment. This being the last of a series of seven amendments I think it should receive serious consideration by the house, particularly in view of the remarks made earlier this afternoon by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and in view of the information which he tabled. He assured us that clause 40 will not change the merit principle, but will only ensure that that principle will stand as it is already written into the Public Service Employment Act. On the basis of that statement, and on the basis of the information he tabled about the hiring of university students, the numbers of them who were bilingual and the numbers who were not, I do not think he can have any real objection to this amendment.

My amendment clearly states:

Notwithstanding anything in this act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this act, provided that the applicant—

And I underline these words.

—has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language.

I can see no reason for any unilingual French speaking member of parliament, or French speaking Canadian seeking employment or promotion in the federal civil service objecting to this amendment.

Many of the suspicions and fears about this bill are based on its possible effects within the civil service. An article in the Calgary *Albertan* of Wednesday, July 2 headed, "Civil Servants Perturbed—Languages Hit Morale" points out how badly the morale of the civil service has been affected by this bill. Adoption of this amendment would assure applicants for jobs in the civil service that they would be treated with equality and fairness.

An article in today's Ottawa *Journal* is headed, "Multi-Million Dollar Federal Plan to Aid Teaching of French," and in effect it supports the purposes of this amendment. Many people fear the scope of this bill. Clause 9 spells out its scope fairly clearly when it refers to:

> Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada—

That covers a lot of ground. Clause 10 states:

> Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada has the duty to ensure that, at any office, location or facility in Canada or elsewhere at which any services to the travelling public are provided or made available by it, or by any other person pursuant to a contract for the provision of such services entered into by it or on its behalf after the coming into force of this act, such services can be provided or made available in both official languages.

Even contracts with the federal government fall within the scope of this bill. What does all this mean? The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) spelled it out very clearly as recorded in volume No. 1 of the Special Committee proceedings, at page 18, and I quote:

> As I read clause 9, and the same thing applies to clause 10, these requirements about service in both languages are placed upon Crown corporations only. That is, when they are placed upon corporations, they are placed upon Crown corporations only. I leave out the civil service and the agencies.
>
> What this means in practice is that, to take three examples, this requirement is placed upon the Canadian National Railways but not the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is placed upon Air Canada but not on Canadian Pacific Airlines or any small air line. It is placed upon the C.B.C. but not on the private television networks. It is obvious that the provision of services at the national capital or anywhere else involves an additional expense—

In that same paragraph, he pointed out that Crown corporations will be put to great expense that will not have to be met by private corporations with which they are in competition. He asked the minister was this fair, and why not encompass all corporations dealing with the federal government or having a federal charter. As recorded at page 20 of the committee proceedings, the Minister of Justice said:

> Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the committee I want to make it clear to the hon. member that we are not relying on any constitutional argument in failing to move beyond the limits already set in the bill. I tend to agree with the hon. member that we would probably have legislative jurisdiction.
>
> There are two points that I would like to make, probably by way of reiteration. The first is that the policy decision was to be limited to federal public institutions and agencies; if we were to take it into private enterprise we would have had the problem of deciding where to draw the line; should it merely be that part of private enterprise that competes with public enterprise as in the railways or in the public broadcasting system, or do we go into those other areas in which we have clear jurisdiction, banks, pipe lines, even companies having a federal charter? That is why the decision on policy was taken the way it was.

As recorded at page 19 of the proceedings, the minister said:

> We hope that the influence of this bill will go beyond the strict legal limits, and the hon. member is right in assessing those strict legal limits.

Let us not kid ourselves. This bill will have an influence on a wide range of activities. It will affect the hiring and the promotion of many, many Canadians. To understand this, one has only to consider the interjection made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) this afternoon when the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was speaking. At that time the minister said, "Why shouldn't a person have the right to be arrested or given a traffic ticket in his mother tongue"? This gives us some idea of the scope envisioned for this bill.

Mr. Pelletier: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not make any remarks about traffic tickets or anything of that kind. I think the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) mistook somebody else for me and did not recognize my voice, which is something I would never do to him.

Mr. Horner: Well, I am not going to argue with the Secretary of State on that point. *Hansard* will prove whether I am right or wrong. But the Secretary of State was reported in this article in the *Albertan* as saying:

> We should realize bilingualism is one of the necessities and wake up to the requirements.

Is this really true? Do all applicants for jobs in the civil service have to be bilingual? I do not think so, particularly in view of the information tabled this afternoon by the Minister of Justice.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Again, Mr. Speaker, we do not really know who will be responsible for seeing that the provisions of this legislation are carried out. We note that the Minister of Justice is being used to pilot the bill through the house. But will his fairmindedness be used in the

application of this bill? We have some suspicions in that regard. We see the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) sitting ever-watchful. It is common belief that the administration of this bill will come under his jurisdiction, that it will be he who will appoint the commissioner and that it will be to him the commissioner will report. So, we have these fears. I believe the amendment I am proposing is a very good one. I hope the Secretary of State can support it, because I think it brings about that degree of security which the Minister of Justice wanted to ensure. He stated that this bill would really ensure that the merit system would be upheld. There is not much point in my reading clause 12 of the Public Service Employment Act. It was read earlier this afternoon and spells out the merit system very clearly. In his speech earlier in this debate I believe the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) spelled out quite clearly what I believe should have been done. I believe this paragraph should be emphasized. As reported at page 9111 of *Hansard* he said:

> But here it is not that simple. Having examined the issues, having read the bill carefully and having studied the constitutional background, I am convinced that we are enacting an administrative measure. Virtually all those things the government seeks to have us approve are things which the government of its own volition could bring about without the concurrence of this house or the other place. We might well have had, and I should have preferred this, a resolution of this house to the other place expressing the views of hon. members and saying that in their opinion there are two official languages in this country and that it would be desirable for the people of this country, so far as it lies within the constitutional jurisdiction of the federal government and in co-operation with the provincial governments, to work toward the greater acceptance of the two official languages. A resolution like that could easily have been concurred in.

I agree with that statement, but here we have the situation in respect of a commissioner and bilingual districts. Along with that there is a great deal of fear among the members of the public service and applicants for employment in the public service because of the question in their minds concerning whether they must become bilingual. The Secretary of State said, "Certainly; wake up to the fact that bilingualism is going to be or should be a necessity". Then, we have the Minister of Justice saying that bilingualism is not quite a necessity yet. He tabled facts this afternoon supporting the argument that a unilingual person could be hired by the federal government. Today's Ottawa *Journal* indicates quite clearly that the government is prepared to spend millions of dollars teaching, I imagine, the official languages to civil servants and Canadians all across Canada. The objection I have to that, of course, is that this money might be spent only in the bilingual districts. If one does not live in a bilingual district he may not reap the benefit of that expenditure.

I do not intend to speak any longer on the amendment. I think it is self-explanatory. I believe it spells out quite clearly what most people have been concerned about. I know I mentioned it earlier in a speech I made on this subject on October 17. At that time I said that western Canada has a growing fear that it is being left out of the policy decisions of parliament. Western Canada also has a growing fear that it is being left out of the administrative decisions of the federal government. That fear will only be strengthened and increased twofold if this amendment is voted down. If this amendment is supported, western Canadians and Canadians from the provice of Quebec or from any other part of Canada whether or not they are bilingual, will be able to feel secure in the knowledge that they may apply for a position if they meet the qualifications for that position and provided they express a willingness to learn the other language. This to me does not seem to cloud the issue. Rather, it would seem to clarify it.

The minister said that in this bill there is the intention to ensure that the merit system as laid down in the Public Service Employment Act shall be followed. I seriously ask the Minister of Justice to persuade his colleagues to accept this amendment. I understand the vote on the amendment is to be deferred until this evening. I hope that during the supper hour he and his colleagues can find time to discuss this amendment and find a way to support it.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I just propose to state in a few words the reasons I cannot support this amendment, although it is very attractive in form and has been presented very moderately and excellently by the hon. member. The reason we cannot support it is really that we think it is totally inconsistent with the principle of the whole bill. It cuts out the guts of the bill. The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) has risen in this house a number of times during the debate to say that he is against the other amendments and because he is against the other amendments is against the whole bill. So far as I am concerned, however, there is more than one way to skin a cat. One way is to be against

the principle of the bill and the other way is to remove the principle from the bill. I suggest that is what is being done here.

Mr. Horner: You give me too much credit.

Mr. Brewin: No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was doing a good job. I believe the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner)—and I respect his right to have this view—is one of those who voted against the bill on second reading. I believe this amendment is very sweeping. It reads:

> Notwithstanding anything in this Act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this Act, provided that the applicant has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language.

There must be very many occasions on which the knowledge of one or the other of the official languages is absolutely essential to the performance of a function, and therefore I do not believe it would be appropriate to say that no person shall be refused employment or promotion because of his inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages. It seems to me this would be carrying the thing very far.

I am sure there are situations in the public service where it is essential that someone know both official languages and not just one because he would be unable to handle the job without that particular knowledge. This bill is full of safeguards. Clause 40 contains many of these safeguards, such as the postponement of early application and matters of that sort, which would be difficult to bring about and which would prejudice the interests of the public. If this amendment should pass, all a person would have to do to make the act completely dead would be to declare his intention and willingness to learn the official language. I have declared my intention and willingness to learn the other official language, although I must say I am finding the actual task of doing so considerably more difficult than my expression of intention to do so. I would not hesitate to say there are many jobs in the pulbic service to which it would be totally wrong to appoint a person with my inadequate acquaintance with one of the official languages. Yet, this amendment says that notwithstanding anything in this act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this act, provided that the applicant has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language.

• (5:50 p.m.)

All a person need do is make that declaration. As I say, I believe the bill contains many safeguards which would protect persons from being wrongfully dismissed in cases where a knowledge of the two languages is not essential. Subsection (4) of Section 40 of the act provides for the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit. This is required by the Public Service Employment Act and that basic principle is preserved.

This measure will have to be worked out in a reasonable manner so as not to deprive people of the right to effective maintenance of this principle of the act. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) spoke of the fears of many people in the west. I can understand why there would be such fears, but I think it is the task of those of us in this house to diminish any fears there may be.

Mr. Horner: Diminish them by our actions.

Mr. Brewin: Yes, that is right, diminish them by our actions. That does not mean we should adopt amendments that would destroy the effective working of the act, and for this reason we are opposed to the amendment.

Mr. Horner: You are nit-picking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I shall say only a few words on the amendment that has just been presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). While I listened to the hon. member making his point, and since he had already said he was against the principle of the bill, I find his amendment is logical, because he has confirmed—

[*English*]

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member suggests that I stated in this house I was against the principle of this bill. I do not recall ever stating that. I said the legislation was poor.

An hon. Member: You voted against it.

Mr. Horner: I voted against it on second reading because I wanted the committee to change it during committee consideration.

Mr. Deachman: Are you opposed to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Horner: Ask me that sometime when I have the floor, and I will answer it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot has just demonstrated his inconsistency when he said that he voted against the principle of the bill on second reading, and he would not state that he is actually against the principle of the bill. So he claims to be in favour of the bill, but in fact he is against it.

For 200 years, we have been witnessing those demonstrations of intentions and good will. Today, we are against that because we wish to live according to reality. It is for that reason that I commend the minister who introduced this bill so that once and for all everything will be done openly and the English-speaking group who are asking themselves what Quebec wants will have to take a stand.

What Quebec wants, we know it, is justice pure and simple. Quebec wants implementation of the policy it has been applying in favour of minorities for the past 200 years.

I feel the bill precisely confirms this policy and that is why I certainly cannot approve the amendment moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), who states that it can result in discrimination against unilinguals within the Public Service. For instance, when he says: "If I were a French-speaking unilingual", I can give him an immediate reply: "If you were a French-speaking unilingual, you would never become a public servant because, in the past 200 years, non-bilingual French Canadians have never been admitted to the Public Service." That is the reply.

It is suggested today that by means of this bill that irregular situation prevailing through Canada must be corrected. I am not speaking of a small area even located in the province of Quebec. Let us see what goes on in the remotest areas. In my riding, where there only 2 per cent English-speaking people, all official publications are issued in both languages. The same cannot be said about the western provinces and that is why we want bilingualism to be respected throughout Canada. The amendment reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding anything in this act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this act—

If we were to accept this amendment, we might just as well totally reject the bill, because by accepting the amendment you destroy all the effect of the bill.

I go on quoting:

> —provided that the applicant has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language—

Imagine the terrific joke of the hon. member for Crowfoot! We have been living on good intentions for the past 200 years. We are told that the English-speaking Canadians are well-meaning. Possibly, but they have never shown any good will. They are well-meaning but they have never made up their minds.

[*English*]

Mr. Horner: Would the hon. member permit a question? In respect of his belief as to the principle of the bill, does he feel that a person has to be bilingual before he can get a job or a promotion in the civil service?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: In the future, Mr. Speaker, when the bill has been passed, it will be absolutely necessary for an individual to be bilingual. This has been going on for a hundred years. An individual will have to be bilingual to enter the public service.

I think this is not asking too much because it has been asked of us for 200 years—

[*English*]

Mr. Horner: May I ask the hon. member another question on that very point? After listening to the debate does he think that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) agrees with the principle he has just enunciated?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) Oh, come on, Jack!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: I refer to the bilingual districts. I know that there are small English-speaking villages where there is not one French Canadian, but I refer to the public service here in Ottawa and to all the bilingual districts. We must use our judgment and I think that if the member for Crowfoot had used his, he would not have presented such an argumentative amendment. May I point out that it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-202, an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, without any amendment.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and motion No. 8 (Mr. Horner).

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I was saying just before recess that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) was not acceptable to this house because it goes against the principles of the bill, and renders void the purpose of clause 40. In fact, it says that the languages bill should be amended by adding subclause 5 to clause 40.

Clause 40, which already has four subclauses, proves that the minister and the government are very tolerant, because first there is the power to postpone, or to defer in some cases, the implementation of the act. This is what the bill says:

40. (1) Where upon the submission of any Minister it is established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that the immediate application of any provision of this Act to any department or other institution of the Parliament or Government of Canada (hereinafter in this section called an "authority") or in respect of any service provided or made available by it

(a) would unduly prejudice the interests of the public served by the authority, or

(b) would be seriously detrimental to the good government of the authority, employer and employee relations or the effective management of its affairs, the Governor in Council may by order defer or suspend the application of any such provision to the authority or in respect of any such service for such period, not exceeding sixty months from the coming into force of this Act, as the Governor in Council deems necessary or expedient.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

I think that if the hon. member had very carefully read clause 40 of the bill, he would not have even thought of moving this amendment.

And, in the following paragraph, we can read the following under the terms of order and directions to ensure an early application.

(2) Any order made under this section may contain such directions and be subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems appropriate to ensure the earliest possible application of any deferred or suspended provision provided for in the order, and in addition may prescribe different periods, not exceeding in any case the maximum period provided for under subsection (1), for different operations carried on or services performed or made available by the authority, to or in respect of which the application of any such provision is deferred or suspended.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in all regions throughout Canada, the legislator has provided for all the exceptional cases which might arise to afford that advantage, for instance, to a constituency without a single French Canadian, in the same way as we might do in the province of Quebec, in parishes and in ridings where not a single English Canadian is to be found. Nevertheless, we publish all court judgments in French and in English, even if the English provinces have never done so and have never adjusted to that full bilingualism.

We find the law very permissive because—as I said this afternoon—it establishes once and for all that bilingualism must be respected all across Canada.

The hon. member says in his amendment that on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages, an applicant for employment in the Public Service cannot be denied employment provided that he has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other language.

Those are the very intentions we want to exclude from the legislation. We are living in the century of realities and the period of good intentions has gone by. We have endured the good intentions of the other group for two hundred years, and I think that now is the time, more than ever, to come back to today's realities in Canada, that is to bilingualism as is now required by conditions prevailing in Canada.

I now want to congratulate all the groups in this house who have made progress in that direction these last years, because the vote on

this motion will indicate to all Canadians that all sincere people in Canada want Canadian unity, that is full bilingualism in Canada. After this vote, Mr. Speaker, there will be some twenty opponents, but I think that by pitching into them the idea that they also must become Canadians, and stop being unilingual, we will make them understand that the salvation of Canada rests upon bilingualism.

If the question is finally put tonight with respect to this motion, I think the Canadian people will realize that government members are determined to recognize once and for all the bilingual nature of Canada, not only in theory, but also in practice.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we listened with great care to the speech made by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) this afternoon just before we rose for the adjournment at six o'clock. I gave careful and sympathetic consideration to the amendment which he proposes. Before dealing with it in specific terms, I think it is perhaps necessary to give the house some background material in order that members may understand fully the significance of the proposal made by the hon. member for Crowfoot in the light of the impact which it would have on the long standing traditional practices in the public service of Canada.

In the early 1930's, parliament amended the Civil Service Act of 1918 in such a way as to direct the Civil Service Commission to ensure, in making an appointment to a local office—that is to say a position not in the headquarters establishment—that the candidate to be appointed be proficient in English or French, whichever of these languages was used by the majority of the members of the community in which he was to be posted and which the local office served. Thus was established the principle that a prerequisite to appointment was a sufficient knowledge of either his first or his second language to enable the public servant to provide services to members of the community in the language used by the majority of those members.

I am told by the chairman of the Public Service Commission that the records of the commission show that in the 1930's it required on an administrative basis, certain linguistic skills to serve the minority linguistic group throughout the period preceding and succeeding the amendment to the Civil Service Act of 1918 to which I just referred. In 1961, when the legislation governing appointments and promotions in the public service was under review by the parliament of the day under the administration of the then prime minister, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), parliament decided, and in my view quite rightly, both to extend the principle to which I just referred and at the same time to provide in the statutes an explicit direction to the Civil Service Commission to the effect that in making appointments or in promoting prospective candidates care should be given to ensuring that the candidates be sufficiently proficient in English or French or both so that service to the public may be effective.

Again in 1967 when parliament endorsed the Public Service Employment Act, this extension of the basic principle to which I just referred was incorporated in section 20 of the act. I should like to read the section. It is part of the law of Canada. It reads:

> Employees appointed to serve in any department or other portion of the Public Service, or part thereof, shall be qualified in the knowledge and use of the English or French language or both, to the extent that the Commission deems necessary in order that the functions of such department, portion or part can be performed adequately and effective service can be provided to the public.

I believe this is a brief review of the history of the practice and traditions of the public service of this country for the past 30 years or more. To an increasing degree, as is evident in the policies of succeeding governments representing both the party to which I belong and the party of the official opposition, we have recognized the need to insist, in cases where in fact there is a need, that the possession of the appropriate linguistic skills, either by way of a first or second language, must be an element in the administration of the principle of merit. This proposition was made explicit by the then prime minister, Mr. Pearson, in his statement to this house on April 6, 1966, when he said the following:

> The achievement of bilingualism is in itself a desirable objective for any Canadian citizen. Where the need for bilingualism clearly exists in practice, above all in the National Capital, it should be recognized as an element of merit in selection for civil service positions.

As the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) said this afternoon in referring to section 12 in the assessment of merit, although it may not be a direct definition certainly it sets the guidelines or standards

by which merit is to be judged, that is general proficiency, the intellectual formation and education, knowledge of the language of the community, and the other factors mentioned in that section which are deemed to be relevant.

The hon. member for Crowfoot, in proposing this amendment, has two objectives in mind I am sure. First, he wants to ensure as far as possible that any public servant is not subjected unnecessarily to the selection standards which would be a barrier to the development of his own personal career, either in his opportunities to achieve recruitment—

Mr. Horner: Not my own personal career.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He was speaking on behalf of his party. As I said, either by way of recruitment to the public service or, once having obtained admission to the service of Canada, in his promotional opportunities.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Second, I believe the amendment seeks to ensure as far as possible that entry into the public service is not unnecessarily barred to one who through no fault of his own has found himself unable to acquire appropriate skill in the second language. To this end, the hon. member has suggested—and I use the words of his amendment—that willingness to learn the other language should be a sufficient qualification. In this connection, we have reviewed the possibility of exploiting language training resources in such a way as to meet the objectives of the hon. member without prejudice to the principles which have been established in the management of the Public Service of Canada over the past 30 years.

I might suggest to hon. members that we in this house are obliged to consider two aspects of the administrative problem. First, I have been informed by the Public Service Commission that 75 per cent of the men and women who work for the people of Canada as employees in the public service never leave the town or locality in which they are recruited. The likelihood of new language requirements from persons recruited in unilingual localities is therefore remote. I have in mind areas such as those represented by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) or by several hon. members from the Province of Quebec—Rimouski and Chicoutimi, for instance. Thus, if the amendment is designed tt protect the person who has never had an oppoetunity to learn the second language, it would really have only a limited application. Second, if one places the extensive language training facilities available, presently 5,000 places—the number is soon to be increased to 7,000 and ultimately to 9,000—against the potential demand—and the global figure today is 370,000 public servants, excluding members of the Armed Forces—

Mr. Horner: The hon. gentleman is not including the Crown corporations.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am including them, but not the employees of the C.N.R. As I was saying, if one places the facilities available against the potential demand it is easily seen that while the requirements for language training might, in the ordinary course of things, be easily met, periods could arise in which this would not be possible because of an unusually high demand. We feel, therefore, that it would not be appropriate to tie the public service into a legislative straitjacket in connection with language training which might well frustrate its development in certain unusual circumstances.

Mr. Horner: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member for Crowfoot knows me well. I am at his disposition, but I wonder whether he will allow me to finish my exposé. His memory is very good at this time of the evening and I am sure he will be able to return to the question later when I have finished what I have to say.

Mr. Horner: My memory is good at any time of the day.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Further, it is estimated that of the total of 370,000 mentioned, barely one sixth, or 50,000, will need any bilingual capability, and of that number one-half, or 25,000, are already bilingual. This is the size of the problem we have to deal with. The question I put to the hon. member for Crowfoot and to the house in general is: In these circumstances should we tie ourselves to the rigid concept of a statutory requirement such as the amendment envisages?

The position of the government in relation to the proposed amendment must now be obvious to members of the house. There are, however, one or two smaller points which perhaps should be made with regard to the administration of such a proposal. For

instance, how does one interpret the words of the amendment "inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages"? It seems to me that this phrase defies definition and, consequently, application. The same problem arises in connection with the phrase "willingness to learn". The point was made very succinctly by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

Mr. Horner: Who gets the 7½ per cent increase in pay?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If applied in the rigid statutory form it could be fulfilled by a candidate simply saying: "Yes, I am willing to acquire a second language." I agree with the hon. member for Greenwood that if this concept were set out in statutory form it would render ineffective not only the clause which the hon. member seeks to amend, but the entire bill.

This is a subjective concept difficult of objective definition and application. There may well be various degrees of willingness. One person might be willing to learn but not willing to make the effort required in order to succeed. As the hon. member for Greenwood said—and this is confirmed by the experience of everybody in the house who has immersed himself in the second language—willingness is one thing, but the persistence necessary to acquire a satisfactory knowledge of the second language is another.

For these reasons the government cannot accept this proposal. We are committed to the principle set out in section 20 of the Public Service Employment Act. We are committed jointly with the governments of the early 'thirties, the early 'sixties, under the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and of 1967, to the establishment and development of that principle.

In the third place, we do not believe that the rigid concept set forth in the amendment—

Mr. Horner: There is nothing rigid about it at all.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —should be put into law, particularly when that concept is difficult to define and not easily applicable.

With respect, the point about which the hon. member is concerned is a valid one but I do not think he has put forward the appropriate solution. The government is concerned as to the necessity for applying a bilingual policy for the Public Service of Canada with equity and justice. The people of French speaking Canada who complain of 100 years of injustice—

Mr. Horner: Two hundred.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is not necessary to reciprocate that injustice with another against the majority of the people of Canada by an unjust application of what we believe to be a legitimate policy.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: You are saying that two wrongs make a right.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. Horner: That is what you are saying in this bill.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We deny that categorically, and I say that through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Crowfoot. We contend that the hon. member's solution would be impracticable, one not capable of realization.

I have reviewed with the chairman of the public service commission, and the government is also reviewing with him, the two aspects of this policy which must always remain in mind. They are, first of all, that no one should be penalized, either by way of recruitment or by promotion, for his failure to have a second language until he is given adequate opportunity to learn that second language. That is the policy of the government of Canada which was first enunciated in 1966 by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, and it is still our policy today. We are in continual contact with the Public Service Commission to see that this policy is ensured.

Secondly, as Mr. Pearson said in 1966—and this statement still governs today—no one who was recruited to the public service of this country under what he believed were different ground rules should be subjected to a situation where government policy, in his mind, has changed without being given an opportunity to learn the other language, or at least to preserve his career that was launched under different circumstances. In justice to members of the public service who have a certain seniority in service to the people of Canada, they have certain rights and at least must be given the opportunity to learn that second language; and this we recognize as part of the policy of the administration of government.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the hon. member for Crowfoot, through Your Honour, that his amendment does not achieve that objective. His amendment would render null and void the purposes of the official languages bill. The policy that he is trying to achieve I believe the government is trying to achieve by ensuring that the public service of Canada is made equally accessible both to French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians across the country. We do not want to force bilingualism on any citizen of this country. What we want is an institutional bilingualism that is achieved with fairness to those men and women who have been recruited to the public service of Canada. The legislative straitjacket which the hon. member is attempting to force on the government would not achieve what the hon. member wants to achieve but would indeed deny the principle of this bill.

For these reasons the government recommends to the house that it rejects this amendment.

Mr. Horner: Now the minister has concluded, would he permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot on a question.

Mr. Horner: I will direct my question to the minister in this way. Let me assume his point is valid. If he finds fault with the wording of the amendment, would he ask his legal draftsmen to use their ability to bring in an amendment that will substantiate the point made by the amendment, which the minister has said is a valid one?

My second question is this: The minister says that all civil servants who so desire will be given ample opportunity to learn the second language, be it English or French. Are we now led to believe that every member of the public service will, in the future, have an opportunity to learn the other language? Will everyone in the 9,000 areas that the minister said will be set up be given an opportunity to learn the other language?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's first question no amount of skilful drafting—and I do not think we could improve upon the drafting of the hon. member for Crowfoot—could convert an inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages and a willingness to learn into an objective standard that would enable this bill to achieve this purpose. This must depend on flexibility and on justice of administration. That is the answer to the hon. member's first question. I could bring all the forces of the law officers of the Crown to bear on this particular amendment and none of them could achieve what the hon. member is attempting to achieve.

In answer to the second question if, as I have said, the bilingual capability really relates to 25,000 public servants—

Mr. Horner: You said one sixth.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes, one sixth. But 25,000 are, in the opinion of the commission, fully bilingual, so we are dealing with one twelfth—one half of one sixth.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I have to watch the minister's arithmetic. One sixth of 370,000 is 60,000.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the minister to direct his remarks to the Chair, and I invite the hon. member for Crowfoot to hear the minister out.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I accept your reprimand, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member for Crowfoot is a pretty magnetic personality and sometimes I get carried away by him. I suggest that if the hon. member for Crowfoot and I were sitting on the fence watching cattle go through the gate, he would have no trouble with his mathematics. At the moment we are dealing with one twelfth of the public servants of Canada, 25,000, for whom a capability of 9,000 places will be available. As a result of the advice given to me by the chairman of the public service commission. I am convinced that our facilities will be adequate to achieve the desired result. They are my two answers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) since it is the only apparent hope of making undesirable legislation at least tolerable. I would have preferred to see this bill withdrawn and redrafted or, failing this measure of good sense, at least held in abeyance until the question of its constitutionality was cleared up and the effects of its provisions more closely studied. But as things now stand, it is clear the government intends to push it through parliament, heedless of probable consequences. In these circumstances, the best we can hope for is to mitigate some of the injustices it will obviously create.

Like other members of my party who support this amendment, I am chiefly concerned

with the damage that will be done, by the implementation of this bill in its present form, to Canadians of all ethnic origins as well as to the national interest. This damage will arise from the discriminatory nature of the bill.

Discrimination is the very essence of this legislation. It will discriminate against all Canadians who, because of the area of Canada in which they were born and the total lack of second language facilities in those areas, have little hope of being classed as bilingual. It will favour those born into one language and brought up in two—in other words, French Canadians.

I very much doubt whether there is in Canada, or anywhere else for that matter, a person who is truly bilingual in the sense envisaged by this bill. Neither do I believe that it is possible for anyone, be he of French or English language background, to reach the condition of bilingualism espoused by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) in this theory of a fully bilingual state, and which they are attempting to create by this legislation.

In saying this I am not being critical, bigoted or stubborn. I am not saying bilingualism is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, fortunate or unfortunate. I believe that human limitations and the facts of life in Canada and in North America as a whole make my statement true. When you have legislation that prescribes, as a condition of employment and career advancement, that a person must be bilingual, you are imposing upon that person something that he is powerless to acquire of his own volition. To my mind it is similar to the arbitrary physical standards set out as a condition of employment in the R.C.M.P. or armed forces. It is a physical attribute that is imposed by nature, not by individual desire or initiative. It is an accident of birth.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The facts of life in Canada are that many Canadians of French ancestry have been born into French speaking homes and raised largely in an English speaking environment. The reverse is true of very few Canadians of English or other ethnic backgrounds. Any law that has the effect of compelling employees of the public service to be bilingual automatically restricts the recruiting ground of the Public service to the French sector of the country. It openly discriminates against those who by chance of birth come from other areas of the country and from a background other than French. As reported in the Montreal *Star* of April 16 last, Mr. S. A. Blackburn, the man responsible for the language training program in the Public Service of Canada said:

> —a second language can only be attained by one who is prepared to work on a full-time basis in a second linguistic and cultural milieu for a long period—a year or more.
>
> Indeed, it is obvious that most Canadians cannot be fluently bilingual.

Mr. Blackburn is further reported to have stated that in his opinion the truly bilingual person is virtually non-existent. "Even the bilingual person", he added, "is at an enormous disadvantage if he has to do intellectual, creative work in a second language."

One does not need to have particularly clear perception in order to see what the effect upon Canada and Canadians will be if the public service of the nation is closed to all who are not already partly bilingual. In this regard it might be well to look at the experience of the Public Service Commission with respect to recruitment on a language basis and in language training, as set out in the 1968 report of the Public Service Commission. On page 24 of the 1968 annual report is found this paragraph:

> Furthermore, the Commission felt it could not rely mainly on external recruitment of personnel already proficient in both English and French to staff positions where both languages were required since this course of action would have had unfortunate consequences. Opportunities for acquiring second language skills in many parts of Canada would have resulted in the Commission's having only a limited capacity to recruit in certain regions of the country. Secondly the career status of employees already in the service would have been adversely affected since through no fault of their own they found themselves lacking second language skills. Finally to have relied mainly on external recruitment to meet required linguistic objectives would have taken perhaps 20 to 25 years in order to attain a satisfactory situation unless a wholesale replacement program was undertaken.

On page 30 of this document is a table headed "Distribution by Training Levels of the Total Active Student Nominations, November 30, 1968". Underneath the table are to be found the following words:

> It will be seen that approximately 88% of those studying French as a second language are in the two lowest levels while this is the case for only 41% of those studying English.

Furthermore, in Table VII, which shows distribution of identified population in the designated categories by levels of instruction, we see that 13,520 English speaking students are learning French whereas 3,200 French speaking students are studying English. On page 44 of this document are to be found

these words with respect to language proficiency:

> Section 12 of the Act authorizes the Commission to 'prescribe selection standards as to education, knowledge, experience, language, age, residence or any other matters that, in the opinion of the Commission, are necessary or desirable having regard to the nature of the duties to be performed . . .', in determining 'the basis of assessment of merit in relation to any position or group of positions . . .' Thus language proficiency is an element of merit pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act.

On page 46 the commission goes on to say this:

> —proficiency in both languages is always a desirable qualification when it is not an essential one when 'ten per cent or more of the public served by the unit have the English language or the French language as their mother tongue—
>
> The Commission's Regulations stipulate that any English-speaking or French-speaking minority group constituting 10% or more of the overall population of a given area justifies provision of service in both official languages.

I am not in any way attempting to impugn the idealism of either the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State. I simply say that the facts of life in the world in which we live make it impossible for this legislation to achieve its ends. In fact, I believe this legislation will create the very conditions it seeks to alleviate and will bring about the opposite of that which it is intended to do. It will create in this country a preferred class and discriminate against the majority of Canadians. It will create language reservations which will be force fed behind protective legislative fencing. The result will be that the bill will create outside these fences resentment and animosity. These feelings in turn will create walls and the people inside the language reservations will not be able to break through them. We are setting the clock back. We are imposing immobility on our French speaking population and not providing for mobility. We are raising up an entire new system of internal barriers at the cost of our unity.

May I now return to the specific question of bilingualism in the public service, Mr. Speaker. It has been stated that merit alone will decide who is to enter or who is to be promoted in the government service. The public service regulations nevertheless make it clear that bilingualism is very important in assessing merit. In the 10 per cent areas envisaged under the bill I can see that merit will mean linguistic ability alone. As I have already previously noted, such linguistic ability on the part of our people in Canada is not a self-acquired characteristic. It is an accident of birth. It so happens that our history and development as a nation have made sure that the bulk of Canadians born with this linguistic attribute are to be found in our French speaking areas. The facts of history and not the people of this country have dictated that the world of North America shall be overwhelmingly English speaking.

A man's facility in the second language will be a prerequisite for his entry into and promotion within the public service. In most cases the second language facility will become an absolute requirement. This, in turn, gives a lopsided advantage to people of French language background. French language areas will become prime recruiting ground for the public service which will become unbalanced. I submit there will be more French Canadians who speak English than English speaking Canadians who will be proficient in French. This state of affairs, certainly, will not be a fair reflection of Canada or Canadian society. It will be unjust and discriminatory and a poor example of the just society.

We must face the problem of defining bilingualism, Mr. Speaker. What is a bilingual person? I have already quoted the leading government authority on the question, who has said that a truly bilingual person probably does not exist. We must therefore recognize that the degree of a person's bilingualism is hard to measure. It is a volatile variable in our calculations. The degree may vary from day to day, month to month and year to year. The degree of bilingualism will vary as the area in which people work varies. Again, this bill will confer undue advantages on the minority at the expense of the majority. I am very concerned as to the sort of national job the Canadian public service will do if it is forced to depend for recruits largely on French Canada because of the provisions of this bill.

Also, Mr. Speaker, will we not present a schizophrenic face to the world in international affairs? Can a predominantly French oriented public service adequately serve a country that is overwhelmingly English-oriented? The highly respected publisher of *Le Devoir*, Gérard Filion, said recently that Quebec is relatively poor and backward because it has failed to develop its vast natural resources and "Above all, its resources of human talent."

Mr. Blackburn, in the remarks I have already quoted, has noted that even when different groups share the same language, let alone two languages, that is not enough for them to understand each other and communicate adequately. He spoke of Great Britain

and the United States as being two countries that share the same language but differ widely in cultural background. He said:

> They have most words in common but the words do not necessarily mean the same thing.

Mr. Blackburn said that satisfactory communication and understanding can only come from two groups thoroughly understanding each other's cultural backgrounds and from experience. All these factors, Mr. Speaker, make me wonder whether this bill is nothing more than an empty gesture, a futile attempt to achieve something foredoomed to failure by the immutable facts of the world in which we find ourselves.

• (8:50 p.m.)

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment simply because I believe it would make a bad bill a little better. It is now apparent that the government's majority and the stubbornness of its leaders make passage of the legislation inevitable. The best we who oppose it can do in the circumstances is to try to make it less objectionable, and hopefully less discriminatory.

In closing, I would simply like to quote another leading thinker and writer from the province of Quebec, Claude Ryan, editor of *Le Devoir*. He said, as reported in *Canada Month* magazine:

> Quebeckers would like to have the best of two worlds, you know. They would like to be as free as possible—and I set no limit here. And on the other hand they want to be as comfortable and prosperous as the rest of North America, in particular the more prosperous parts of North America.

I echo those sentiments, Mr. Speaker, and to them I say "amen". But if the people of Quebec and the rest of French Canada are to find the freedom and the just share in North American prosperity to which they are entitled I do not believe it will be by means of artificial contrivances such as the bill now before us. They cannot find what they seek through legislative measures that will only end by segregating them behind legalistic barbed wire on isolated language reservations. They will not find it by accepting a false and unjust position of preferment. Neither the French people of this country nor the unity of Canada can come fully into their own on the basis of injustice and discrimination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State.

Mr. Alexander: Some hon. members "Oh, oh."

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I had made up my mind to speak in French to avoid the rather troublesome and, on the whole, rather vulgar, interruptions my colleague, the Minister of Justice, had to put up with earlier while he was quietly and soberly expressing his point of view.

I see that my decision was justified because I had hardly opened my mouth that I heard coming from the other side of the house certain noises hardly identifiable, which did not make any sense to me, perhaps because did not have any, which would not surprise me a bit.

At this point of the debate, I should like to point out a number of particulars on two interventions: First of all, the one from the sponsor of the amendment that is before us now, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and then, the more surprising one and the least explainable, from the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie).

I merely wish to clarify some points because during this debate, Mr. Speaker, a certain number of statements were made which neither the facts nor the bill under study can justify.

For instance, the hon. member for Crowfoot stated, on the basis of a very fragmentary and truncated quotation taken from a newspaper article, that I had said that I believed it necessary for all federal public servants to become bilingual. That is pure fantasy. Because I have said, on many occasions, that there was an obvious need in the Canadian public service for a certain number of bilingual public servants, but that in all likelihood it would never become necessary for all federal employees to be fluent in the two official languages of Canada.

When I said that we need a number of bilingual civil servants, I was thinking in fact of views such as those expressed by the hon. member for Crowfoot in the amendment he put before the house today. In fact, the hon. member wants us to include in the legislation that no appointment nor promotion will ever be refused to a civil servant on the sole basis that he cannot express himself in both the languages of this country.

Mr. Speaker, how can one reasonably propose such a thing? And I would put this question to the hon. member for Crowfoot if he were still in the house, but he has the art

of vanishing into thin air when his opponents take the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pelletier: I never had the pleasure—besides, I wonder whether it is a pleasure or not—to speak while he was here. How can the hon. member for Crowfoot seriously move that amendment and face up to cases such as this one, for instance: a unilingual French-speaking federal civil servant who, by his sole competence, becomes the head, let us say, of the Income Tax office in Toronto, or else, to come closer to the hon. member for Crowfoot, of the Income Tax office in Edmonton.

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: How about the commissionaires you fired?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: I would not know how to reply to the objections of this honourable member of whose constituency I am not exactly sure. I feel he has nothing to do with this discussion, since he is not interested in the bill. Besides, as far as I am concerned, he could leave the house right now and I would not feel the difference. I do not understand what he is saying but I suspect that it would not be very useful to me even if I did.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot study an amendment such as this one without considering also its practical consequences. And its practical consequences—I see that the honourable member has returned; I welcome him back—if it were passed and fully implemented, would make it possible for the honourable member for Crowfoot, if defeated in a future election, to be admitted in the Civil Service and become, for instance, an office head in the province of Quebec where nobody would be able to understand him. Has he truly considered the consequences of an amendment which, to my mind, is completely thoughtless and against one of the basic objects of the bill now under consideration?

I would also like to point out also—to throw light on the hon. member's statement—that he made some allegations which seem to me extremely gratuitous. He said, for example, that according to the bill, the responsible minister would appoint the Commissioner of official languages and that the latter would report to the responsible minister.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

I was wondering when listening to him, whether the hon. member had read the bill. If so, he would have found in clause 19 (2)—

> The Commissioner shall be appointed by commission under the Great Seal after approval of the appointment by resolution of the Senate and House of Commons.

As for reporting to the responsible minister, he would have read in clause 33, and I quote:

> If within a reasonable time after the making of a report containing any recommendations under section 31, no action is taken thereon that seems to the Commissioner to be adequate and appropriate, the Commissioner, in his discretion and after considering any reply made by or on behalf of any department or other institution concerned, may transmit a copy of the report and recommendations to the Governor in Council and may thereafter make such report thereon to parliament as he deems appropriate.

Therefore, the Commissioner of Official Languages would report to parliament, and the same provision is contained in clause 34 (2):

> Every report or statement to parliament made by the Commissioner under section 33—

• (9:00 p.m.)

Nowhere is it mentioned that the minister responsible shall appoint the Commissioner of Languages nor that the Commissioner of Languages shall report to the minister responsible.

Of course, any member may look at this legislation with a critical eye—this is what we are here for—but he should at least read it first.

I should like to raise another point. Much has been said tonight about a fair treatment being given to civil servants and God knows I am all for it. It has been said and acknowledged that injustice has been done. That is right. It has been asserted that two wrongs do not make a right, and that is also true.

Now what surprises me is that no reference is never made to the fairness extended to the public, while the legislation respecting the official languages is essentially intended to render justice, at the language level, to a whole section of the Canadian public, that is to the English-speaking Canadian public and the French-speaking one as well living in communities with a different linguistic majority.

Now it is most important, Mr. Speaker, for one not to worry exclusively, nor even primarily, when considering such legislation, about the fairness exercised with respect to civil servants, but to worry above all about

the fairness extended to the public. A French-speaking or an English-speaking taxpayer, in an officially bilingual country, is entitled in all fairness to communicate with his government in the language of his choice, that is most likely in his mother tongue.

Thus, any rational appraisal of the text of the legislation, to be neither emotional nor biased, should give some consideration to that very important entity, the Canadian people, which through its historical fate and also its own will happens to belong to two different cultures and to speak two different languages.

I return now, Mr. Speaker, to certain points in the hon. member for Dauphin's intervention. According to him, we are dealing with an undesirable legislation. When the hon. member for Dauphin used the adjective "undesirable", I found myself wondering what he would consider to be a desirable legislation in the language field.

I felt I could guess, as he pursued his intervention, for instance when he told us—and it was like hearing Quebec separatists speaking—that there are no real bilinguals and when he mentioned that French Canadians were bilingual as a result of an historical accident. I relished the expression "historical accident", being, like almost all French-speaking Canadians who speak English, one of those who have had to the language, and at their own expense, with no government paying to have them taught.

I like very much the "historical accident" referred to by the hon. member for Dauphin. He seems to think that French Canadians are born bilingual, like the people who are born black or yellow. I can set him straight on that. No Canadian is born bilingual. Those who are bilingual have become so through their own efforts.

[*English*]

But I could also reassure him and say it does not take that much intelligence or effort to become bilingual, once you have decided that you want to do so.

Mr. McIntosh: Tell us what you mean by bilingual now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: So, Mr. Speaker, I understand what a desirable legislation means for the hon. member for Dauphin. I apologize for straying a little from the subject of this amendment, but that is exactly what the hon. member did himself.

He says there are no bilingual people. He thinks that Canada is a country with such an English-speaking majority that we should not go to so much trouble for the language minority, precisely because it is a minority. He thinks that serving the French-speaking public in French and the English-speaking public in English is a means of discrimination for the federal government.

He did not tell us how he came to that conclusion and that does not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, because I have a notion that he does not know himself. The connection between the two statements is not clear to anybody, and probably not to the hon. member for Dauphin himself.

I merely want to say that once more we find, in his speech, one of those ill-omened prophecies—"the effort is doomed to failure". According to him, Canadian parliament is considering a bill which is doomed to failure. If the failure is inevitable, in the mind of the member for Dauphin, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why he entertains so many fears, because nothing he fears is likely to happen. He might as well leave the house safely, go to sleep soundly and let us discuss quietly.

Finally, I think, Mr. Speaker, and I want to stress this—I do not know which parliamentary language I should use—that it is a shame to quote out of context people like Mr. Gérard Filion or Mr. Claude Ryan, as the member has just done.

Those are men who when they analyse their society are not afraid to recognize its defects and to state them. But, the member for Dauphin uses a truncated quotation, for instance, to present Mr. Gérard Filion, as a detractor of the culture in which he was born and of the people to which he belongs.

I just want to say to the hon. member for Dauphin that if Mr. Filion were here, he would get a rather severe tongue-lashing, because Mr. Filion is capable of defending himself and his views differ fundamentally from those of the hon. member.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall what I thought the most unbelievable statement of the evening: this legislation, the hon. member said, will be passed through the obstinacy, the stubborness of the government.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only through the obstinacy or the stubborness of the government, but also because of the enlightened views of many members of the opposition—and I would like to pay my respects to them—among which there are some of our colleagues of the New Democratic Party, and because finally of the enlightened and intelligent attitude of the

leader of the hon. member for Dauphin, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

[*English*]

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, would the minister allow me one question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) on a question of the minister.

Mr. Alexander: I just wish to ask the minister one question. I was very impressed with the minister and his usual brilliant footwork in bringing about—I shall use the word of the Minister of Justice—the exposé of the importance of the bill. I stand behind the bill with certain qualifications, but of course I wonder why this government does not want to appreciate the—

Some hon. Members: Question, question.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Alexander: What amazes me is that we now have an opportunity to do something, but the hon. member and the government do not seem to realize that we are discussing an important matter. I will get to the question and hon. members will have an opportunity to hear it. I am very impressed with the minister's statement to the effect that if anybody wants to be bilingual he can become bilingual. I take issue with that statement.

What I should like to know is what happens after a civil servant has been involved in one avocation for a period of 15 years and has not only shown a willingness but an integrity in his desire to become efficient in a second language, but for some God known reason cannot become proficient in that second language? This individual might well have all the attributes necessary to handle the particular job he is now holding, but what happens to him after he has attempted with all his God given attributes to become bilingual and cannot? The answer to this question will perhaps clarify this whole matter, particularly in the minds of a great many people in Canada. I hope the minister can answer it, keeping in mind the importance of a lifetime of work on the part of one individual in one particular avocation who cannot become bilingual.

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to tell the hon. member it is always possible that there may be exceptions. I would say that for a man who was, let us say—I am sure this is what the hon. member had in mind—only able to speak French, and he is applying—

Mr. Alexander: Or English.

Mr. Pelletier: I am sure the hon. member had in mind a unilingual French speaking civil servant who would like to—

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Pelletier: That is not what you had in mind?

An hon. Member: Do not be so facetious. You are not good at being funny.

Mr. Alexander: After I make a statement it is amazing to me that the minister is able to read my mind. I say, with all due respect, that it was most unfair of the minister to say he thought I was thinking along a particular line. I was not thinking of anyone in particular. I had in mind a person who had given 15 years of his life to a particular vocation, had shown a willingness and an integrity to learn a second language but could not do so. What would happen to such a person who had the scholastic background and know-how to handle the position which that individual aspired to but could not learn a second language? I think it is very unfair for the minister to attribute to me the thought that I was trying to channel my ideas in a specific direction.

Mr. Pelletier: I cannot understand the objection of the hon. member. I was taking for granted that he was thinking of a French speaking civil servant.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Pelletier: I thought the hon. member was a very generous man and wanted to put himself in the boots of an individual who spoke another language. If he is thinking of an individual who only speaks French my answer to the hon. member is very simple. If that individual were among the few exceptions who found it really impossible over a period of five, ten or fifteen years to learn a second language, he would still have access to other positions.

Let me refer to a specific case. Let us consider a unilingual French-speaking civil servant who wanted to be the head of the income tax office in Toronto. Being French speaking, he would still have access to 25 per cent of similar jobs. If he were English speaking he would still have access to 75 per cent of these

jobs. Instead of becoming head of the income tax office in Montreal an English-speaking civil servant could become head of the income tax office in Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Vancouver, Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland or any other major city throughout the land.

Mr. Alexander: Perhaps I was not paying too much attention to the exposé and explanation of the minister, for which I am very grateful. I should like the minister to explain to me what would happen after a man had given 15 years of his life and was the best suited for a specific job but found that his capabilities did not allow him to become bilingual. Would he be the one considered for that job notwithstanding his ability to become bilingual? That is a very simple question, and I hope the minister can answer it in simple terms.

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I used very simple language, but I suspect the hon. member does not understand because he does not care to understand. What I said was very simple.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Let the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) take on this question. At least he would be a gentleman.

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) understood my opening remarks in which I said that the amendment before us would lead to impossible complications. I used the example of a unilingual French speaking civil servant who might be qualified for the job as head of the income tax office in Toronto but could not speak a word of English. I posed the question to him in simple terms. I am surprised that the hon. member needs my help to understand a very exceptional case that he might judge from a common sense point of view.

An hon. Member: Just because the seals are flapping does not make it right.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments I should like to make in respect of this bill and the amendment posed by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). Tonight we have been given an example of a situation where two ministers differ in opinion. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) stated that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) moved an amendment which had a lot of merit. On the other hand, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) has said the hon. member's amendment was so poor he did not think he had even read the bill. Perhaps they should get together to see which of them is right.

Someone remarked that the Minister of Justice is a fine fellow. I would say that, on occasion, he has a lot of good sense. He has tried to make a good job of a poor argument. He always tries to gild the lily, even though it may be a poor lily. He did that tonight. The minister pointed out that there were some 370,000 public servants of whom approximately one sixth would be bilingual. He went on to say that 75 per cent of them would never move from their original localities. Do these people not get an opportunity to move to the top, 25 per cent of the jobs in Ottawa because they do not have the opportunity to become bilingual? I should like to know whether this is not straight discrimination against them. Perhaps the minister can also indicate why he does not accept the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot, in view of the opportunity given to civil servants in Ottawa who are or can become bilingual to obtain an increase of 7½ per cent in salary. Why in the world should the people in my riding or other ridings be discriminated against by not being given that opportunity to become bilingual?

• (9:20 p.m.)

I am perturbed because the government did not consult the provincial premiers before bringing in this bill. Education is basically a provincial matter. I do not know why the government did not consult the provincial premiers and then come to the house with a plan that it knew could be put into operation across Canada, with the ground rules well laid.

I am interested to learn that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is involving the government in shared-cost programs. Just the other day he said the government was getting out of this type of program. He promised the provincial premiers that there would be no more high-jinks like medicare. Yet, as I understand this bill, it will involve a multi million dollar program for French language education in English speaking provinces and English language education in the province of Quebec.

More schools and teachers will be required. In fact, this program will require a third school system. From where shall we get the teachers? A feasibility study has never been undertaken to obtain the facts. The B and B Commission brought in a report, but it did

not know the cost involved. This government does not know the cost. Perhaps the government will find itself in the position the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) predicted the other day when he said that if we do not control hospital and medicare costs, we will be bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member would mind very much if I interrupted to remind him that the discussion should be limited to the motion before the house. I anticipate that there will be further general debate on third reading, and it seems to me that the very interesting remarks being made by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) would be more pertinently made on third reading than on a motion moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) which deals with a rather specialized aspect of the bill now before the house.

An hon. Member: What about the minister?

Mr. Rynard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am coming to the point as fast as I can. I am laying the ground work. I have not spoken previously on the bill. I find fault with it because the provincial premiers were not consulted and a consensus has not been arrived at in Canada. If we are to have three school systems, what will happen to the separate schools in the province of Ontario? Will they have less and less funds with which to carry on? They are short of funds now, particularly in secondary education. It may sound fine to the English in Quebec to have English schools, and the French elsewhere to have French schools. I agree with this program provided we can afford it and it will not mean poor quality schools which will make our young people second-class students and non-competitive in a world of quality scholars.

This is an age of irresponsible financing. Do we know if we can handle this program? I want the people of my riding, be they French, English or of any other ethnic origin, to be not discriminated against when they apply for a civil service job at Malton, Toronto or anywhere else. I do not want any French speaking person from my riding discriminated against because he does not speak English. I do not want people of any ethnic origin discriminated against if they want a job and qualify other than in respect of language. I do not want language to be made a barrier. People must have the opportunity to learn the other language in a reasonable period of time. There are not in this bill adequate safeguards to prevent discrimination of this type.

Like everything else the government does, this matter has been handled in a dictatorial way, with little acceptance of ideas and thoughts from anyone else. This has been proven by amendment after amendment getting the axe. When you think you know it all, you are hopeless. That is our problem today in this house. There has been today a great deal of talk about the civil service. You may be a civil servant for years. I met a civil servant who some years ago went to lengths to become bilingual. He obtained a civil service job in Ottawa and took a position that never required the bilingualism he had acquired. I ask, Mr. Speaker: Is he still bilingual?

We have in the civil service some very brilliant people who speak only one language. Are they to be discriminated against, as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) asked, because they cannot learn the second language, or because they have been in the civil service for so many years that they do not feel they are capable of learning it or should do so? I believe this provision would put the civil service at a distinct disadvantage in respect of its ability to hire competent people. Many of these employees with ability cannot be replaced. Are we to discriminate against them because they speak only French or English? As the hon. member for Hamilton West asked: Are people to be discriminated against because they find it impossible to learn the second language? Perhaps we should look at our Bill of Rights, but frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect this government to do anything but muddle up the languages bill.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed several amendments concerning this bill on the official languages, but we are astounded by the impertinence of the amendment now before us.

I must now congratulate the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) for setting the record straight so adequately that I wonder whether the movers of the amendment will ever understand things which I consider elementary, since everything said by the hon. members of the Conservative party is completely beside the point and they seem to overlook the principle that full bilingualism will apply only in bilingual districts. Therefore, there is

no possibility, in a practically unilingual area, English or French, for a unilingual civil servant to be deprived of his office on the ground that he is not bilingual. This will not happen in a unilingual area; this will happen in the bilingual districts.

And to come back to an argument that was put forward a while ago, if in a bilingual district there is a rather important linguistic minority and if a civil servant has been living for 10 or 15 years among people that speak a language other than his own, which language he never cared to learn, I say it is time to abolish such an anomaly. I cannot even understand that such a situation can be tolerated, even to save some civil servants, and I do not think there are any, Mr. Speaker. But, if there happened to be in the city of Quebec a person who speaks English only, who has been living in a French-speaking surrounding for 10 or 15 years, this anomaly should not be tolerated on the ground that he has 10 or 15 years' service.

Mr. Speaker, as I said when the other amendment was being discussed, it is time to deal with such situations and I think that those who oppose, who wish to restrict too much the scope of the bill have not understood its purpose.

Our Conservative friends are "toryfied" by this bill. This fright, this unjustified fear, reminded me of the fable by La Fontaine: "The Wolf and the Lamb", in which the wolf is afraid and complains, although it always had a great advantage over the lamb. However, it is afraid of being swallowed by the lamb.

The great majority of the country is English-speaking. Everybody knows it. However, they fear, Mr. Speaker, that the small minority will take over the country. Those are simply absurd considerations. It is to believe in myths: the French domination. It is especially to take every possible means to divide this country which however we would like to see better united than it is now.

Therefore, I believe that the time has come to speak frankly. It is time to dot the "i's" and to realize that it is necessary to have true bilingualism and not just intentional bilingualism. I cannot get over the proposed amendment. It seems impossible to me that, in 1969, in the light of all the events which have occurred during the past few years, that a member for parliament could even think of moving an amendment which reads in part as follows:

—has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other official language.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost inconceivable, almost unbelievable. We know fully well that if it were ever implemented, it would work only one way. There is no precedent enabling us to find out that a unilingual French-speaking person would be hired exclusively because of its qualifications. Again, unfairness would prevail and perhaps even worse than now.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, how "off-the-track" one is when saying that. Therefore, with such arguments and opinions it is not surprising that for all practical purposes the Progressive Conservative party has disappeared from the province of Quebec. And the four who succeeded in coming off well were lucky. Why? Because that party never understood that the basic problem was perhaps less a matter of language than one of participation by the founding people of this country, a participation that we want to regularize today, to bring to normal. We want abnormal things to become normal and it is unfortunately for some people some kind of revolution. And this is too bad because everybody can rest easy, everybody can be sure that there will never be a case in a district with an English majority where a French-speaking person will enjoy priority for the only reason that such a person is French-speaking.

• (9:40 p.m.)

On the other hand, we hope we shall never see in such a district public service employees unable to communicate with the local people. Should such anomalies exist at present, they must absolutely be abolished.

And if need be, Mr. Speaker, I will suggest something to the government. I admit that people are not born bilingual and that it is difficult for an English-speaking person, in the North-American context, to learn French. On the other hand, even if it were to be more costly, I wonder whether it would not be a good idea to provide service both in French and in English at the same time.

Besides, that is what is done in other bilingual countries to avoid frictions between races and having a unilingual civil servant located in a bilingual district lose his job. I even agree with the idea of waiting until he retires. If that is what is feared, then let another civil servant be appointed, bilingual this time, and have the two perform the same duties. Then it can be said that the service is truly bilingual. The service could be bilingual in two ways: through a bilingual civil servant, or through different persons providing

services in the two languages. I feel that if this bill could achieve this, and all federal organizations could provide bilingual services, regardless of the way in which it is done, we should have made great progress.

Once again we are confronted with amendments that prove all too obviously the lack of understanding, logic and common sense of some hon. members. If at least the reasons for the amendments had been explained to us clearly, but until now the arguments have had absolutely no bearing on the fundamental principles of the bill. One of the main articles, that of the creation of bilingual districts, and the necessity of bilingualism strictly in those districts where there is need for it, has been ignored.

It seems to me that sheer justice, would require us to provide people with adequate service, irrespective of language. We deplore, in view of the present development, especially in Quebec, the lack of concern for the wishes of the French Canadians towards emancipation and fulfillment. To think that we are still discussing such amendments! Mr. Speaker, the amendment under consideration is a step backwards. It would have been better had it not been introduced.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11) the vote on this amendment stands deferred.

We will now resume consideration of the motion of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

Is the house ready for the question? The question is on the amendment to the motion which reads as follows:

That the motion be further amended by deleting the words "to a committee designated"—

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

[Mr. Matte.]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Does the minister not intend to make a statement on the position of the government with regard to this amendment?

Mr. Baldwin: The question has been put

Mr. Speaker: The question has, of course, been put to the house. That is the purpose of the exercise the Chair has been going through for a couple of minutes now. I am in the hands of the house, of course, but when a question has been put I doubt that we should go back.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I rise on a point of order. I assume that what Your Honour is doing is putting the amendment to the amendment—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has put the amendment to the motion.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Lewis) which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:50 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	MacDonald (Egmont)
Alexander	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Alkenbrack	MacLean
Baldwin	Macquarrie
Barnett	McCleave
Bell	McGrath
Benjamin	McKinley
Bigg	McQuaid
Brewin	Marshall
Broadbent	Mazankowski
Burton	Monteith
Code	Moore
Comeau	Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Crouse	Muir (Lisgar)
Dinsdale	Nesbitt
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Nowlan
	Nystrom
Downey	Orlikow
Flemming	Peters
Gilbert	Ricard
Grills	Ritchie
Harding	Rynard
Hees	Saltsman
Horner	Skoberg
Howard (Skeena)	Skoreyko
Howe	Southam
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Stanfield
	Stewart (Marquette)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	Thomas (Moncton)
	Thompson
Korchinski	Thomson
La Salle	Winch
	Woolliams—62.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Beer
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Dubé
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Olson
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—126.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the motion lost.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment because I oppose the bill in principle.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it might be called ten o'clock.

Mr. Horner: No, let us continue with the vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: According to Standing Order No. 40 a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been made at this time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I believe I should wait for a few minutes.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). The hon. member is waiting. I wonder whether the hon. member might take advantage of the audience now in the house to pursue her question.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

INCOME TAX—EXEMPTION INCREASES IN BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I do not know which is worse, the audience or the noise.

On May 14 I drew the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to the fact that the Economic Council had recently set new poverty levels at $1,800 a year for single persons and $3,000 for married couples. My question was:

> Will the minister in preparing his new budget consider raising income tax exemption levels from $1,000 for single persons and $2,000 for married couples who have survived 21 years of inflation?

You found my question Mr. Speaker, unacceptable but assured me that I had made a suggestion which I must assume would be considered. Perhaps it was, but the fact remains that when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) brought down his new budget two weeks later, on June 3, there was no

mention in it of raising the income tax exemption levels. This was the case in spite of the fact that the cost of living in May of this year had risen 4.7 per cent over the cost of living in May of 1968. The cost of food was up by 4.2 per cent; the cost of housing by 5.3 per cent, the cost of transportation by 5.2 per cent and the cost of living is still going up.

I wonder whether the minister is deluged by letters of the kind I get? An example is this one from a woman in Alberta who says:

> If only people like our Mr. Trudeau could experience the frustration of being put through the degradation of never having enough money to go around, I am certain some drastic changes would be made. I'd like to cover the rising food costs also, and what they mean to us. At the present time we cannot afford to have meat on the table once a day. Try and explain that to a grade 2 child who is being taught the importance of Canada's food rules in school.
>
> I would like to explain that my husband is a graduate of the University of Alberta in Edmonton. He worked steadily for 8 years before entering university, and through the years he held a part time job as well as working all summer. He is presently working Saturdays, hours which should be devoted to classroom preparation as he is a high school teacher. During summer vacations he will also have to find a job instead of going to summer school as he had planned.

These are people who would be helped by raising income tax exemption levels—they and their three small children. So would some of the elderly people whose incomes are just enough to keep life in their bodies, but who are continually obliged to find survival in ways which are dubious and disgusting to them as well as to every sensitive person who hears about them.

This government must surely be compelled to make a determined effort to shut out the thought of their misery. Fortunately for cabinet ministers, they do not have to think about it, except once in a while, as when those elderly people told them about old age pensioners being obliged to eke out their food by eating dog and cat food. Undoubtedly, ministers made sympathetic noises in reply, but it is action that counts. The finance minister's budget was a cool and modern edition of Marie Antoinette's famous reply, which paraphrased, would be: If they haven't meat, let them eat cat.

I realize that my question of nearly two months ago referred to the minister's current budget. He will soon be hard at work doing the necessary thinking in preparation for his next budget. At this time I urge him to consider carefully the need for raising income tax exemption levels to at least $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for married couples.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

In this way, persons below these levels should not have to pay any income tax whatsoever. Income taxes are essential to carry on the public services of this country, but they should be levied according to ability to pay. Instead of scraping the last few cents from the pockets of young families and elderly pensioners, we should provide them with enough income to lead a modern and decent life, secure in their dignity as human beings. At the same time we should place the tax burden on the shoulders of those who have incomes, in the measure of their ability to pay. It is not what you pay in taxes that counts, it is what you have left to live on.

I do hope that the next time the Minister of Finance will be guided in preparing his budget by the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Let him raise the exemption levels from the present $1,000 for single persons and $2,000 for married couples to at least $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for married couples.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, proposals of the type just made by the hon. lady have already been made in this house by many hon. members, including members on this side who support the government. As the hon. lady must know, the government is completing work on a comprehensive program of tax reform, and it is expected that this will be made public in the not too distant future in the form of a white paper. One would think that the matter of exemptions would be one of a number of matters under active consideration in the course of the preparation of this program of tax reform.

• (10:20 p.m.)

As the hon. lady knows under our British and Canadian parliamentary tradition matters involving possible changes of taxes are considered to be secret and confidential until formally announced in the house by the government in the course of a budget presentation or through a white paper. May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by again pointing to the interest and concern in this question on the part of many hon. members, including those on the government side of the house and again giving the assurance that this matter is one of those under consideration at the present time.

FISHERIES—DOGFISH—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN CANADIAN AND JAPANESE OFFICIALS

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I understand that meetings are

being held this week between representatives of the Japanese fishing industry and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) for Canada. Yesterday, I asked whether the subject of dogfish would be on the agenda of these meetings. I hope that tonight the parliamentary secretary can provide confirmation of reports that the subject of dogfish and their disposition will be a matter of serious discussion at the Japanese-Canadian conference.

Dogfish are far more sinister than merely fish with a funny name. They are of great importance on the west coast. Dogfish are a resourceful, predatory species of baby shark. They are suspected of doing real damage to our salmon stocks. They are proven mortal enemies of our herring industry. It is safe to say that dogfish directly or indirectly exact an immense toll amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps even millions, from our fishermen and those in the allied trades. The economic impact of dogfish is beginning to have serious repercussions on the west coast. It is to be hoped that an effective dogfish control program will be evolved without delay, hopefully through the development of an economically viable dogfish industry on the west coast. The industry, hopefully, can exist without the need of federal government subsidies.

It has been suggested that Japanese fishing interests be invited to harvest and process dogfish within the territorial waters of Canada or our exclusive fishing zones. I hope it will not be necessary—I think this feeling is shared by British Columbia members of all parties—to have them engage in the actual fishing. One can comprehend the fears of those in Canada's fishing industry who see dangers in this kind of precedent. Let harvesting and delivering of dogfish be carried out by Canadians. If economics will not support the establishment of a viable dogfish industry in Canada, developed by Canadians with processing carried out by Canadians, let the processing for the world market be carried out by Japanese factory ships or factory ships of other nations.

At one time dogfish were harvested profitably in Canada, primarily for the vitamin-rich dogfish liver oil. A profitable and useful industry existed on the west coast between 1920 and 1944. In 1944 the synthesized vitamins industry effectively displaced the need for dogfish liver oil and the industry was rendered non-competitive. It may be more than significant that during this 24-year period herring and salmon stocks on the west coast were far more abundant than they are at the present time. In 1944 it was assumed that the dogfish was virtually extinct, but this ingenious, resilient fish has come back by feasting on the other treasures of the sea. Today the dogfish population on the west coast is back to 80 per cent of the 1920 population and constitutes a serious problem. The dogfish population is growing rapidly, so much so that whether or not a commercially successful program can be developed to reduce their numbers, with or without the co-operation of other nations, there must be a systematic counter-attack to reduce the toll exacted by this predatory creature.

Let us not be deterred by the failure, success or partial success of past programs involving various types of subsidies. In 1956-57, a $10, a ton dogfish subsidy was instituted. Only 220 tons were processed. In the period 1958-62 various bounties were paid on dogfish liver with rather inconclusive results. In 1966 another try was made. I will not go into all the details because time does not permit but let me say in summary that it is encouraging to note the interest in the problem which has been demonstrated by the minister. We wish him well in his meetings with the Japanese this week. It is to be hoped that the precedent can be avoided of allowing foreign fleets to move into our territorial waters or our exclusive fishing zones. It is to be hoped that negotiations can be completed successfully with our friends from Japan which would see Canadian fishermen harvesting and processing dogfish with the resultant product sold to Japan and other nations. If this is not feasible, then let Canadians fish and deliver their catch to the Japanese who could do the processing.

These activities may require a degree of government support for a period of time. But this support could be minimized if, through research, we evolve new uses and new markets for dogfish. Perhaps we had better start by renaming the species. No one will rush to the grocery store to buy tins of dogfish. All sorts of suggestions have been proposed, but surely the name needs changing. Government dollar support combined with an all-out program of scientific and market research could reduce the population of the dogfish predator, help our salmon and herring industries, reduce fishing gear damage, and help our fishermen. As the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Borrie) proposed so constructively at meetings a few months ago, our unemployed herring fleet, representing a fantastic tie up of capital at the present time,

could be converted to dogfish harvesting, thus solving another acute financial problem of at least a section of our fishing industry in British Columbia.

Off season employment would effect substantial savings in the matters of unemployment insurance and welfare payments. But, above all, let us not be defeatist about the challenge of the dogfish. Many other resources have been dismissed as valueless because, seemingly, they held out little potential, and we have known them in the history of Canada. Yet, subsequently, they became very valuable because we have applied know-how in research and some development dollars.

With the application of some foresight, some well distributed dollars, and some Canadian ingenuity, the lowly dogfish or the Pacific tuna, however it may be named—the deep sea turkey, as my friend here suggests—would become a major source of wealth to our fishing community in the nation. Let us hope that at least a beginning of a solution will be found this week.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question I should like to say, first of all, that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) is meeting representatives of the fishing industry and of the fishermen themselves in British Columbia this week, along with Japanese officials. That is why he is not present in the house.

The suggestions for exploratory discussions were initiated during meetings between the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry for Canada and the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry for Japan during the Canada-Japan ministerial meetings in Tokyo in April. We realize that only 25 years ago the dogfish, which was the most valuable single species contributing to the fisheries economy of British Columbia, was so heavily exploited that it was threatened with depletion. However, before appropriate conservation measures could be developed and enacted, the problem was solved by economics.

In 1950 the market for dogfish liver collapsed, as the hon. member said, and brought the fishery to an abrupt end. We are told that in Japan the dogfish catch has dropped from 67,000 tons a year a decade ago to around 15,000 tons in 1968.

I agree with the hon. member that dogfish should be renamed. In parts of Europe it is called the greyfish and used in fish and chips.

[Mr. Perrault.]

In other parts of Europe it is used as a salted delicacy and eaten to the accompaniment of beer in beer gardens. In Japan it is used in many different ways. If dogfish is properly harvested, cleaned, etc. after being caught, it can be made into a very good food for human consumption.

• (10:30 p.m.)

I will stress again that it is in our interest in the Department of Fisheries to make sure that the fishermen of British Columbia are protected. These meetings are exploratory, and we hope some good will come out of them. We are optimistic at this time because of the Japanese initiative in seeking to take part in some program which we may be able to work out to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

FISHERIES—ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.—LICENSING OF FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, on July 2, as reported at page 10755 of *Hansard*, I asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Whelan) a question relating to the prohibition of the granting of licences enabling foreign trawlers to use the Port of St. John's.

At that time, in your wisdom, Your Honour ruled that my question should more properly be asked at the time of adjournment. I am sure you did not mean to reflect in any way upon the urgency of my question, because it is one of great urgency. Under present Canadian law, all foreign fishing vessels desiring to use Canadian ports on the east coast must first obtain licences. These licences used to be granted by the local customs officers. Recently, however, this function has been taken over by the federal Department of Fisheries.

On June 23 last, the St. John's office of the Department of Fisheries issued the following circular concerning the issuance of licences, that is circular No. 12-1969, File No. 728-1-2, and it reads:

To: All shipping agents re issuance of foreign fishing vessels licences and permits.

When the issuance of foreign fishing vessel licences was transferred from the Canadian customs to this department, you were advised that it was not our intention to issue these licences and/or other permits on Saturdays, Sundays or statutory holidays. Realizing that it would take some time for you to acquaint the foreign fishing vessel captains with this procedure, we have been providing issuance service on a limited basis during the weekends. During the month of July, an officer will be on duty for the issuance of foreign fishing

vessel licences at our district office in the Marshall Building in St. John's from 0900 hours to 1000 hours on Saturday only. After July 31, neither foreign fishing vessel licences or other permits will be issued during weekends or on statutory holidays except in the case of an emergency entry involving medical need or the safety of the vessel.

The circular is signed by the assistant regional director.

Last year the department issued another edict to the effect that each time a vessel wanted to use the port it had to obtain a new licence. This was another move in a general campaign to discourage these vessels from using east coast Canadian ports. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter—so serious, indeed, that it can mean a direct loss in revenue to the port and city of St. John's of an amount in excess of $20 million. This is a conservative estimate of what the presence of these ships means in terms of money spent in the port. Where will these ships go if they are discouraged from using St. John's? It is obvious the will go to the French islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon where they will be welcomed with open arms. The French government has recently completed extensive harbour facilities there. In April of this year they announced they were building a 28,000 sq. ft. warehouse for the storage of fish by fishing companies from Holland, France and West Germany, all common market countries.

The *Canadian Fisherman* in its issue of April, 1969 last stated:

> Construction is scheduled to begin this spring of a huge refrigerated warehouse on St. Pierre which will contain about 28,000 square feet of refrigerated space for the storage of fish by Dutch, French and West German fishing companies. This was announced in St. Pierre by Albert Pen, the representative of the French islands in the Senate in Paris.
>
> The refrigerated warehouse is another step in the continuing program of modernizing and expanding the facilities on the French islands to attract the foreign fleets which operate on the Grand Banks.
>
> Although some of the European fleets still visit St. John's on a more or less regular basis, the St. Pierre facilities are attracting more and more foreign trawlers for servicing and provisions.

Today, the St. John's city council passed a resolution unanimously condemning this latest move on the part of the federal government to discourage foreign fishing vessels from using the port, stating it would mean a loss in revenue to the city of between $15 and $40 million. Only recently a group of foreign skippers got together and decided to recommend to their owners that they boycott the Port of St. John's for one year to protest what they consider to be discrimination. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) has received a telegram from the St. John's Port Association calling the move highly discriminatory and reprehensible—I am quoting directly from this telegram.

I am sorry the minister is not here tonight. Perhaps he can draw some comfort from the resolution recently passed by the Fisheries Council of Canada calling for a continuance of the prohibition which prevents foreign vessels unloading their cargoes in Canadian ports for trans-shipment. It is a well known fact that fishing interests of eastern Canada have a reputation for caring for no one but themselves. The industry is so poorly managed that, in my view, it could not stand to see the much more efficient operators use Newfoundland ports to tranship their fish, notwithstanding the fact that this would mean a lucrative new industry creating hundreds of new jobs and pumping millions of dollars into what is now a sagging economy.

The port of St. John's has excellent facilities and is probably one of the best ports in Canada in this regard. Its facilities were built by the government of Canada at great public expense. In my view, for the government to discriminate against foreign vessels that want to use this port is to deprive the port and the city I represent in this house of revenue amounting to millions of dollars, revenue that this city and the province from which I come can ill afford to lose.

St. John's is ideally suited, as I say, to handling traffic of this nature. It has the reputation of being the service station of the North Atlantic. This really is the function of the port of St. John's. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Fisheries, through his parliamentary secretary, in the name of reason to reconsider this order and to rescind it as soon as possible.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, under the coastal fisheries protection regulations, foreign fishing vessels entering Canadian ports must obtain a permit from the Department of Fisheries. For some time the issuance of these permits has been handled by the customs officers of the Department of National Revenue, but recently customs asked that they be relieved of these duties. For this reason the Department of Fisheries and Forestry must once again assume the responsibility, and is prepared to do so. However, the department believes that these permits can be issued during normal business hours,

and that it is not necessary to have our office remain open during the entire week end and on statutory holidays solely for the purpose of issuing the permits that would be required by the limited number of foreign fishing vessels entering the port of St. John's.

Under the present arrangement, permits can be obtained on any weekday and on Saturday mornings. Foreign fishing vessels using the port facilities at St. John's have a ship's agent in that city who can determine in advance when a ship may be entering port. The shipping agents have been advised that any foreign fishing vessel wishing to enter St. John's on Saturday afternoons, Sundays or statutory holidays have only to advise our office in advance of their intentions and a permit for entry will be issued on the Friday preceding, or on any day earlier in the week. This is not at all unreasonable, because any fishing vessel captain, except in an emergency, knows several days beforehand when he will be entering port. The captain simply has to notify his agent, who in turn can secure the necessary permit from our department's office without delay. In cases of emergency, such as illness of a crew member or danger to the vessel, our office is prepared to give oral clearance at any time to the vessel to enter port on request from the ship's agent or the master of the vessel.

It should be pointed out that there has been a general lack of observance of the coastal fisheries protection regulations by foreign fishing vessels entering the port of St. John's.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements similar to those now proposed for St. John's were adopted for the port of Halifax some months ago. These arrangements have proved workable and satisfactory in Halifax, which has a larger number of vessels entering and clearing port, and we believe that similar arrangements can work satisfactorily for all concerned in the port of St. John's without in any way jeopardizing the economic benefits which the foreign fishing fleets contribute to the economy of the port.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.42 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 4, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

AIR TRANSPORT

STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL POLICY AND INSTALLATIONS—TABLING OF SECOND VOLUME OF ROBINSON REPORT

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an undertaking to make a statement regarding air traffic control policy, I should like to make the statement now.

Recently I, together with officials of my department, met with the president of the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association. We discussed a number of matters of mutual interest and I am pleased to say that there was unanimous agreement that the air traffic control system in Canada continues to operate as the acknowledged leader in its field. I share the department's determination that it should be kept this way. Safety standards maintained by the department in civil aviation services are second to no other country, and this I feel is a direct and proud reflection of the dedication and professionalism of the people we have working in this field.

The remarkable growth in the aviation industry in all major centres during the past decade is self-evident. The next few years will see even more dramatic advances. The Department of Transport is taking steps to meet these rapidly accelerating needs by, for example, comprehensive planning for the development of a supersonic jumbo jet airport at St. Scholastique, and the provision of greatly expanded facilities to serve Toronto and the southern Ontario region. Considerable growth can also be anticipated in many other parts of Canada. An integral and vital part of this forward planning must include provision of an adequate number of skilled air traffic controllers and the most modern equipment to enable them to do their work efficiently and with maximum security for the travelling public.

In this connection I am pleased to announce that a contract amounting to $3.9 million has been awarded by the federal Department of Transport to Philips Electronic Industries Limited of Toronto for 29 instrument landing systems, known as "I.L.S.", for Canadian airports.

The 29 installations have been purchased as a part of a continuing program to improve the safety and efficiency of aircraft approach and landing operations at airports. The department now has I.L.S. equipment installed at 55 airports and the new ones will be put into service during the next five years.

Each system provides both vertical and horizontal guidance to pilots approaching the runway and is particularly valuable during conditions of poor visibility. The new equipment is of fully solid state design and surpasses the requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organization. Delivery of the first unit is expected in April 1971.

To help in the achievement of the best possible system, Judge John Beverley Robinson was commissioned in 1966 to enquire into the working conditions of the air traffic controllers. I am tabling Volume II of his report today, and I am pleased to advise the house that 75 per cent of the recommendations made by Judge Robinson in this document have been or are being implemented. Some of the remaining recommendations could properly be termed matters for collective bargaining. Such collective bargaining is now under way, having begun on June 11 of this year. This represents the second series of negotiations with the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association, the first having been completed in August of last year with results that produced substantial improvements in pay and working conditions.

In addition to those matters which are the subject of direct collective bargaining, officials of the Department of Transport and members of the controllers association meet regularly to discuss all phases of air control policy and related matters. I have given an assurance that such consultation will be stepped up in future and that I am ready at all times to hear and consider the controllers' recommendations.

29180—685

Report on Air Traffic Control Policy

• (11:10 a.m.)

In order to ensure that an adequate number of new controllers will be available to meet the increasing demand and also to alleviate the current shortage in some regions, the Department of Transport has begun a more intensive recruiting campaign with the immediate objective of engaging an additional 70 trainees over and above the normal number in the department's continuing training program. Other plans call for a further increase in the department's air traffic controller strength in order to keep up with the development of new airports such as those planned for Montreal and Toronto. Detailed studies are under way also to determine the best types of new equipment that should be obtained so that our controllers will have the most advanced and efficient technological aids at their disposal.

I can assure the house and the Canadian public that the Department of Transport will continue to give the highest priority to matters of air safety, and I am confident that through the measures I have outlined, and with the continuing co-operation of the controllers, we will preserve and enhance the enviable record that Canada has achieved in this field.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the house welcome the statement just made by the minister with respect to air safety in general and air traffic controllers in particular. This has been a matter of great concern in the press and elsewhere by members of the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association. The matter has on various occasions been brought before this house by myself, the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Thomas), the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and others. I think we are all delighted to see that the minister has fulfilled his undertaking to make a comprehensive statement in this regard; this is pretty good.

I should like to make one or two comments on the minister's statement. We are very glad to hear from him that plans are under way for greatly expanded airport facilities to serve Toronto and the southern Ontario region, which is by far the most densely populated region of Canada. Arrangements have already been made for the Montreal region. I hope that in the near future the minister will be in a position to give the house details of the expanded arrangement for Toronto and southern Ontario becaus there has been a great deal of interest an debate in that part of the country in thi regard. I hope the minister will hurry up hi planners so he can give us details in thi respect at least when the house reassemble in the fall.

With respect to continual consultation o the matter of air safety between air traffi controllers and officials of the Department o Transport, this is an excellent move. I an glad to hear that arrangements are under wa with regard to detailed studies that are to b carried out with respect to equipment an various arrangements for proven safety con ditions. But I suggest to the minister that thi matter could very well be referred to ou Standing Committee on Transport and Com munications in order that the committee ca look into the question during the comin session of parliament.

There has in the past been some suggestio that departmental officials have brushed asid some of the suggestions of the air traffic con trollers. I am not suggesting this is correct but one hears these allegations and I think i would clear the air if everybody concerned i these matters were brought before the trans port committee. Those who have complaint or alleged complaints about air safety coul then present their case to the committee. I would be extremely helpful if the Air Traffi Controllers Association in particular could d this. Officials of the department should b able to present their views to the committee together with any other interested and knowl edgeable parties. The transport committee after hearing the views of people concerne in this question, might very well be able t make many worth-while suggestions.

If the program is to operate in the way i which the government suggested it woul operate—it has not operated too well so far— this would be a good opportunity for one o the major committees of the house to accom plish something useful and substantial in th coming session.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speak er, I think I can meet the rule requirement that you have drawn to our attention on a number of occasions because I have brie comments on only two or three points.

First, I often wonder why it takes so lon to get under way something that obviously needs to be done. The inadequate number o

air traffic controllers has been the point at issue between the controllers association and the department for some years. They have complained about the fact that there are not enough of them to do the increasingly important and expanding job. Why it has taken the department until now to realize that they have to start getting more people and training them for this important job, God only knows. I just do not understand this long delay. I hope that the minister and the department this time will really undertake the job of recruitment and training with an eye to the next decade or so, because the job is an important one, the training requires time, and I hope there will be a sufficient work force to do the job properly.

The second point I want to make is that I do not know why the second volume of the Robinson report is being tabled only today. I suppose it has only recently been received. As a matter of fact, I am ashamed to admit that I had forgotten there was a second volume which parliament had not yet seen, even though it is almost three years since Judge Robinson was appointed. I hope that the figure of 75 per cent of the recommendations which have been implemented is not merely a quantitive figure but also a qualitative one. You can implement niggling things that do not mean anything and have them add up to 75 per cent. From what air traffic controllers have told me I have a strong suspicion that the arithmetic is of that kind and that some of the really important matters about which Judge Robinson was concerned have not yet been implemented.

Finally, I want to draw to the minister's attention the fact that there is still a great deal of objection from residents in the area to the proposed extension of one of the Toronto runways, and those of us in the Toronto area at least who are in the house have received briefs from an association that is deeply concerned about that. I hope the minister will meet with these people and satisfy them that whatever is to be done is essential, necessary, and will not be done at the expense of their comfort and welfare.

The matter of the air traffic controllers has taken far too long, for a start at least, to give us a sufficient work force to assure not only the safety of the people travelling by air but also to ensure that the welfare of the air traffic controllers themselves will be protected and that their lives will not be darkened by overwork and overanxiety.

29180—685½

Inquiries of the Ministry

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

RESEARCH

LETTER FROM DR. O. M. SOLANDT RESPECTING SCIENCE POLICY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but since he is not in the house I will put a different question to the Prime Minister asking him whether he has replied to the letter from Dr. O. M. Solandt dated January 6 concerning science policy. In view of the fact that Dr. Solandt's letter has been published in the Science Council's report tabled in this house, will the Prime Minister table his own reply?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will look into the matter. I must confess that I am not familiar with the letter to which the Leader of the Opposition has just referred.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question for the President of the Treasury Board arising out of criticism concerning the past year contained in Dr. Solandt's letter. Can the President of the Treasury Board say if the Science Council has now received approximations of federal spending on science for 1969-70? At the same time can the minister assure the house that the Science Council will be given the necessary information next year early enough for it to be of use to the council in the manner indicated by Dr. Solandt?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I think Dr. Solandt was addressing himself rather more to the general problem of the lack of adequate statistics in Canada relating to expenditures on research and development. The Science Council has had and will continue to have made available to them all the figures that the government has in relation to its expenditures on research and development. I think Dr. Solandt was concerned rather more with the general lack of information from government channels in relation to expenditures on research and development outside the government sector.

Mr. Stanfield: It is clear that Dr. Solandt was critical of the role of the government in this matter and I hope the minister can give us some assurance that the situation is being corrected. May I ask whether the government

takes the position that the total expenditure on research and development should be raised to the level of 2 per cent of the gross national product by 1972?

Mr. Speaker: I think we are getting involved in a subject which is very wide in scope at this point; it is akin to a debate and I would not think that the further supplementary is in order.

COMMUNICATIONS

SUPPORT BY DR. O. M. SOLANDT OF BELL CANADA RATE INCREASE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Some time ago I asked the President of the Treasury Board a question about the appearance of Dr. Solandt before the Canadian Transport Commission. The minister gave me an answer privately but I think the matter is of sufficient public interest to justify an answer being given in the house.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Speaking from recollection, Dr. Solandt appeared before the Canadian Transport Commission at the request of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. He went there as chairman of the Science Council of Canada and his remarks were addressed to advocating before the Transport Commission an increase in expenditures on research and development in Canada generally. That was the purpose of his intervention, as well as to testify to the good record of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada in this particular field.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): In view of the fact that the President of the Treasury Board has promised the house for a number of months that he will make a statement on motions concerning the government's general science policy, will he now undertake to make such a statement in the house some time next week?

Mr. Drury: I know the house has a limited agenda ahead of it and I am not sure it will be sitting all next week.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A further supplementary to the minister arising from his answer on the subject of Dr. Solandt's appearance before the Canadian Transport Commission. Do I understand that Dr. Solandt appeared as chairman of the Science Council in support of further research and in support of an increase in the rates charged by the Bell Telephone Company to enable the company, as it claimed, to do further research?

Mr. Drury: Dr. Solandt made it quite clear in his statement—unfortunately I do not have a copy with me—that he was not offering an opinion or evidence in relation to any increase in rates—whether this was necessary or not—on behalf of Bell Telephone.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister whether he has considered the propriety of the chairman of a government board appearing before another public body at the request of, and in support of, necessarily, a private or public corporation asking for favours from that public body?

Mr. Drury: I am not sure I would agree that the applicant in this case was seeking favours. I reject the dialectic used by the hon. member. Dr. Solandt appeared at the request of Bell Telephone Company to offer expert evidence in relation to the research and development effort being put forward by Bell. He was not asked to address himself, nor did he address himself, to the question whether or not a rate increase was necessary or desirable.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest that we are becoming involved in a debate. We are now discussing matters that have already happened. This is clearly debate, and I suggest that this type of question should not be asked at this time.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION AGENCIES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Prime Minister with respect to the task force on information which was appointed last August. In view of the importance of the assignment given to this task force, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he has yet received a report and, if not, can he give the house any indication when he does anticipate receiving a report?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have received a report and it is now being considered by the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the importance of the

report, and in view of the unconfirmed leaks that are made from time to time as to what is in reports can the Prime Minister indicate whether or not this report will be made public?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the leaks will have to remain unconfirmed until the government decides whether it is in the interests of both parliament and the country to make the report public. It is a task force report and is meant to inform the government of certain attitudes and recommendations. It is not intended primarily for publication.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question. Is the government considering issuing a white paper, at least with respect to the recommendations. It is not primarily for publication. intends to implement?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. The government may want to implement certain recommendations made by the task force, if they are found useful. I hope that parts or the totality of the task force report will be published by the government, but I do not want parliament to regard that as a commitment until the government has studied the report. I repeat that task force reports are for the government, whereas royal commissions make reports for publication.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister at least indicate whether the task force will recommend that the government be less secretive in its approach to public affairs?

WATER RESOURCES

LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES AND INDUSTRIES TO COMBAT POLLUTION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In order to help get an effective nationwide anti-pollution program underway, is it the intention of the government in the near future to make available low interest rate loans to those municipalities and industries that wish to instal the expensive machinery that is necessary to remove pollution from waste, in the same way as the government made loans available to industries that wished to commence war production during the last world war?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I find that an interesting suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, that is the minister's usual way of brushing off these matters. Does the minister mean that he is going to give the matter serious consideration?

Mr. Benson: I consider seriously all suggestions made by my hon. friend.

Mr. Hees: Then may I ask a further supplementary. Would he be straightforward and answer my question? Is the minister going to give this matter serious consideration?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Is the answer yes?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benson: I will write you a note.

Mr. Hees: Just say yes, like a plain, ordinary human being.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I just wonder whether the Chair might have the co-operation of the hon. member, so that the Chair has an opportunity to recognize the hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. Hees: Say it like a man; don't mumble.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS OF QUEBEC AND GABON

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the question I asked yesterday concerning the agreement passed between the governments of Quebec and Gabon was ruled out of order, and having heard that the Gabonese Minister of Education had officially met the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), here in Ottawa, may I ask the Prime Minister if that agreement, which had first been discussed in Ottawa and was passed in Quebec city with the Gabonese Minister of Education, is approved by the Prime Minister or by the Canadian government?

Moreover, I would like to ask him if, after that meeting with the Gabonese Minister of Education, the relations between Gabon and Canada, severed in 1967, are in the course of being re-established, if that has not already been done?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as far as the first part of the question is concerned, I have not studied the specific exchange between the government of Quebec and the Gabonese Minister of Education, but I heard from the Quebec authorities themselves that the Minister of Education had stated that no agreement or treaty was involved but a mere exchange between both governments. Therefore, subject to examination as to what took place exactly, I cannot answer the first part of the question.

As for the second part, the meeting in Ottawa between the Gabonese minister and the Canadian minister led us to conclude that the relations between Gabon and Canada were satisfactory, and we hope that they will remain so.

[*English*]

RHODESIA—INQUIRY AS TO WITHDRAWAL OF SANCTIONS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Since the policy announced by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in respect of future treatment of Indian people is based on the concept that white is right, is the Prime Minister considering withdrawing Canada's sanctions against Rhodesia?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not in order. It contains allegations.

Mr. Trudeau: Not only is it not in order; it is very low.

TRADE

WHEAT—SALE TO PERU—CONTRACT WITH RUSSIA

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question I attempted to direct to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce yesterday, and ask him whether the Wheat Board has recently completed an important wheat sale to a South American country?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy to say that—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pepin: —the Peruvian Minister of Finance is coming to Ottawa today in order to conclude governmental negotiations. I am having lunch with him in a few minutes and will be making an announcement at that time, making known certain details. I might add that this is the largest sale of Canadian wheat made to a Latin American country in recent years. I might also add that the sale was facilitated by the new credit arrangements for developing countries indicated in the discussion of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce estimates earlier this year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any recent developments with regard to the balance of the wheat contract with the U.S.S.R.?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to add on this at the moment.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since this sale, hopefully, will mean that space will be available for more shipments, will the minister advise me if I can take to the meeting to be held in the northern part of Alberta on Sunday, which the minister unfortunately will not be able to attend, some useful information to the effect that a great number of box cars will be made available to that very depressed area so that farmers can meet their quotas?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member that he read at page 10784 of *Hansard* a declaration of the chief commissioner of the Wheat Board.

Mr. Baldwin: I have read it. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. Trudeau: Read it slowly.

WHEAT—SALE IN AREA OVERSOLD BY ARGENTINA

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of current reports that our competitor, Argentina, has oversold its wheat supplies to some of our competitors and that there is a vacuum in that situation, will the minister or his officials look into the situation and see if Canada can dispose of some of her surplus in that area?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is bidding on that sale as well as on all others.

GRAIN

ALLOCATION OF BOX CARS TO THE LAKEHEAD AND VANCOUVER

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In response to questions asked yesterday the minister advised the house that he will investigate the allegations of the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that the pool has space at its terminals at Vancouver and the Lakehead and that only half the required number of box cars are being allocated for unloading. He replied that he would investigate and inform the house of his findings. Has he been able to do so and, if so, what are his findings?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I do not have that information yet. I shall be in Winnipeg on Monday, obtain the information, and report to the house on Tuesday, when I am here.

Mr. Benjamin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the statement of the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has a direct bearing on the telegram sent by the commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board to which the minister replied yesterday, will the minister investigate the allegations of the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and advise this house on Monday whether enough box cars will be allocated to those terminals to fill the space there?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I will be in Winnipeg on Monday. I will try on Tuesday to do as the hon. member suggests.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE ON DELIVERY QUOTA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister now assure us that farmers of western Canada will be able to deliver the five bushel quota, or in the alternative, that in view of the sale just made, which means a few million dollars, quotas will be increased to more than five bushels?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have answered similar questions almost every day for the last few weeks. There is nothing to be added. As you yourself might say, Mr. Speaker, the question is hypothetical. I have read on a number of occasions declarations by the chief commissioner of the Wheat Board to the effect that the five bushel quota will be met by the end of the month.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister, on motions, at some time in the near future will list the delivery points in western Canada that are down to as little as a two bushel delivery quota, and that have no hope of reaching the five bushel quota?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker I keep in touch with these things on an every-day basis. I have the latest figures before me at the moment. I will be glad to send to my hon. friend information about the number of stations on three, four and five bushels.

ALLEGED PADDING OF ORDERS TO SECURE BOX CAR ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister investigate allegations of the Canadian Wheat Board that certain elevator companies are padding their numbers of shipping orders in order to secure box cars they are not entitled to?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will add that to my shopping list for Monday.

Mr. Baldwin: When for?—next Christmas?

TRANSPORT

BORDEN-TORMENTINE FERRY—SERVICE BELOW CAPACITY

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Transport is now in a position to answer the question I asked last Friday. The acting Minister of Transport took it as notice.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member's question has to do with the number of passengers being carried on the Prince Edward Island ferry. In the hon. member's absence a few days ago I explained that we were quite prepared to examine the matter and to see whether we needed to change the present pattern. The problem seems to arise from the fact that the passenger-to-car ratio is not steady. In any event I am having the whole matter looked into to see whether we can make changes that will enable us to accommodate more passengers.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSING

DISCUSSIONS WITH FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS RESPECTING RATES ON MORTGAGE FUNDS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the minister in charge of housing. I wonder if the minister will tell us what are the results of the consultations he had with various financial institutions on the subject of mortgage moneys and interest rates?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I had useful meetings with the representatives of the banks on Monday, the insurance companies on Wednesday, and the trust companies yesterday. We covered a wide range of subject matters, including emphasis on measures to be taken as a result of amendments to the National Housing Act. The financial institutions are now in a better position to enter more actively into the residential housing market, and I believe have an obligation to do so. I talked to them about the possibility of increasing their lending for modest housing, even though that might mean some reduction in lending for luxury homes. We talked about further measures to improve our relations and the contacts between us, and we agreed to meet at least twice a year with more formal and precise agendas in order to make these meetings more meaningful.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask whether these financial institutions agreed that the level of interest rates fixed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was sufficiently high, or is it to go higher?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Act amendment freed the interest rate at which N.H.A. insured loans can be made. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation set its own direct lending rate, for the present time, at 9 per cent. I think this will have some influence on the activity of approved lenders.

INCOME TAX

DELAY IN PAYMENT OF REFUNDS

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Is he seeking for the government new sources of revenue through the device of delaying income tax refunds?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is similar to one asked yesterday although, as I recognize, it is in a somewhat different form.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

AIR TRANSPORT

SERVICE OF AIR LINE PILOTS UNDER CONDITIONS OF FATIGUE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Since the minister this morning made a statement about air safety with respect to air traffic controllers, will he be in a position to make a statement within the next few days about another aspect of air safety? Allegations have been brought forward in this house concerning complaints that pilots of Air Canada and other air lines have been given permission by Department of Transport officials to fly up to 150 hours a month.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there are no such pilots to our knowledge. Certainly there has not been any such permission given.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question asked by the hon. member was whether a statement would be made. The second part of the question was ruled out of order some days ago.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary to the Minister of Finance. Would he take note of the straightforward way that the minister answers—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: —and try to do a hell of a lot better—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must again seek the co-operation of the hon. member to look to the direction of the Chair.

Mr. Hees: He can teach you a lot!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PENITENTIARIES

SPRINGHILL, N.S.—TRANSFER OF INMATES TO OTHER MINIMUM SECURITY ACCOMMODATION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General, and ask him whether the minimum security institution at Springhill is being closed? If so, what arrangements are being made to deal with those inmates who have been so successfully treated in that institution?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The temporary minimum security institution at Springhill is being closed on September 1. The institution, when it was created, was on a temporary basis. Since that time two other minimum security institutions have been created in the area. The prisoners will be transferred to the other minimum security institutions in the area.

Mr. Orlikow: I wish to ask the minister if that is the institution he told me about a month ago, that is being used to test new treatment facilities for psychiatric care?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker. The institution referred to in answer to the question a month ago was the medium security penitentiary at Springhill.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Solicitor General advise if there are any current plans for closing any other minimum institutions at this time?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker. This particular one at Springhill is a matter of there not being enough inmates to require the services of that institution. There are three minimum security institutions in the maritimes. Two will adequately service the inmate population.

FARM MACHINERY

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF BARBER REPORT

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since the government does not appear disposed to making a policy statement until the information is received, I ask the minister when he anticipates the reports of the task force on agriculture and the Barber Commission will be completed and provided to the government?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an indication of when that study will be completed because, as Dr. Barber has pointed out, there have been some significant changes in the pricing patterns in farm machinery in North America and as related to Europe, for example, in the last two or three months. He indicated in an interim paper he prepared for the Canadian Agriculture Congress that he wanted to look deeply into it. Indeed, members of this house asked that it be done. This of course makes it difficult to predict when his study will be completed.

Inquiries of the Ministry

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

WILLINGNESS OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT TO ACCEPT FEDERAL GRANT FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): My question is directed to the Prime Minister, and it is prompted by an article that appeared in yesterday's press. Can the Prime Minister tell the house whether the government of the province of Quebec has indicated its willingness to accept what amounts to a conditional grant from the federal government to assist in financing English language education in the province of Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not have that information. This question should be addressed to the Secretary of State, as it comes under his jurisdiction. He might answer when he is in the house.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FREEZE IN TRACKER AIRCRAFT OVERHAUL

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My question is to the Minister of Supply and Services. Notice of this question was given a few days ago by my colleague the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. Can the minister say when a review of the Tracker and other contract programs involving Fairey Aviation of Canada will be completed?

Mr. Speaker: I forget what the reaction of the Chair was at the time the question was asked originally. If the question was allowed, perhaps the minister might answer now.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, the question was allowed last week. In fact two questions were allowed at much greater length—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister does not reply twice; he may reply once.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I believe that question was directed to the Minister of National Defence. My understanding is that his parliamentary secretary has an answer.

Mr. McCleave: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This involves the roster system again, and statements made by some ministers that they will bring questions to the attention of other ministers. At page 10706 of *Hansard* for June 27 the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt said:

> Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring the hon. member's question to the attention of the Minister of Supply and Services.

I wish the hon. gentlemen would get together.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio did bring the question to my attention. As I have indicated, the original question was directed to the Minister of National Defence. My information is that he has an answer prepared for that question.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether this matter is also being discussed with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, in view of the unemployment that may result from this stop work order?

Mr. Richardson: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

ALLEGATION RESPECTING NEWFOUNDLAND SECTION OF INDUSTRY

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): I wish to direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries. Last night during the late show as appears at page 10835 of *Hansard* the hon. member for St. John's East stated that the fishing industry in Newfoundland is poorly managed. Will the Department of Fisheries and Forestry investigate these very serious allegations and take any action which may be necessary?

Mr. Speaker: I think the debate might be resumed at ten o'clock.

COMMUNICATIONS

SENATOR KEITH DAVEY—EMPLOYMENT OF LIBERAL SUPPORTERS IN MEDIA INQUIRY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Will the minister advise the house whether he intends to bring forward a supplementary estimate or, if not, what other procedure is to be followed, to enable parliament to decide on the grant of $150,000 being contracted for by Senator Keith Davey to employ a number of prominent Liberal Party workers on his fishing expedition into press, radio and television?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the matter of detailed expenditures is a matter for my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Stanfield: Then Mr. Speaker, may I direct the question to the President of the Treasury Board?

[Mr. McCleave.]

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, he has referred to a committee of the other place. It has not been the practice of this house to try to exercise detailed control over their affairs.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it not any longer the practice of the government to seek the approval of the house on estimates of money being expended?

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It has been the practice and will continue to be the practice to seek the approval of the house in respect to parliamentary appropriations.

Mr. Stanfield: Does the government intend to bring forward a supplementary estimate in this regard?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, there has not as yet been any request made either to the government or to this house for supplementary moneys to carry on the operation of the Senate for the current fiscal year.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NATURAL GAS—ANNOUNCED PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It is with reference to a question I asked yesterday. Is the minister prepared to take action against the anticipated rise in natural gas prices in the west? He answered with his trade and commerce hat yesterday, and said, no. Today in his capacity as minister of industry, concerned about costs to industry in Canada, would he put that hat on and answer the question?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I might have to see my doctor. I was not aware that I might suffer from schizophrenia.

The question raised is a very complex one. I do not think I could answer it in just a few sentences. The price of gas indeed is going up, but there are regulatory agencies in the provinces, on the production as well as on the consumption side, to keep a check on that. The Canadian Energy Board has responsibility to make sure that the gas exported to the United States is surplus to Canadian needs. It must make sure also that the price is "just and reasonable". I am informed—there is no distinction between "told" and "informed" in French—that at the moment, in some cases anyway, the price of gas going to the United States is at a higher level than—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that perhaps we might revert to motions to allow the minister to make a statement.

Mr. Saltsman: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While thanking the minister for his lesson in French, in view of his responsibility to industry may I ask him whether it is his intention either to see about refusing export permits for natural gas or to make representations before the National Energy Board on behalf of the manufacturers of Canada.

Mr. Pepin: The hon. member is hoping that I will say whether or not I am in favour of a two-price system for gas. As usual there are advantages and disadvantages on both sides of the argumentation. I shall consult with the minister in charge of energy to see whether the two of us can develop some kind of an answer.

SPORTS

TORONTO—FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF DOMED STADIUM

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In light of the approval in principle by the Toronto board of control for a domed sports stadium for metro, and in the light of the decision to approach the federal government for funds should approval be given by plebiscite in December, will the Prime Minister say whether it is the intention of the federal government to give favourable consideration to assisting financially in the construction of such a domed sports stadium—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the question should be placed on the order paper.

PENSIONS

ACTION TO ASSURE ADEQUATE BENEFITS FOR ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, a week ago I directed a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. The acting minister said that he would take note of the question and have it answered at the earliest possible opportunity. Following that I was advised by two departments to try the President of the Treasury Board; so I shall redirect my question to him now. In view of the appeal received from the Naval Officers Association of Canada, what immediate steps can the government take to update to an adequate level the pension benefits of long service pensioners in Canada's fighting forces, and their wives and children.

Mr. Speaker: If I did not say so when the question was asked earlier, I should have said that this is a question which normally should be answered by way of a statement on motions.

Mrs. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister make a statement on motions, perhaps on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I am not sure whether the house will be sitting on Monday and Tuesday—

Mr. Hees: It will be sitting.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wetaskiwin.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member for Wetaskiwin that we will have to yield to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker I was very respectfully going to draw to your attention the fact that you cut off the President of the Treasury Board in the middle of a sentence. I think he should have had the opportunity to complete that sentence.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister did not appear to complain.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wetaskiwin.

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—GREATER BUTTERFAT QUOTA ON PRAIRIES

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try again. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister any plan to change the policy of the Dairy Commission to allow the retention of more butterfat quota in the prairie provinces.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of representation to set up regional quotas. We have decided we do not like to set up the kind of program that would inhibit interprovincial trade within Canada.

Inquiries of the Ministry

REQUEST FOR TASK FORCE REPORT

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, this question really relates to a question asked a few moments ago of the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with the task force on agriculture. I should like to know when the task force might be reporting to the government.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the task force expects to report before the end of this year.

AIRPORTS

CHARLOTTETOWN—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF TERMINAL

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Transport, who in his last reply to a question of mine demonstrated his capacity to get to the bottom of things. Can he advise whether, as a result of his upgrading, progress is being made on the provision of new facilities at the Charlottetown airport, where there is a unique situation.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything new, in addition to what I reported a few days ago. An examination is being made of the airport facilities to see what is there, but that examination is not completed.

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—DISCUSSION WITH TRADE UNIONS ON PACT EXTENSION—DISPARITY IN PRICES

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the genial Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. A few days ago I asked the minister a question concerning an extension of the area of the auto pact. I asked him whether he had discussed with the affected trade unions the specific proposals presented by the Canadian government, and he said he would look into the question.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pépin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we have received representations in respect of the auto pact in general but not on the question of broadening—I was going to say "broadbenting"—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: I think you are bringing vaudeville back.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Pepin: Jealousy on the part of the hon. member! The subject of broadening will be fully surveyed in the coming months. Representations will be received from everybody who wants to make a contribution and I hope the unions will make theirs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISION RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Thursday, July 3, consideration of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, and Motion No. 4, Mr. McQuaid, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am rising because I had hoped the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) or the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) would be making some comment in respect of why the government apparently is rejecting the amendment now before us. Last night we received no indication concerning the reason the amendment of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) was opposed by the government.

It seems to me there is a good deal to be said for the merit of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). It suggests that the statement to parliament made by the commissioner and any report that may be made by him under clause 33 should be referred to a committee of the House and also to a committee of the Senate. I would be interested in knowing what the government's view is. When the amendments were being discussed the other day I thought the minister was prepared to give some consideration to this. He has not indicated to the house at all why the government has now decided to reject these amendments.

• (12 noon)

When this legislation was first introduced the hon. member for York South, in pointing out the views of this party, indicated that we support the principle of the legislation. At that time the hon. member said something with which I wholly concur, that the value of this legislation will be largely dependent

upon how it is administered. This legislation, which we support, can have a unifying influence in Canada. It could also be the subject of acrimony and have a divisive effect if it is not properly administered and, even more important, if it is not properly understood.

There is a great deal to be said for having machinery set up whereby any reports the commissioner makes under clause 33 will be discussed by a committee of this house in order that the whole question may be thoroughly aired. I should not need to tell the government that there is a good deal of suspicion about this legislation. Personally I think the government has done a lamentably poor job of selling it to the people of Canada. For a government that talks a good deal about involvement, consensus and participation, this government has done very little about selling this legislation. I except here the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who I think has made a valiant attempt, but on the whole the government has done a very poor job of explaining this legislation to the people of Canada.

In many areas of the country this legislation is misunderstood and, unfortunately in some cases, misrepresented. The government ought to be trying to do a selling job. There has been a breakdown in communications between the government and the people of Canada in respect of the purport of this measure. I want to say also that this situation has not been helped by the inflexible attitude the government has taken in regard to the amendments that have been discussed during the report stage.

I do not want to discuss the amendments now as I would be out of order, but certainly some of them were reasonable and would have improved the legislation. We heard a most specious argument advanced as to why they should not be accepted. The Minister of Justice dealt with the amendments with his usual charm and urbanity, but I have the feeling that behind his pleasantry there is a very firm iron hand which indicated to him that no changes or amendments are to be accepted irrespective of whether or not they improve the legislation. If that type of ruthless arrogance is continued in the administration of the legislation this act, which could be a great forward step in Canada, will have a divisive effect. Therefore I am at a loss to understand why the government should not be prepared to give an assurance, and even put it in the legislation, that the reports of the commissioner will be sent to a committee so that there will be the fullest possible discussion and the widest possible understanding of what this is all about.

We are not going to have public hearings for those adversely affected. There will be some suspicion as to what has happened when reports are submitted which adversely affect some people, perhaps based on tittle-tattle and malicious gossip. There should be the fullest opportunity for a complete airing of any complaints. Certainly the best way to obtain that kind of airing and understanding of a misunderstanding that might arise would be to have all reports made under clause 33 sent to a committee of the house. I think the government should consider very seriously the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

I know the minister will say it is not usual to put instructions to the House of Commons in legislation. The fact remains that what will happen is that these reports will be tabled in due course in the House of Commons but there will be no opportunity to discuss them under Standing Order 26 because they will not be matters of urgent importance. Questions may be asked from time to time. Even if we take one of the allotted days, this will mean just a formal debate with the minister closing it at the end of the day. What is needed is a dialogue in respect of the report. What is needed is a forum in which there can be informal discussions. A committee could call the people adversely affected and could have the benefit of the opinions of witnesses who are concerned with the particular items in the commissioner's report. That can only be done by having these reports sent to a committee of the house.

We would have preferred, of course, to have an appropriate standing committee named. This amendment calls for a committee designated by His Honour the Speaker. That would be the second best choice. In whatever way the committee is appointed, particularly in the initial stages of the administration of this legislation, surely there ought to be provision made for discussion of the reports and for the widest possible understanding of them. We automatically send reports in respect of other activities of the government to committees for discussion. Why not send these reports to a committee? I make the plea, not on any political ground but for the government's own sake, that hon. members opposite accept this amendment.

I congratulate the minister on having done a very masterful job of studying this whole

question. He and the government want this legislation to be a success. I assume they want it to be understood, appreciated and supported in those areas of Canada where, to say the least, at the present time it has not been welcomed. I cannot imagine any better way of having this whole question examined properly than by sending the reports of the commissioner to a committee where members will be able to ask questions, call witnesses and make a report to the house which can be discussed by the whole house. The result would be twofold. There would be publicity and there would be no feeling that the commissioner's reports were made in secrecy and that persons were adversely affected behind closed doors. This would also give members of this house the opportunity to become fully familiar with the operations of the commission, its activities, the commissioner's duties and how he has discharged them. They in turn would be able to go back to their constituencies and remove any fears which now exist regarding this legislation.

I hope the government will give serious consideration either to accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River or suggesting some alternative procedure which will assure the house that when the commissioner's report is received it will be fully discussed by the members of this house in order that we may have all the facts and in order that suspicions, whether justified or unjustified, can be fully investigated.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, when this motion was originally before the house, as introduced by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), amended with his consent by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), and then amended again by the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), I said I would be prepared to consider and reflect upon it.

The official languages commissioner will be in effect a servant of parliament. He will make his report of any adverse investigation to parliament under clause 33 of the bill. Under clause 34 of the bill he will be required to make an annual report to parliament. After very serious reflection we decided we would take the position that we should recommend to the house that the amendment be rejected, for this reason: The House of Commons is master of its own proceedings.

• (12:10 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Amazing!

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It would in our view be very inadvisable to restrict parliament in advance, to tie the hands of parliament in advance, by way of a statute, with regard to how parliament ought to deal with any particular report, in this case the report of the official languages commissioner. We believe that the internal proceedings of the house and its committees should be a matter for the House of Commons of the day to decide in its own good, collective judgment.

We believe that the proceedings of the House of Commons ought not to be delineated by statutory provisions, and we have been unable to find any other statute which so requires. I think parliament has, in its wisdom, always reserved to parliament the right to determine how reports are to be dealt with. A report submitted to parliament under clause 33 by way of a specific investigation or under clause 34 by way of an annual report will be dealt with by parliament as it sees fit. It will be open to the house to examine it under Standing Order 26. It will be in order for the house to examine it by way of reviewing the estimates relating to the commission or by way of referring the report, in its judgment, to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs or whatever committee the house should decide, or it could set up a special committee to examine the report. It is not the intention of the government that this report should lie fallow and unattended when it reaches the house.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister says that the house is master of its own destiny. He also knows, of course, that the government, having a majority in the house, can always decide what disposition is to be made of a report that is laid on the table. What does the present administration intend to do with the commissioner's report when it is tabled?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I cannot say—

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is the problem.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —because that will depend on what the parliament of the day intends to do with it. But nothing in the subamendment of the hon. member for

York South which was defeated last night, or in the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), will cure the happy fact that the government happens to have a majority in the House of Commons. The amendment will not cure that. Our argument is that parliament should be left to deal with any report submitted to it and should not be restricted by any statutory framework attached to it.

Mr. Hees: You sound like the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): But the amendment would get the report off the table of the house and into a committee.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The house may send it to any committee of its choice. This procedure has always been adopted by the house, namely, leaving the house the master of its own procedure. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), who is a parliamentarian of great experience and usually sticks up for the rights of the house in all his flushed vigour, knows that this is a very proper precedent to maintain.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister should take his tongue out of his cheek.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I simply say the minister knows perfectly well that the government does not want these reports examined by a committee of the house and will not have any of them examined by a committee. Why not be honest and say that?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is right.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Finally, Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with remarks, which perhaps went beyond the scope of the amendment, as to the treatment the government has accorded this bill since it received first reading. I do not believe any bill has been the subject of so much consultation across this country, within and without parliament, with the provincial governments and interested institutions and bodies. There have been over 29 amendments, some introduced by the government as a result of consultations with the provinces, some introduced by members of the opposition of all political parties. There have been 29 amendments, fully dealt with and accepted.

We have attempted to adopt a reasonable attitude in dealing with this bill because, as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands recognizes, it is a bill of great sensitivity; it is a bill that has provoked a good deal of controversy in certain quarters; it is a bill that labours under some misunderstanding. We intend that the commissioner's report be public, that it be placed on the table of parliament. But we want to leave it to parliament in its good judgment to deal with the report, just as is the case in every other area.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Hon. members may not like it, but I am sticking up for parliamentary privilege and the rights of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: You are just doing what the Prime Minister told you to do.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes.

Mr. Lewis: I have already spoken on the amendment and I am not trying to speak again. The minister will recall that this matter was discussed in the special committee.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes.

Mr. Lewis: At the end of those deliberations I moved a motion that the committee recommend to parliament that these reports be sent to a committee of parliament. That motion was ruled out of order on the ground that our terms of reference did not permit us to deal with that matter. I am not going into that question. At the time I moved my motion there was expression of support for it from members of all parties on the committee. I now ask the minister a very simple question: Can he undertake, on behalf of the government, that as long as this government remains in office, until the next election at least which may be a year, two years or three years away, the reports of the commissioner will in fact be referred to a committee of parliament, and that the government house leader will undertake to do this? That is a simple question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is a simple question which is difficult for me to answer at the moment without consulting my colleagues, and the house leader in particular. The hon. member is perfectly correct. At the

committee stage we felt that if there was to be a recommendation from the committee it should be made to an organ of the house, to the committee on procedure, the government house leader or the house leaders of the parties. We felt it should be a recommendation to one of these bodies because it concerned the procedures of the house and should not be incorporated within the statute. At the time the hon. member was willing to accept that position because I think he himself realized there would be a certain rigidity attached to a statutory, mandatory order imposed upon parliament. He would have preferred at that time, as I would—we were at one on this; our minds were ad idem at that time—that parliament be left to its own devices and its own procedure.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one follow-up question, Mr. Speaker? I can understand that the Minister of Justice would perhaps hesitate to speak for the government house leader without having talked to him. I ask the minister this simple question: Is he prepared to state on his own behalf that as a member of the government he will do everything he can to see that these reports are referred to a committee of parliament? I put the minister on the spot without any hesitation.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member is putting me deliciously on the spot, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is in the interests of the people of Canada and of parliament that public notice and public viewing be given in respect of the commissioner's reports. Having said that, I will draw the hon. member's remarks to the attention of my colleague.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words at this time because of the jeers the leader of our party received from members on the government side when a few moments ago he suggested to the government and the minister piloting this bill through the house that (a) there is a great deal of misunderstanding in all parts of the country about the bill and (b), that all of us must do as much as we can and a great deal more than we have done to make people understand the real principles behind the bill and how it will operate. It seems obvious to me, as it did to the leader of our party a few moments ago, that if we want to do this, the more public airing there is of how the bill will work and how the commissioner will operate the better it will be. Therefore I am all for getting the report of the commissioner before a committee which can deal with it.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

• (12:20 p.m.)

I say to the minister that he does not encourage those of us who have supported the principle of this bill from the day it was brought in, those of us who have gone back to our own areas and stood up for the bill, unlike his colleagues. I have just come back after participating in the provincial election in my own province in which the provincial members of the Liberal party ran away from this bill and in which the Conservative premier, at least until today, opposed it. We in our party were not afraid to take the same position in Manitoba that we took in this house.

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order. I am not attempting to speak for other members of my party from Manitoba, but I want to make it abundantly clear that the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) can in no way apply to me, and I can prove it if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I should like to make a comment on the point of order. May I remind hon. members that we are now considering an amendment to the motion, and interesting though the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North may be I would not want the debate to stray into a discussion of the recent election in Manitoba. I invite the hon. member to restrict his remarks as much as possible to the amendment now before the house.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking much of the time of the house at this stage. I intend to make some remarks on third reading of the bill, which I think will be in order. I am simply pointing out one of the reasons why I think we should adopt the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), namely, the tremendous amount of misinformation and misunderstanding of what we are trying to do that exists. With regard to the point of order of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler), may I say I was not referring to Liberal members of parliament from Manitoba. I was referring very specifically to the attitude taken by the provincial leader of the Liberal party and by the Liberal members of the legislature as well as the Liberal candidates. I repeat that they ran away from this bill and we did not. My colleague, the former member for Selkirk who led our party to victory, made his position quite clear.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Orlikow: He made quite clear the position which we have taken in this house. This is more than a political matter. If the minister wants the basic principles of this bill to be understood by the people of Canada, he should co-operate with those members of parliament from all parties who want to see the bill implemented, and agree to reasonable amendments which will help the people of Canada to understand what we are trying to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? The question is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River to the motion moved by the hon. member for Cardigan. All those in favour of the said amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Baldwin) which was negatived on the following division:

• (12:30 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Broadbent
Burton
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Flemming
Gilbert
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
La Salle
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Saltsman
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Olson
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—122.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the amendment since I oppose the bill in principle.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Division

Mr. Speaker: The question now is on motion No. 4 moved by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid):

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 34 thereof the following subclauses:

"(4) Where a member of the House of Commons, on or before the third sitting day next following the day the Speaker of that House tables any report made by the Commissioner under section 33, asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the report as a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, the matter shall be deemed proper to be discussed and shall thereafter be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of the standing order of the House applicable to the subsequent stages of the proceeding.

(5) The annual statement to Parliament made by the Commissioner under this section, when tabled respectively in the Senate and House of Commons, shall thereupon be referred in each House to a committee designated by the Speaker."

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost on division.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour did not call the nays.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 4 (Mr. McQuaid) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take the deferred votes on motions Nos. 7 and 8. The question is on motion No. 7, Mr. McQuaid:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by deleting subclause (4) of clause 40 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(4) In relation to the appointment and advancement in employment of personnel the duties of whose positions include duties relating to the provision of services by authorities to members of the public, it is the duty

(a) of the Public Service Commission, in cases where it has the authority to make appointments,

(b) of the authority respectively concerned in the cases of the Canadian Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and

(c) of the authority concerned in all other cases, to ensure that, in the exercise and performance of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed upon it by law, due account is taken of the purposes and provisions of this Act, subject always to the maintenance of the principle of selection of personnel according to merit as required by the Public Service Employment Act or any other Act of the Parliament of Canada respectively applicable to the Canadian Forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and the authority concerned in all other cases."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house that we proceed with the vote on this motion without the ringing of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 7 (Mr. McQuaid) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Broadbent
Burton
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Flemming
Gilbert
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
La Salle
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Saltsman
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Thomson
Winch
Woolliams—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Greene

Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Manceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Olson
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Watson
Walker
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—124.

During the taking of the vote:

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The-Islands): Mr. Speaker, are we not to be called on to vote? We follow the official opposition. I wish to record my vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Speaker: With the consent of the house I am certain that there will be no difficulty in accommodating the hon. member. The Clerk Assistant is instructed to continue calling for votes in favour of the motion.

An hon. Member: Why don't you people over there wake up?

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I have already voted.

After the taking of the vote:

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

• (1:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Some hon. members have been saying one o'clock to the Chair. I wonder whether the vote could be taken now and the house could then agree to adjourn for one hour after the vote is taken?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 8.

Mr. McIntosh: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should be allowed to register my presence in the house today. I did not vote for or against the last motion because I oppose the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this would not be the appropriate time to make a ruling on the hon. member's point of order. We will continue putting the question on motion No. 8. The question now is on motion No. 8, Mr. Horner:

That Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 40, the following subclause 5:

"(5) Notwithstanding anything in this act, no person shall be refused employment or promotion within the Public Service of Canada on grounds alone of inadequate acquaintance with either of the official languages mentioned in this act, provided that the applicant has declared his intention and willingness to learn the other language."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house that we proceed with this division without the call of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 8 (Mr. Horner) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Bell
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Downey
Flemming
Grills
Gundlock
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Korchinski
La Salle
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rynard
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Woolliams—43.

Division

NAYS

Messrs:

Andras
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Borrie
Breau
Broadbent
Brown
Burton
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gilbert
Godin
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Laing
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Latulippe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orlikow
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Rodrigue
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Serré
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Yanakis—138.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for or against the motion because I oppose the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house that the Chair put formally the motion that precedes third reading?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister) moved that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion for concurrence agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Baldwin: One o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: As agreed earlier today, the house will rise until ten minutes after two. Members will be reconvened by the bell.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.10 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my understanding that the house has extended leave to proceed at this sitting with third reading of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada.

Hon. John N. Turner (for the Prime Minister) moved that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the importance of this measure has been emphasized by the widespread support it has received from leaders of political parties and of public opinion throughout the country. Included in this support, which has

been evidenced by speeches made both in this chamber and outside it, is a notable contribution made in my own constituency by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). I might say we always feel honoured when distinguished visitors come to our constituency. I am sure that in coming my hon. friend had no ulterior motive so far as the sitting member is concerned.

We are dealing with an important principle of national policy. Undoubtedly there is a general concensus in the country that this policy is sound and will contribute a great deal to the future development of Canada. Policies and objectives are important and vital in many important areas of our life, but the means used to accomplish these policies are also important.

I wish to speak for a few minutes about one group of people which is greatly affected by the policy involved in this legislation. I refer to the public service. The first thing I should like to say is that, as all hon. members know, the public service of Canada is in a unique position in relation to this legislation and indeed in relation to any general policy expounded by the various governments of this country. The very nature of their occupations makes it difficult, if not impossible, for them to comment publicly as individuals on policies of this type as they may affect them in their employment.

Having said that, I should also like to express the opinion that we in this parliament are under a special obligation toward the members of the public service who in a very real sense are our employees. These are people who rightfully look not only to government but to parliamentarians to protect them. Indeed, I think it is fair to say—and one could put it stronger than that by saying it is perfectly evident—that the public service of Canada has been one of the greatest unifying forces in the nation. There are many people here in this chamber and certainly in this city who like myself came originally from the far regions of Canada to Ottawa to work for the public service. The contribution the public service has made toward national unity because of its composition, representing all parts of Canada and all regions of government in Canada, has been immense. It is certainly to be hoped that as a result of the passage of this bill this contribution will be enhanced in the future by virtue of the fact that people whose native language is French will feel even more welcome in the public service and as a consequence be in a position to make an even greater contribution to the life of the nation.

When the policy of bilingualism was first expressed for the government of Canada by the Right Hon. L. B. Pearson in April of 1966 there was in my judgment a general acceptance of that policy by the members of the public service. This judgment has been confirmed by the frequent contacts I have had with members of the public service since that time and more particularly since my election to the house.

There are many aspects to the question of bilingualism and to the application of two official languages. This has already been commented upon in the discussions which have taken place. I do not intend to go over all the ground again. Since I represent a large number of public servants, people who will be and are being affected by this policy, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the house not only to their general approbation of the policy but to some concerns they have about it.

At the time the policy was announced by Mr. Pearson on April 6, 1966, he made a number of detailed comments about its application to the public service. Two of them have always been deemed by the public service in this city at any rate to be of singular and great importance. I now quote from page 3916 of *Hansard* for April 6, 1966, where Mr. Pearson set out the following as point (e) in his exposé:

> For similar reasons of equity, the careers of civil servants who are not bilingual and who have devoted many years of their lives to the service of their country must not be prejudiced in any way by measures to develop bilingualism.

The next paragraph, item (f), reads as follows:

> The government will consult from time to time with civil service associations concerning its policy on bilingualism in order to obtain their point of view, and to provide them with all reasonable assurances and remove any possible misunderstandings in regard to measures being proposed.

• (2:20 p.m.)

In many circles in the public service these statements are referred to as "the Pearson pledge". Because of the singularly important position which Mr. Pearson occupied and because of his long experience as a public servant these two items in his statement were given great value by the public service. One reason the policy of greater bilingualism in the public service has been introduced with so much ease and general acceptance is that the public service believes that these two

principles are not only important but will be adhered to.

As I said a moment ago, one of the greatest problems facing the public service is the expression of viewpoints on important issues of this kind. I am very conscious of this problem. If I may be permitted a personal reference I might explain to the house something which I attempted to do in April of this year. When my constituency association had its annual meeting, arrangements were made for a discussion on the policy of bilingualism. That meeting was attended by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and the executive secretary of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada.

During that discussion two points were made which I think are important to record at this time. The first point was that the Professional Institute, and I think other organizations representing public servants, felt that the policy as it had developed up to that time had not really protected unilingual civil servants of long experience and service in the way this was contemplated in Mr. Pearson's statement. The other point, which is equally important, is that the staff associations representing the public service were very definitely of the opinion that there had not been consultation between them and the authorities of the government of Canada in respect of the implementation of this policy, as was contemplated in the statement of Mr. Pearson.

The position in which we now find ourselves is that the policy of bilingualism in the public service, which, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) pointed out the other night, had been expressed in a previous statute, the Public Service Employment Act passed in 1967, will now receive wider application and greater authority by virtue of the passage of this bill. It seems to me quite clear that as we embark upon this very great enterprise of providing greater access to our public institutions to those people speaking either French or English, we must be sure that this aim or policy is not in any sense defeated by the means used to implement it. It is my view that the success of this policy over the next few years and, indeed, over a longer period of time, will depend to a very considerable extent upon the degree of support and confidence it enlists from the public service.

I see no evidence now that it will not have the support and confidence of the type required. There is no evidence that the authorities of the government responsible for the administration of this policy will be anything but diligent in an effort to make sure that the basic principles of equity and justice, implicit in Mr. Pearson's remarks, are continued in the forefront of the application of the policy.

Now that we have had some experience with the application of this policy and how it can be made effective by virtue of regulations and procedures within the public service, I believe the time has come to review the position of public servants with seniority and experience. Certainly it seems to me that in any case where bilingualism is not an absolute requisite for a particular position in the public service, any preference or special points given to persons with bilingual capability should be balanced off in the case of experienced unilingual civil servants by a formula which takes into account their years of service.

• (2:30 p.m.)

This policy, to be effective and fair, will have to be one of gradualism. As my colleague the Minister of Justice stated last night, it will have to be applied with common sense and with considerable attention to the position of individuals affected by it. I have every confidence that it is within the power, compassion and authority of this government, and indeed of any government of Canada, to see that the policy is applied in this way. I have equal confidence that if it is so applied it will, as the promoters of this bill hope, contribute greatly to the future strength and unity of our nation.

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, before beginning my discussion of this very important bill I believe I would be less than fair if I did not take advantage of this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Roberts) who very fairly and effectively chaired the special committee of the house which studied the bill and reported on it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McQuaid: It was my privilege to serve as a member of the committee. I say quite frankly to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house that I was impressed throughout the hearings by the very fair and impartial manner in which the chairman carried out his duties. For this I now publicly thank and congratulate him. I feel, too, that I would be less than fair if I did not at this time express my

appreciation to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) for the contributions they made to the work of the committee. I found them very co-operative and helpful in many ways. While they were not inclined to go along with all the proposals we saw fit to submit to the committee, they entertained them with quite a bit of consideration and in some cases saw fit to accept them. I will deal later in more detail with that aspect of the committee hearings. I also say without hesitation that the law officers of the Crown were extremely helpful in assisting me to draft some of the amendments we had in mind and put them in proper legal form. To them we also extend our sincere thanks.

In speaking to the bill at this stage I would like to do three things specifically. First, I shall speak to the general principle embodied in the bill and, of course, its several amendments. I say without reservation that I support the principle represented in the bill. In this connection, if you will permit me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I want to take very serious exception to the allegation made in the house yesterday by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) when speaking in the debate. I notice that unfortunately the hon. member is not in his seat at the moment. He was here a few minutes ago. As reported on page 10803 of *Hansard*, while speaking to an amendment to the bill which I had the privilege of submitting to the house, namely, that dealing with the armed forces and members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the hon. member said:

> I read between the lines, and I see that the competence of the French Canadian is questioned. That is one of the purposes of this amendment.

I categorically deny that there was ever any such intention in my mind or the minds of members of our party in introducing that amendment, that is, that one of its purposes was to question the competence of French Canadians. We have the utmost respect for and confidence in the competence of all the people of Canada, be they French speaking, English speaking or of any other ethnic origin. I am very sorry that the hon. member for Champlain saw fit to read into our amendment such a meaning because it certainly was not intended.

That statement can probably be excused but, if I am permitted to say so, what the hon. member then said cannot be excused. I suggest that it was a direct misrepresentation of what I said during the committee study of the bill. As reported at page 10803 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Champlain continued in these words:

> Having sat on the special committee on official languages, I have heard with my own ears what the hon. member who moved the amendment—

That was I.

> —had to say and he even stated categorically that French Canadians in provinces other than Quebec were against this bill.

I never said that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Champlain is now in his seat. If Your Honour will permit me to do so, I will resume my seat for the moment and ask the hon. member where he finds in the proceedings of the committee that I ever said any such thing. The proceedings of the committee will show what I said. We were discussing an amendment to the bill, and I said:

> I think we have to recognize that there are areas in Canada, particularly in western Canada . . . and probably in Quebec too—but I am referring now particularly to the west—where 10 per cent of the people are French speaking.

I continued in these words:

> Now, these people are violently opposed to having a bilingual district established in their particular area.

I said that the people of Quebec were in many cases opposed to having bilingual districts established in their area. This is exactly what the Prime Minister of Quebec said, that we were establishing linguistic ghettoes; but it is not what the hon. member for Champlain said I said. He said I stated categorically that French Canadians in provinces other than Quebec were against this bill. I never said any such thing. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to resume my seat now and ask the hon. member either to withdraw that statement or prove that it was said by me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt because I know the hon. member for Cardigan feels very strongly on this point, but this is an unusual procedure and I think it would be more proper for the hon. member for Champlain, when he makes his contribution on third reading, to deal with the point raised by the hon. member for Cardigan. I think that is probably the more correct procedure to follow.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether with the consent of the house the hon. member for Champlain might be allowed, without prejudicing the hon. member for Cardigan

and having him forefeit his right to continue speaking afterwards, to speak to this point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Of course, with consent the house can do anything. But I again make the point that I think it is an irregular procedure and I would not like to encourage it. It is obviously a procedure that can be used on other occasions even though it is not particularly correct. Although I appreciate the strength of the feeling of the hon. member for Cardigan, I would encourage the house to allow the hon. member for Champlain to deal with the point when he makes his contribution on third reading.

• (2:40 p.m.)

An hon. Member: He may not make a contribution then.

Mr. Woolliams: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say with the greatest respect that perhaps the distinguished hon. member will not want to make a contribution at that time. I believe he did want to say something and I suspect he will likely withdraw the remarks he made if he feels so inclined. So I hope that with the consent of the house you will permit him to speak, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I see the disposition of the house is more in favour of the view taken by the Minister of Justice. If there is agreement of the house, the hon. member for Champlain may have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I want to make the following remark, as a reply to the request of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid).

I believe that the establishment of bilingual districts is the basic principle of the bill, and that this is significant. But the hon. member undoubtedly said that French-Canadians, within the province of Quebec but especially outside Quebec, were against the establishment of bilingual districts. That is what took place in the special committee on official languages, and those who are against the establishment of bilingual districts are simply against bilingualism, which this bill attempts to implement. So, I maintain what I said.

[*English*]

Mr. McQuaid: Mr. Speaker, I can only say I am very disappointed that the hon. member has not seen fit to withdraw his remarks. I am sure he must realize that the objective of this bill is not the setting up of bilingual districts but rather the establishment of the French and English languages within the government services throughout Canada. I can only repeat that I am sorry the hon. member did not withdraw his remarks.

As I said before, what I would like to do first of all is to speak to the general principle embodied in the bill, but I also feel I would be doing less than my duty if I failed to point out some of the general deficiencies in the bill, despite the surgery which was attempted and in some cases performed in the committee, which will affect the people of Canada. I realize that even for experienced draftsmen it is very difficult to draft a perfect bill. Probably they felt they had done the best they could under the circumstances, but we submitted some proposals in the committee which we felt would improve the bill. As I mentioned at the beginning, some of them were accepted while others the committee in its wisdom saw fit to reject. We are convinced that if those proposals which were submitted by us in the committee and later, in somewhat modified or different form, to the house had been adopted, they would have improved the mechanism and the functional operation of the bill. Incidentally, we suggested that they would probably have made it much easier for the government to administer the bill properly when it does become law.

Third, I wish to draw the attention of the house to some rather specific weaknesses in the bill which we on this side of the house still feel should be corrected. We attempted to correct them by several amendments which we introduced but which, so far at least, have not met with the approval of the other side of the house.

As I see it, the basic principle of the legislation before us is to declare explicitly that English and French will be the two official languages of this country after the passing of this bill, as they have been actually in practice since confederation. I do not think anybody will attempt to deny that since confederation, in fact if not in law, English and French have been recognized as our two official languages. So I suggest it is not a very remarkable feat in itself to have introduced this legislation, but the many experts—and no doubt many experts have worked on this matter—have assured us and convinced me personally that the declaration we now find embodied in this bill which will very soon become the law of Canada will certainly

strengthen the determination of the two language groups in this country to live happily together.

I believe it is admitted by all fairminded people that as a general rule we have got along very well together in the past. There have been differences, as naturally there are bound to be, and this bill may strengthen our determination to live happily with each other. Such an objective, and I take this to be the objective of the bill, certainly cannot be opposed, and it is simply because of that objective that I and the party I have the honour to represent support the principle embodied in this bill.

To further the determination of the English and French speaking peoples to live happily together, the bill seeks to ensure that no matter which of the two official languages Canadians speak they will be able to enjoy the services of the government in their own language. Surely no fairminded person can take any serious exception to that. The bill directs federal government agencies to provide public services in both languages in areas which have been determined by the advisory board to be bilingual, that is, where at least 10 per cent of the people living in these areas speak either French or English or, in other areas, where in the opinion of the commissioner it is practical to have bilingualism. Under the bill public services in both languages will be provided wherever there are enough speakers of both languages to make the use of those languages a workable and worth-while objective. As legislators I think we will agree it is the very essence of good government to deal with all citizens in ways which are clear and unambiguous, and to the extent that this bill promotes that object we support it.

• (2:50 p.m.)

However, I would point out that to whatever extent this bill tends to bring about confusion, resentment or misunderstanding as between citizens and their government, we have serious reservations about it. This is one of the reasons we introduced the amendments put forward from this side of the house, namely, in order to clear up areas of confusion and misunderstanding which we believe exist in this legislation. We did not submit our amendments for the purpose of interfering with the principles embodied in the bill. If you examine our amendments carefully, Mr. Speaker, I think you will conclude that not one of the amendments proposed by our party interfered in any way with the principles embodied in the measure.

The purpose of the bill is not to compel everybody to learn to speak both English and French. That is not its purpose, though unfortunately I am afraid there are some people throughout Canada who have an idea that this is the case. Such a step—I would call it imposed bilingualism—would certainly spell disaster and it is clear there is no such intention inherent in the legislation before us. As a matter of fact, this is confirmed by an assurance from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) himself. As I gather it, the purpose of the bill is to make for a happier relationship between French speaking and English speaking Canadians. The leader of our party has stated, and I quote:

> The Canadian confederation will work only if the French-Canadian people do not feel threatened in their development as such.

That is a correct statement. If the bill we are now considering reassures French speaking Canadians, especially those who live outside the Province of Quebec, if it reassures them substantially as to the willingness and eagerness of the people who live side by side with them to understand their aspirations, it will have done a great deal for our country. I was surprised to hear some of those who spoke yesterday on behalf of the Creditiste party suggesting that the bill would have a divisive effect. I am confident it will not.

There is another point which is often overlooked. In this connection I refer to English speaking Canadians who find themselves in what is essentially a minority position. Many of these are of British origin. But for the most part these islands of English speaking people are today largely composed of non-British immigrants representative of the "third force group" as we are sometimes fond of saying. This bill seeks to guarantee the provision of federal services in English to these people to the same extent and on the same terms as to French speaking people outside Quebec.

I express the sincere hope that our colleagues everywhere will remember that confederation will only work if not only French speaking Canadians but English speaking Canadians wherever they live do not feel any kind of threat to their cultural rights and opportunities for development. The leader of our party has always stated that English speaking people should accept and welcome

the French language and culture as a continuing fact in Canada. He stated, and I quote:

> This involves no more than the acceptance of reality and the recognition that the French tradition is a great tradition which has contributed and will contribute much to our national life.

I suggest that nobody can validly take exception to a statement of that kind.

We say no one is taking anything away from anybody else and, indeed, the bill guarantees this. No one is denying the contribution made by other groups in this country. To make this point even more explicit, we on this side made a proposal to alter the bill slightly. An amendment was introduced by a member of our party which would have made it abundantly clear—though it is reasonably clear in the bill as it stands—that no one is attempting to deny the valuable contribution which the ethnic groups have made to Canadian life. Unfortunately, our proposal was not accepted. But we believe the bill will do nothing to take away from these people the privileges, rights and honours to which they are justly entitled.

As I said earlier, the bill is unfortunately much misunderstood throughout the country. With all due respect, I suggest that responsibility for this situation lies at the doorstep of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whose complete failure to engage personally in a dialogue with the Canadian people about this measure is a major factor in permitting the amount of misunderstanding which exists today.

The Prime Minister would like to blame the press. But I think the press has done an excellent job in trying to get across to the Canadian people the principles embodied in this bill. The people of Canada did not necessarily want to hear from the press. So many of the things they see in the press they take with a grain of salt. They wanted to hear these things from the lips of the Prime Minister of Canada. He was the man who carried the responsibility for promoting the principles of the official languages bill. I cannot for the life of me understand why he did not promote the measure to a greater extent. Surely, there is nothing in the bill of which he need be ashamed. As far as the principle is concerned, he can be proud of it. Why he did not go out and properly explain the purpose of the measure to the people of Canada, thus avoiding all the confusion and misunderstanding which now exists in the minds of the people, is beyond my comprehension. We on this side continue to be baffled by the Prime Minister's gross neglect in this respect.

We know he cares about this measure. At least, I feel he does. He was the man who conceived it. Why has he not explained it to the people personally? He could have done much to end the unhappiness felt in some parts of our country where this bill has been misinterpreted and misunderstood. The blame for the present situation lies directly on the doorstep of the Prime Minister of Canada. He could have made a major contribution to Canadian unity during the past few weeks by explaining to the people of this country what this bill is all about. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister chose not to do this. Indeed, it seems to us that at times the Prime Minister prefers to leave to the opposition parties the task of trying to explain this government measure. I suggest that is a very strange situation.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Far too many commentators, both in the press and on the radio, have treated this bill as an ethnic measure, as a racist bill. This bill does not deal with race but with language; let that be very clearly understood. This bill deals with two great linguistic cultures, with a great partnership of two groups of people, each with its hopes and fears, its aspirations, its pride in the other and faith in the future, in terms of two tongues, two languages. I submit the so-called third force is not a third force; its members belong to one of two great, co-equal first forces. We in this country are united by a common language, which is one of the two official languages. No Canadian can be properly classed as a third class citizen or even as a second class citizen in so far as his rights, his privileges and his citizenship are concerned.

If this bill were concerned with the dominance of French-speaking Canadians, or with those who are commonly referred to as WASPS, over other kinds of Canadians, as some who misunderstand the bill would have us believe, then the bill would not receive support from the members of this party. Neither would it be supported by those of Scottish, Irish or Welsh origin or by those of non-Protestant religious faith. The members of this party are proud to rank in exactly the same order of equality as all other Canadians who speak the French or English languages, regardless of place of birth or line of descent.

To summarize this part of my remarks, let me say that we support this bill because we sincerely and firmly believe that it asserts the essential equality of all Canadian citizens regardless of their origin. The bill is based on the essential equality for official purposes of

the two great language communities. The bill recognizes the necessity for providing equal government services at the federal level to all citizens whether they speak English or French. We support the bill because we believe that it can prove to be an instrument to bring about greater unity rather than division.

Having said that, I would not want the house to gain the impression that, because we support certain important principles inherent in the bill we are, therefore, happy about every aspect of it; far from it. We have very serious reservations about the means by which the government proposes to implement these principles. The means used to implement the bill may very well prove to be equally as important to the objects of the bill as are the principles.

We see some very grave and serious dangers arising if this bill is not properly administered. In committee we sought to remedy some of the rather glaring weak spots in the bill in terms of its administrative provisions. It is with some justifiable pride that I say that some of the proposals we made in the committee were accepted. I should like briefly to review for the house the proposals that were made by us in committee and which the government members of the committee as well as the committee as a whole saw fit to accept.

Clause 15 as originally drafted set up the bilingual districts advisory board. An examination of the original clause 15 revealed that the advisory board was given the power to determine whether or not a certain area should be classified as a bilingual district, and this determination could be made without holding a public hearing. We felt that this function was important enough to warrant a public hearing in the area concerned before that determination was made. We, therefore, submitted a proposal to the committee which the committee accepted. As a result, before determining that a given area shall be classified as a bilingual district, the bilingual districts advisory board must now hold at least one public hearing in that area, at which hearing organizations and individuals are free to make known their views.

Clause 24 of the original bill authorized the commissioner of official languages—and make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker; this man is given great powers—not only to carry out the duties assigned to him under the languages bill, but also, the original bill states, to:

> —carry out such other assignments and engage in such other activities as may be authorized by the Governor in Council.

We conceived that to mean that, if the Governor in Council saw fit he could authorize this commissioner to carry out practically any kind of investigation, even though it may not be related to his duties under the official languages act. Therefore, we asked the committee, and the committee agreed, to include the word "related", in the clause, and now the bill provides that the commissioner can carry out only those assignments that are related to the official languages act which may be authorized by the Governor in Council.

Clause 25 of the original bill gave the commissioner power to interfere in the affairs of parliament. We felt that this was much too broad a power to give the commissioner and so we had the clause amended. As a result of our amendment, his power now extends only to the institutions of the parliament of Canada and not to the parliament of Canada itself.

Clause 26 (5) as originally drafted provided that, if the commissioner thought fit, he could give his reasons for any decision that he made. For example, if a complaint were made against a department of government or an individual, the commissioner would hold a hearing; but under the bill as originally drafted the commissioner was not required to make his decision known to the department of government or individual concerned. We suggested, and I think properly suggested because the committee accepted our suggestion, that the words "if he thinks fit" should be dropped. As a result of our proposal in committee, the commissioner is now required to make known the reasons for his decision. Before that the bill said the commissioner did not have to inform the complainant of the reasons for his decision. Now, the commissioner is required to notify not only the complainant but also the people complained against of the reasons for his decision. We were happy indeed that the minister and the committee went as far as they did in meeting our suggestions in committee. We were glad to see the changes brought in; nevertheless, we still feel that other changes to the bill could have been made to improve it. We tried to introduce those changes by bringing amendments before this house, but unfortunately they did not carry.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) proposed an important amendment, which was accepted, to the effect that section 107 of the Criminal Code shall not apply to the official languages act. We do not think the government has gone far enough in protecting

those civil servants who are not bilingual and who, because of their age, have little prospect of becoming bilingual. We should have liked to see those civil servants more adequately protected. Those who are getting along in years especially need protecting in this regard. I think we all realize that as we grow older we find it increasingly difficult to acquire a working knowledge of any tongue other than our mother tongue. We hoped to see civil servants falling into this category being given a little more protection.

We are not at all happy about the administrative process under which bilingual districts are to be established. We were particularly dissatisfied and unhappy with the government's obvious reluctance to have the people of the affected districts participate in meaningful discussion. When we put our proposals in this area to the government in committee, the government went along with what we said.

We are particularly unhappy with that part of the bill which provides that once a bilingual district has been set up it will remain a bilingual district even though its population changes. That is firmly spelled out in the bill. Once a bilingual district, always a bilingual district—that is what the bill says. In these days people move about quickly and easily from one area to another. We can easily conceive of a situation in which, over a 15 year period, the 10 per cent of the people speaking French in a bilingual area may, because of their mobility and changing circumstances, move away from the area and leave behind, say, 1 per cent of the total population of the area which can speak French. In other words, only 1 per cent of those in the bilingual district will speak French—and the argument is equally applicable to English speaking people in a French area—but the bilingual district will still remain a bilingual district. The government will still have to supply bilingual services in the area for the entire population, even though 1 per cent of the population speaks one of the official languages and 99 per cent speaks the other. We feel that is not right.

This matter was mentioned in committee. We feel that it entails a waste of the taxpayers' money. We do not object to money being spent on bilingual services where they are required and where they will be used. If however, as a result of changing population patterns there is no longer any reason for those services to be provided, then the continued provision of those services entails a waste of the taxpayers' money. If the government had accepted our amendment it would not, surely, have detracted one iota from the principle of the bill. We suggested that once the percentage of those speaking French or English in a bilingual area fell below a certain level, there ought to be no further obligation on the government to provide bilingual services which are expensive and which, under those circumstances, entail a great waste of the taxpayers' money.

The bill provides for the appointment of a linguistic ombudsman. This point has been thoroughly debated in committee and in this house and I will not belabour it. It is sufficient for me to say that precisely the sort of man he is to be has not been spelled out. We are sincerely of the opinion that even now the bill gives this languages commissioner excessive powers. We think it would have been much better if the bill had confined his powers to those which are given to a commissioner under the Inquiries Act. We made that suggestion in committee and in this house but again, and I say this with all due respect, we were unfortunate in that the government did not go along with our proposal.

I must be frank, Mr. Speaker, and say that I was far from satisfied with the explanation the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) gave this morning for refusing to accept the amendment which would have had the effect of referring the report of the commissioner to a committee of this house. With all sincerity, we say that that provision ought to have been written into the bill. As the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and the leader of the N.D.P. pointed out this morning, once the report has been tabled there is no effective way for us, so to speak, to get it off the table. It is all very well for the Minister of Justice to say that I or other hon. members on this side of the house may introduce motions saying that this report shall be referred to a committee. What the minister said looks great on paper. We must look at this question realistically and not forget that no matter what government is in power—and another government will be in power in four years time—if the members of the government do not want that report to go to committee, it will not go. The government, having the majority of the votes in the house at its command, can always vote against such motion, and the report will not go to committee. So I say that even though I and others in the opposition may want to see the report, we have no effective way of obtaining it.

I cannot stress this point too strongly, Mr. Speaker. Members of the opposition have no effective power to obtain the report of the advisory board or the commissioner. They cannot force that report to be referred to a committee of this house, and that is not right. This report ought to be subject to the scrutiny of the appropriate standing committee of this house. That was the gist of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York South. If accepted, his amendment would have guaranteed that the report would be referred to the appropriate standing committee of this house. The Minister of Justice was asked to give an assurance that he would not object, on behalf of the government, to the referral of such report to a committee. I know he cannot give that assurance today and I appreciate his position; but I cannot understand why he did not accept that amendment. I have confidence enough to think that, despite his powers, the commissioner will effectively and efficiently carry out his duties. All the same his report should be subject to the scrutiny of the representatives of the people of Canada, because it is the people of Canada with whom the commissioner is dealing. If he is not scrupulously careful about doing his duty in an efficient manner, there is all the more reason for sending his report to a committee of this house rather than leaving it to the discretion of the government. I do not care which Party forms the government, it should not be left in their discretion to decide whether or not this man's report should be submitted to a committee of this house.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I realize I have probably taken up more time than I should, and the house has been very lenient toward me. These are some of the objections we have to the bill. These are some of the things which we in our party, and members of other opposition parties, earnestly tried to correct in committee. Unfortunately, the government did not see fit to go along with them. We want to see this bill work. We can only hope and pray that the bill will be properly administered once it becomes law. If it is, I do not think there is any question but that it will promote the unity in this country to which we as Canadian citizens look forward.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, the aims and principles of this bill have received overwhelming support from hon. members in all parties at every stage at which the bill has been discussed. If I remember correctly, in the vote on second reading every Liberal member, every member of New Democratic Party, every Creditiste member and a very substantial majority of the members of the official opposition voted in support of the bill.

We must realize that in this country there is a good deal of doubt, hard feeling and objection to this bill. I believe to a large extent these doubts and objections are based on misconceptions. They are based on objections by people who have not even read the bill. I do not think anyone questions the fact that there is a good deal of doubt about this bill. One needs only remind hon. members that the former premier of Alberta indicated he would, in all probability, challenge the legality of this bill in the Supreme Court. The present Liberal Premier of Saskatchewan indicated he may challenge the validity of this bill, and the Conservative Premier of Manitoba made it clear that he not only opposed this bill, but that he would in all likelihood take this bill to the Supreme Court of Canada.

An hon. Member: The former premier.

Mr. Orlikow: The premier until next week. I will come to that in a few moments. The deputy leader of our party, the former member for Selkirk who will be the Premier of Manitoba next week, to whose speech I will refer in a few moments, and I myself gave unreserved support to the basic principles of this bill. We realize it is necessary if this country is to survive as one country. We English speaking people, and I say that as a person who is not of Anglo-Saxon origin but a member of the third force, as it has been called so often inside and outside this house, have been portrayed as people who oppose this bill. This measure supposedly makes us second or third class citizens. I will come back to that in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. We support this bill because we realize unless the French speaking people of Canada, and particularly the French speaking people of Quebec, are made to feel they are equal partners in Confederation the urge to separate will grow rather than diminish.

I say to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who has had the task of piloting this bill through the house, that the government has not helped those of us who voted for the bill in spite of the fact we knew many of our constituents were confused about it. The government has not helped in getting the message in relation to this measure across to the

people. I join with the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) in saying that it was a dereliction on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). During the last election the Prime Minister campaigned from one end of Canada to the other for a united Canada. He explained to the people in the key centres of our country that this legislation was necessary to maintain one Canada.

The Minister of Justice went across the country. He did not talk to the ordinary citizens. He made the mistake, I think the Manitoba election proved it was a mistake, of talking to the premiers as though the premiers necessarily represented the people. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) also went across the country. He does not turn me off as he seems to turn off so many members of this house. I did not object to the things he said inside or outside of the house. However, I want to say the representations I received have indicated he is not a very good salesman for this bill, whatever his other problems may be.

I am amazed at the total lack of participation in explaining this bill not just by the Prime Minister, but by virtually every English speaking cabinet minister of this government. If the minister from Manitoba, the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) or the ministers from British Columbia spoke on this bill in their own provinces, I certainly did not see any reports to that effect. It is not surprising the people are still confused.

When I spoke on second reading of this bill in May, I said that many of the people in my constituency, particularly the people of non-English or non-French speaking origin, the Ukraines, Poles, Czechs and the Jewish people I represent in such large numbers, had doubts about it. They wondered whether this bill would make them into second or third class citizens. I had no hesitation in voting in support of this measure but I suggest to the Secretary of State, as did the former member for Selkirk when he spoke on October 17, 1968, that the federal government ought not to merely pass this kind of legislation, but ought to promote the cultures and languages of the other ethnic groups of this country, the Germans, Czechs, Poles, Ukrainians and other groups. This is what the Prime Minister suggested in a press interview at the time he was Minister of Justice.

One of the first announcements the former hon. member for Selkirk made was that his government in Manitoba will set up a task force to study what a provincial government ought to do about this language problem. Had this kind of thing been done, we would not have the tremendous doubts which still exist. Five members of parliament from Manitoba voted against this bill at the second reading stage. I do not question their right to do this or their motives. I think they did so because they believed substantial numbers of the people they represent oppose this bill. One of the important lessons the people of Canada can learn from the election held in Manitoba last week is that while the people of Manitoba are concerned about this bill, they are not opposed to it.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The facts are very clear. The Toronto *Globe and Mail* of Friday, June 27, 1969 in an editorial dealing with the Manitoba election said this:

> It is an illuminating sidelight on the man that of the three leaders in the campaign, he alone publicly supported the federal Official Languages Act—

They are speaking of course of Mr. Schreyer.

> —which is not popular in Manitoba. He had voted for it in Parliament and he was honest enough to stand by his convictions. The Liberals, whose brothers in Ottawa had introduced the bill, and Mr. Weir, who attacked it, appear to have alienated the public by pandering to its prejudices.

I shall not say that our party won the election because Mr. Schreyer stood firm in his conviction that this bill must pass parliament, but I do say that opposition to this bill was used extensively, not just by Mr. Weir but by candidates all across the province, particularly in those areas in which it was felt there was opposition to the bill.

I should like to place on the record part of a pamphlet which was circulated by the Conservative candidate in one of the provincial constituencies which is contained in my federal constituency. The candidate, Mr. Swysten, was a candidate in the constituency of Burrows in which the people are probably 80 per cent Slavic in their ethnic origin. This pamphlet reads:

> I'm completely against the official languages act which will ultimately make French compulsory for everybody. The official languages act is unconstitutional and discriminates against and disregards the rights of all ethnic groups other than English and French such as Ukrainian, Polish, German, Jewish, Czech, Slovak, Baltic groups, etc. No one language is superior to another.
>
> Right hon. John Diefenbaker stated just three weeks ago about the language bill, "There is a

recognition that one third of our Canadian people from other than English and French origins are to be placed in a lower category".

The Liberals are pushing the official languages act and the N.D.P. blindly supports it.

I am for minority rights. I am for teaching your language of descent in the public schools from Grade 1 and your second language, not compulsory French, on an optional basis where economically feasible and practicable.

The hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) and the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Stanfield), in their speeches at various stages of this bill, denied everything that is written in that pamphlet; but this was the kind of—

An hon. Member: Garbage.

Mr. Orlikow: "Garbage" one of my colleagues says—the kind of propaganda that was disseminated in the province of Manitoba from one end to the other. It was completely unsuccessful in my constituency which has a large ethnic population. Not only were all our candidates elected, but the percentage of the total vote they received ranged from a low of 60 per cent to a high of 70 per cent. The same was true in the provincial constituencies contained in the federal constituencies of St. Boniface, Selkirk, Provencher, Winnipeg South, Winnipeg South Centre and Winnipeg North Centre. We carried or came close to carrying the constituencies of Dauphin and Churchill.

Mr. Stanbury: What bill are we discussing?

Mr. Orlikow: I am trying to tell the parliamentary secretary that there is no need to worry. The people of the country are not so angry they will vote against any party which supports Canadian unity.

I have no hesitation in supporting this bill at this stage. I do not think it is a perfect bill. Members of our party and of the official opposition have moved amendments which I think would have improved the bill. I am a little concerned about the commissioner and his authority, as well as the manner in which he is to report. The one thing which would harm our country or create dissension would be a feeling on the part of any group that the people in that group were not being treated as first class citizens. I said before, and say again, that I did not think there was anything in this bill that did that. However, as members of parliament and as Canadian citizens, it is our duty to guarantee to the people of Canada that their rights are not being infringed by this bill.

I would hope that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and other members of the government who drafted this bill, who sponsored it and who piloted it through parliament, would assume responsibility for explaining to the people of Canada, as the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State have done, that not every person in Canada must become bilingual and that not every civil servant must be bilingual. They should explain that every person of English origin or French origin has a right to conduct business with the government in his own language, but that not every civil servant must be able to speak French. As the Secretary of State said, the head of the income tax office in Toronto, Winnipeg or Vancouver does not have to be able to speak French. I say this fact has not yet been explained to the people of Canada.

We, as individual members, have spoken in support of this bill both in the house and outside the house. We have tried to explain to the people precisely what this measure means, but after all we are members of the opposition and the people would not expect us, nor could the government expect us to be treated as representatives of the government. I say to the Prime Minister that he has a responsibility to travel across the country talking about his concept of one Canada and explaining how this bill, as well as similar legislation in the future, help the one-Canada concept. I hope that he would do this in the same eloquent and convincing manner he did it in June of 1968.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to those of the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), by way of thanks to the hon. member for York-Sincoe (Mr. Roberts), who served as chairman of the special committee on the official languages bill, and the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin), who served as vice-chairman.

Let me say, as one who was concerned with the details of this bill and its passage, how much I admired the work of all the members of that committee from all parties. They did their very best to bring to this house a bill which was worthy of parliamentary approval. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) deserves mention as the chief spokesman for his party on that committee, particularly because of his very constructive contribution to its work.

I was gratified today to hear the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) say he unreservedly supports the principle of this bill, and that there is nothing in the bill of which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) need be ashamed. I regret that is not the attitude of all the members of his party, but I am convinced that this is truly his attitude and his party should be proud of the manner in which he conducted himself as its spokesman.

The only exception I take to his remarks, and those of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) is regarding the alleged lack of effort on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government to explain this bill. I cannot imagine any parliamentary proposal which has received so much discussion in the country as has this bill. During the election and since, I suppose there is not one minister of this government who has not spoken about this bill and in all parts of the country. As a parliamentary secretary I have had the opportunity of speaking about it in at least three provinces.

I must say, like the hon. member for Winnipeg North, I did not find in Winnipeg the same antagonism toward this bill as that reflected in the remarks of some hon. members of the opposition from that province who have spoken during this debate. I did not find that kind of response or antagonism when I spoke about this bill in Vancouver. I did not find that kind of antagonistic response when I spoke at a meeting of Ukrainian Canadians in Winnipeg, a national convention of Canadian Ukrainians.

Contrary to what has been said, allegedly on behalf of certain ethnic groups, it might be of interest to know that Ukrainian-Canadian university groups across Canada officially approve of the official languages bill. I think this is an indication of the attitude of young Canadians of all ethnic origins.

Mr. Baldwin: Will the hon. member permit a question on this particular issue? I am glad he referred to Ukrainian university students. Is the hon. member aware of the fact that a telegram was sent to me as the sponsor of a resolution to substitute a new clause 38 approving the position I took? I am not in any way trying to deprecate what the hon. member said, I am wondering whether he is aware of this fact.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps I might ask a question of the hon. member. Is he aware—

[Mr. Stanbury.]

Mr. Aiken: Hold on; what's going on?

Mr. Stanbury: I should be glad to entertain a question from the Hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I should like to know whether the hon. member is aware of the opinion of the committee of this house to the effect that if we proceeded with clause 38 we would do more in this particular situation than we might have done by accepting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps hon. members will realize that there has already been a disposition of that matter and the discussion now is in respect of the motion now before the house.

Mr. Stanbury: I can say that I am aware of the matter to which the Minister of Justice has referred. The fact is that university students of Ukrainian extraction have recognized, as I presume the house leader of the official opposition has recognized, the intrinsic value of this bill. We may each have different opinions about how best to protect the rights of Canadians whose first language is other than English or French, but the principle of the bill has been clearly approved by these young Canadians. This illustrates the attitude taken generally by young Canadians toward this bill which, I am pleased to say, has been unreservedly approved today by the official spokesman of the official opposition.

Many members who have spoken during this debate have expressed approval of this measure in principle, but some in their remarks have tended to encourage rather than allay the fears they claim exists among Canadian citizens. Let me say to the hon. member for Winnipeg North and the hon. member for Cardigan that there is a responsibility on members of opposition parties. The hon. member for York South has carried out that responsibility most admirably. There is a responsibility on the part of members who belong to parties other than the party on this side to explain this measure to the people of Canada.

This has been a government bill up to this point because the government has the responsibility of putting it forward. When this bill is passed, as I presume it will be, with almost unanimous approval in this house, it will become an act of the parliament of Canada. Under this act the commissioner will be

appointed by the parliament of Canada, not by the government. He will report to the parliament of Canada and not to the government.

When the purposes of this bill have been approved by nearly all of us in this house, and when this measure is passed, I hope that all of us here will accept responsibility as members of parliament to explain this historic piece of legislation to make sure it contributes as most of us believe it will to the greater unity of Canada and greater opportunity for all its citizens.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few minutes to express some of my feelings on this subject. I feel very strongly about this bill, not because it will make it possible to speak both English and French within the civil service, but because, as a member who belongs to neither the English or French ethnic group, I have a responsibility to the people back in my constituency. This is the first opportunity I have had to discharge that responsibility during my 11 years in this house and to thank my people for sending me here. There are those who may scoff at this suggestion. However, the experience in my lifetime, short as it may have been until now, is of some very humiliating and trying episodes brought on by people who subjected not only myself but people of my kind to a great deal of ridicule and humiliation.

(3:50 p.m.)

Hon. members must understand that I represent a constituency that is perhaps different from theirs, and I may have to speak a little differently from those who have already spoken in the debate. I have to express an opinion that is not necessarily that which a lot of other people would like to hear. I say this because this is the first opportunity I have had to thank those people who sent me here and to express their views.

There are many things I would like to deal with, such as, for example, the constitutionality of this bill. I do not think the government appreciates the constitution at all. I think those people who have come to this country from countries whose constitutions have been overridden would appreciate someone saying to the government that a constitution either means something or it does not. It is evident that this government has about as much respect for the constitution as a tom cat has for morals. I could say a great deal more on that subject, but I shall go on to my next point.

I know what the position of the government is with regard to the bill; I can read the signs. It is quite apparent from the votes that have already been taken. I know that I should not discuss votes that have been taken, Mr. Speaker, but it is obvious that the government does not want to improve the bill. I do not claim to speak on behalf of other ethnic groups; I can speak only for myself. I tell the house and the country that I am able to think just as members on the other side of the house are able to do. They cannot take this away from me.

This will be a very expensive exercise, and we have gone about it the wrong way if we believe the civil service should be bilingual. I have not too much quarrel with that, but let us bring bilingualism to the people out in the country; let us give them the opportunity to learn the other language. Let us start the program where it should be started, in the little, red school house. I would like the program to be started at this level, rather than flouting the constitution and telling us that it does not mean a damn. We are told that the constitution has been changed once, twice or three times and it may have to be changed again because of this and other bills. I think this is a wrong way of going about it. If we have the money with which to carry out this expensive exercise, let us start it where it should be started. I took five years of French. To what avail? The type of French that was available to me was a waste of time. I might as well have studied the stars, because I would at least have got something out of that. I might as well have studied heavenly bodies, anyway.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Korchinski: We have gone about this in the wrong way. The Acting Minister of Mines and Resources wrote an article in my local paper suggesting, lo and behold, that the bill does not require federal civil servants to learn the French language, but in areas where a significant number of people have French as their mother tongue those people will be able to obtain federal services and information in that language. He suggested that perhaps secretaries should have this bilingual ability. Perhaps he has a secretary who satisfies his requirements, but not everybody is entitled to a secretary, especially a bilingual one. Undertaking this program will

involve a huge amount of money. I shall not read what the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) said, because I have only a few minutes and I wish to deal with other points. In my constituency about 41,000 people speak English—these figures are based on the old constituency—and only 100 speak French. Can anyone imagine me supporting this measure and thereby making it impossible for 97½ per cent of my people to get a job in the civil service or obtain promotion? I ask, should I take that position? I do not think that is fair.

Other ethnic groups have been mentioned in the debate. I want to cover a lot of territory in a short time. The ethnic composition of the people in my area is as follows: Those from the British Isles, which include English, Welsh, Scots and Irish, 12,000; French, 2,100; German, 3,500; Italian, 94; Jewish, 25; Netherlands, 765; Polish, 3,000; Russian, 1,306; Scandinavian, 4,100; Ukrainian, 10,248; other European, 2,500; Asiatic, 82; native Indian and Eskimo, 4,100. We are overlooking that aspect of the matter. Now, with the proposed changes to the rules—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being four o'clock, the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills. public bills, notices of motions.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I believe there would be general agreement in the house that we proceed with items Nos. 1 and 2 on the list of private bills, that is, Bill S-32 and Bill S-39, and once those two bills have been disposed of the house would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE CANADA NORTH-WEST LAND COMPANY (LIMITED)

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's) moved that on Bill S-32, respecting The Canada North-west Land Company (Limited), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Wahn moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

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

• (4:00 p.m.)

BOY SCOUTS OF CANADA

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface) moved that Bill S-39, respecting Boy Scouts of Canada and to incorporate L'Association des Scouts du Canada, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

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

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the house that the house adjourn at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: By unanimous agreement this house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. Monday.

At 4.04 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 7, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

UPPER GREAT LAKES COAST GUARD BASE

Question No. 1,637—**Mr. Foster:**

1. What plans are there for the construction of a Coast Guard base for the Upper Great Lakes Region of Lake Huron and Lake Superior?

2. What is the location of the planned base?

3. In what year will construction be started and when will it be completed?

4. What is the anticipated cost of the base?

5. How many ships and how many men will be located at the base?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1, 2, 3 and 4. Consideration has been given to the replacement of the badly deteriorated Coast Guard base at Port Arthur, Ontario.

Plans have been prepared for the construction of the base this year, provision having been made in the estimates amounting to $600,000.

Consideration has also been given to the provision of a small facility at Sault Ste. Marie on presently owned federal property. Plans have not been prepared, and neither time phasing nor magnitude have yet been established.

5. Not finally decided but unlikely to change appreciably from present, i.e., one ship and approximately seven men.

INDUSTRIAL-SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH TASK FORCE

Question No. 1,723—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Who are the members of the Task Force reviewing government programs for Industrial-Scientific research and development?

2. What are the terms of reference for the above Task Force and when is their report expected to be completed?

3. Will the above report be tabled in the House?

29180—687½

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1 and 2. The task force referred to is an interdepartmental study group. It is not the practice to name public servants doing such work or to make available information concerning such projects.

3. The report of the study group was not drafted with a view to publication.

YARMOUTH, N.S.—PROVISION OF TERMINAL FACILITIES

Question No. 1,861—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Public Works received a request from the Government of Nova Scotia for the provision of terminal facilities at Yarmouth for an end-loading ferry to operate between that port and a port in the U.S.A. and, if so, when was this request received?

2. What are the specifications of the ship for which the facilities would be provided?

3. Has the ship been acquired and, if not, on what basis have specifications been sought?

4. If the Government of Canada builds new terminal facilities at Yarmouth, will the *Bluenose* be withdrawn from the Yarmouth-Bar Harbour run?

5. Has the C.N.R. been making payments to the Government of Canada for the use of the terminal at Yarmouth?

6. When will the new terminals for the new C.P.R. service between Digby and Saint John be completed?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport and the Department of Public Works as follows:
1. Yes. An informal approach was made by the Government of Nova Scotia in October 1967 and since then correspondence has been exchanged on the terminal arrangements.

2 and 3. Specifications for the ship and the service are the concern of the Province and the operator. The Canadian Transport Commission is advised that the operator has under construction a ship of 350′ length, 55′ beam and 14′ draft.

4. No.

5. C.N.R. in its role as operating agent for the Government of Canada makes no payment for use of the terminal.

6. Anticipated completion date December 31, 1970.

Questions

RADIO AND TELEVISION POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

Question No. 1,901—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. How many members for each political party have been interviewed on C.B.C. radio (a) Public Affairs programs (b) National News programs for the following months: October 1968, November 1968, December 1968, January 1969, February 1969 and March 1969?

2. How many members for each political party have been interviewed on C.B.C. television (a) Public Affairs programs (b) National News programs for the following months: October 1968, November 1968, December 1968, January 1969, February 1969 and March 1969?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows:

1 (a):

English Network

	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
Liberal	1	2	3	1	7	4
P.C.	1	1	2	–	3	1
N.D.P.	1	1	1	–	1	1

French Network

	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
Liberal	1	2	2	10	4	7
P.C.	–	1	1	–	1	–
N.D.P.	–	1	–	–	1	–
R.Cr.	1	1	–	–	–	1

1(b): No continuing record of individual news interviews is maintained. An attempt was made to determine the total number of news interviews with Members of Parliament, but it was not possible to arrive at accurate figures for the period in question due to the large number of newscasts involved and the fact that many of the scripts or tapes are no longer available.

2 (a):

English Network

	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
Liberal	2	3	4	5	2	2
P.C.	2	1	1	–	3	–
N.D.P.	1	2	2	–	2	–

French Network

	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.
Liberal	3	3	3	1	3	6
P.C.	–	1	–	–	1	–
N.D.P.	–	1	–	–	–	1
R.Cr.	2	1	–	–	–	1

2 (b): See 1 (b).

DESIGNATED PORTS IN P.E.I. EXPANSION

Question No. 2,062—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What are the twenty ports designated for inclusion in the federal provincial agreement for the economic expansion and social adjustment of Prince Edward Island?

[Mr. Forest.]

2. How will the maintenance, repair and expansion service provided these ports in the next fifteen years differ from that provided other ports in Prince Edward Island?

3. What services will the Government of Canada provide the remaining fifty ports in Prince Edward Island?

4. What services normally provided seaports and fishing centres by the Department of Public Works of Canada will no longer be provided these ports?

5. What are the projected plans for the ports of Prince Edward Island other than those listed in part (1) above?

6. Will the operation of the federal-provincial agreement referred to above result in an overall increase or decrease in expenditure in Prince Edward Island under the Department of Public Works of Canada?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Department of Public Works as follows: 1. The locations are to be determined as the agreement is implemented.

2, 3 and 4. The level and quantity of services which the Department of Public Works provides in the field of maintenance, repair and expansion will continue on the same basis as in the past i.e. each individual project must be justified economically and funds must be provided for it by Parliament.

5. Plans will be developed to meet the level and type of needs that materialize.

6. The effect of the agreement on future expenditures of the Department is unknown at this time.

GRANTS FOR CONSUMER PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,200—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What organizations receive grants from the federal government for consumer programs?

2. How much money, if any, is each organization receiving for the fiscal year 1969-70, and for each fiscal year since 1960?

3. On what basis are these grants made?

4. Are these organizations required to file a report on the disposition of such grants?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Finance as follows: 1. Consumers Association of Canada.

2. Fiscal year 1960-61, $10,000; 1961-62, $10,000; 1962-63, $10,000; 1963-64, $10,000; 1964-65, $30,000; 1965-66, $30,000; 1966-67, $30,000; 1967-68, $30,000; 1968-69, $30,000; 1969-70, $50,000.

3. These grants are made on the basis that this association is a non-profit organization whose objectives are to protect the interest of the consumers.

4. No.

FEDERAL REVENUE FROM PROVINCES

Question No. 2,204—**Mr. Nielsen:**

1. What amount of revenue did the federal Treasury acquire in the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968 from taxation and other revenue sources from each of the ten provinces?

2. What amount of monies did the federal government expend in the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968 towards the development of each of the ten provinces?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1 and 2. Information is not now available to provide an accurate answer to this question and the necessary expert staff is not available to undertake the large amount of work which would be required to gather the necessary information.

ASSISTANCE TO PROVINCES FOR LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Question No. 2,251—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What provinces have submitted requests for financial assistance towards the establishment or improvement of French or English language instruction in their educational system?

2. What is the amount of these requests?

3. What steps has the federal government taken to comply with these requests?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. The Government has received enquiries about assistance from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

2. The Federal Government has agreed to pay fifty per cent of the costs of preliminary studies undertaken by the provinces in this field. Agreement has been reached to pay one half of the cost of a study of this nature, totalling $60,000, which is being conducted by the Government of New Brunswick. A request for co-operation in a pilot project has been received from the Nova Scotia government but the extent of Federal assistance has yet to be determined. No figures were mentioned in the enquiries about Government policy received from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

3. It is anticipated that discussions will be held in the near future with most of the provinces concerned.

LEGISLATION PERMITTING FEDERAL GRANTS FOR LANGUAGE TRAINING

Question No. 2,281—**Mr. Rose:**

1. Under what legislation or agreement does the federal government make grants to the provinces for adult education in the English and French languages for new Canadians?

Questions

2. What is the formula upon which these grants are based?

3. Were the language courses extended to the Czechoslovakian refugees after August 23, 1968 made under the legislation queried in part (1)?

4. If not, under what authority did the Czechoslovakian refugee language training courses emanate?

5. What portion of the Czechoslovakian refugee language program was financed by the federal government?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1 (a) Citizenship and Language Instruction Agreement of 1954; (b) Language Textbooks Agreement of 1963.

2. (a) The Government of Canada makes to Provincial Governments who are signatories of this Agreement, grants equivalent to one half of whatever the latter have spent or contributed towards the teaching costs whether these costs have been borne directly by the Provincial Governments or indirectly through grants to local school boards; (b) The Government of Canada reimburses Provincial Governments, signatories of this Agreement, for the total expenditures in any year of this Agreement on language textbooks for use by adult immigrants in programs of language instruction. The amounts of money payable each year do not exceed the average calculated on the five preceding fiscal years of the annual amounts disbursed by the Government of Canada prior to this Agreement or by the Provincial Governments subsequent to this Agreement.

3. No. However, some individual refugees have taken advantage of courses supported by the Government of Canada under the two Agreements.

4. Czechoslovakian refugees were provided with language training within the authority for expenditures from a special fund set up by the Canadian Government to meet the special and urgent needs of the Czechoslovakian refugees admitted to Canada under the Special Refugee Immigration Program.

5. All of the language programs for Czechoslovakian refugees were financed by the federal government except some special language courses provided by a few universities which are in addition to the language courses provided by the federal government to Czechoslovakian refugee students.

[Mr. Rose.]

FORESTRY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,324—**Mr. Robinson:**

1 Does the Department of Forestry and Rural Development provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. An information service was provided by the Department of Forestry and Rural Development, while it existed from October 1, 1966, to March 31, 1969.

2 and 3. Such statistics are not maintained.

MONTREAL—CLOSING OF CANADIAN VICKERS PLANT

Question No. 2,355—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. Is it the intention of Canadian Vickers Company to close down its shipyard in Montreal?

2. If so (a) for what reason (b) does the government intend to provide assistance?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. Yes.

2. (a) Its continued operation has proved unprofitable; (b) The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has provided, over the past ten years, assistance totalling approximately $13.4 million in subsidies for marine vessels and $1.1 million in grants and loans for defence industry modernization (Industrial Division).

The Department of Manpower and Immigration is making available to those workers affected all its services including placement in other employment, training or retraining, counselling and relocation assistance when needed. In addition the Manpower Consultative Service has been able to persuade the Company and the Union to enter into a Manpower Assessment Incentive Agreement by which the problems facing those still to be laid off can be thoroughly researched. Training on-the-job or outside the plant will be arranged for those who are able

and willing to transfer to the industrial sector of the Company's operations.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING DON MESSER'S JUBILEE

Question No. 2,385—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many letters (exclusive of petitions and form letters) regarding the Don Messer show cancellation have not been answered by the C.B.C. as of May 27?

2. When does the C.B.C. expect to answer such?

3. Is it policy for the C.B.C. to give some kind of acknowledgement to each signed submission made to it and, if not, for what reason?

4. How many individuals have expressed their (a) approval (b) disapproval, of the CBC's Messer decision by letter, telephone calls, petition, other written communication?

5. As to the figures answering part 4, how many (a) approve (b) disapprove, of the C.B.C.'s Messer decision by provinces or territories?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1 and 2. As of May 27, some 65 letters to various C.B.C. offices regarding the Don Messer cancellation were awaiting reply, and were expected to be answered within a few days.

3. The C.B.C. makes every effort to acknowledge all signed submissions made to it, with some exceptions such as letters lacking a return address, form letters received in bulk, abusive and crank mail, and letters already acknowledged by other bodies or individuals and forwarded to the C.B.C. for information only.

4. As of May 27, letters and petitions written directly to the C.B.C. protesting the Don Messer cancellation totalled approximately 8,130. Letters and petitions approving the cancellation totalled approximately 80.

Telephone calls totalled approximately 1,475 protesting the cancellation and 50 approving it.

The C.B.C. has also received some 13,000 pieces of mail forwarded from other sources, including the C.R.T.C., Members of Parliament, newspapers and private stations. About two-thirds of this mail was in the form of commercially sponsored protest coupons appearing in newspapers.

Because of the multiplicity of the comments, it has not been possible to tabulate accurately the number of individual viewers involved, or the extent of duplication in the protests.

5. Provincial representation has not been tabulated in detail, but a sampling of the mail indicates that all provinces are represented.

LEBRETON FLATS DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,387—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Has the N.C.C. acquired all the land it needs to carry out the Lebreton Flats Development?

2. Is the N.C.C. engaged in negotiations with the O'Keefe Brewing Company for any of its land remaining in the Flats area?

3. Has the O'Keefe Brewing Company made the Commission an offer of any of its land in the Flats?

4. What are the amounts of settlement, area of land, and general description of properties acquired from O'Keefes in the Flats to date?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

4. In November 1964 the National Capital Commission settled an expropriation with O'Keefe Brewing Company in the amount of $393,862. The area of land involved was 27,475 feet and comprised lands lying west of Broad Street, north of Wellington and east of the northerly production of the westerly limit of Preston Street.

INCOME FROM INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Question No. 2,388—**Mr. Robinson:**

What direct and/or indirect income, if any, does the federal government receive from research in industry?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Government has no information either as to the amount of additional income earned by industrial concerns attributable to research or as to the additional taxes paid to the Federal Government resulting therefrom, if any.

"FINANCIAL TIMES" CAREERS ADVERTISEMENT

Question No. 2,397—**Mr. Monteith:**

1. What was the cost of the advertisement, concerning Executive Careers, placed in the *Financial Times* issue of May 12, 1969, which took up all of page 16 of that publication?

2. Were similar advertisements placed in other magazines or periodicals?

3. If so, what magazines or periodicals and at what cost?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. The cost was $1,050.

2. Yes. Similar advertisements were placed in other media to ensure that as many qualified candidates as possible were given an opportunity to express an interest in these important appointments.

3. The cost for the advertisements in the other publications were: The magazine *Executive,* $480.00; the weekly *Financial Post,* $1,199.52; the weekly *Les Affaires,* $600.00.

WATSON LAKE, YUKON, ASPHALT ROAD

Question No. 2,424—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. Does the government intend to build an asphalt road to Watson Lake, Yukon Territory, in the near future?

2. If so (a) when will the work begin (b) when will it be completed?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

KAMOURASKA, QUE, POST OFFICE CLOSURES

Question No. 2,444—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. (a) Which Post Offices does the Post Office Department intend to close in the constituency of Kamouraska during 1969 (b) what savings does the Department foresee as a result of each of these closures (c) are the postmasters and postmistresses affected assured of obtaining other employment within the Department?

2. What are the names and business addresses of the newspapers, periodicals, brochures or other publications that meet the conditions laid down in sections 11 and 12 of the Post Office Act, as amended by chapter 5 of the Statutes of Canada, 1968, and in the second-class mail regulations pursuant thereto?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. (a) and (b): Pied-du-Lac, P.Q., $1,700; Plante, P.Q., $1,241; St-Pacôme-Station, P.Q., $900; Village-des-Aulnaies, P.Q., $2,700. (c) No alternative employment is offered by the Government but those postmasters under superannuation would receive benefits in accordance with the Public Service Superannuation Act.

2. A list of those publications meeting the conditions laid down in Sections 11 and 12 of the Post Office Act as amended by Chapter 5 of the Statutes of Canada, 1968, and the regulations made pursuant thereto, has been tabled, on the 18 June 1969, in reply to Inquiry No. 2141.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Records are not maintained, at this time, in such a way as to permit the listing of business addresses of publications without undue labour and cost.

CRITERIA FOR CANADA COUNCIL AWARDS

Question No. 2,446—**Mr. Stanfield:**

1. Does the Canada Council require only "residence" and not "citizenship" or some similar criterion, as a requirement for scholars receiving awards for post doctoral fellowships, research grants, publications and travel grants and, if so, is there active consideration being given to changing that requirement?

2. Does the Canada Council keep records of the citizenship of the applicants to whom it gives grants and, if not, is consideration being given to keeping a record of the citizenship of successful applicants?

3. In considering applications, is it the policy of the Canada Council to take any notice of the length of time applicants have been in Canada and, if not, is consideration being given to establishing that as one of the informal criteria?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Canada Council fellowships and grants to scholars for study, research and travel are available to persons holding Canadian citizenship, residence or domicile, subject to two exceptions: (a) in rare instances, scholars who meet none of these requirements but are nevertheless established as full-time members of faculty at a Canadian university are considered eligible; and (b) Canadian citizens resident abroad are eligible for grants only if this foreign residence is clearly temporary or if the nature of their research makes it of particular relevance to Canada.

No change in these requirements is contemplated.

2. The records of the Council disclose whether the requirements described in No. 1 have been met, but separate records of the citizenship of applicants are not kept, nor is this being contemplated.

3. Applicants are eligible from the time they meet the requirements described in No. 1 above, the only exception being that, in order to receive a doctoral fellowship for study abroad, a scholar must have been a landed immigrant for at least a year. No change is being considered.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE STUDIES

Question No. 2,449—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What progress is being made in the studies of the possibility of creating a Canadian merchant marine?

2 Will such studies be tabled in the House and, if so, on what date?

3. If not, for what reason?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. A contract for a feasibility study of a Canadian merchant marine has been awarded to a consulting group under the direction of Hedlin, Menzies and Associates Ltd.

2. The report will be made to the Canadian Transport Commission. After it has been studied by the Commission and the Government, consideration will be given to tabling it.

3. N/A.

BALANCE DUE TO CANADIAN NATIONAL (WEST INDIES) STEAMSHIPS

Question No. 2,457—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the United States Government maintain a ban on payment of the balance due to the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamship Ltd. and, if so, for what reasons?

2. Who are the directors of the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamship Ltd.?

3. In what activities is that company at the present engaged?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. The balance payable by the Bank of America to the Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships Limited, being in Cuban funds, has been withheld under the Cuban Assets Control Regulations.

2. H. J. Darling, Canadian Transport Commission; H. R. Balls, Department of Supply and Services; C. L. Read, Department of Finance; G. C. Tilley, Department of Transport.

3. The wind-up of the affairs of this Company has been deferred pending settlement of this payment.

CANADIAN NATIONAL HOTEL LOSSES

Question No. 2,458—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What C.N.R. hotels presently operated by the Railway Company have shown losses in their operations in the last five years?

2. What was the total amount of loss in each case?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:—

1. and 2. The following statement indicates the profit or (loss) after allowing for depreciation from the seven hotels operated by the Canadian National Railways during the years shown.

	1968 $	1967 $	1966 $	1965 $	1964 $
The Bessborough	(186,185)	(198,894)	(165,766)	(91,293)	(82,645)
Chateau Laurier	(219,216)	392,997	1,718	(297,169)	(102,650)
The Fort Garry	290,937	228,447	(27,201)	(153,503)	(154,354)
Jasper Park Lodge	415,313	254,728	393,461	348,780	218,055
The Macdonald	(33,076)	(120,786)	(98,013)	21,557	33,366
Newfoundland	72,293	126,246	113,531	151,956	164,244
The Nova Scotian	134,530	168,868	168,753	120,464	63,902

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,463—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Transport have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What is the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. No.

2. N/A.

COSTS OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY OPERATION

Question No. 2,472—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What was the total cost to operate the St. Lawrence Seaway for each of the years 1960-68 respectively?

2. How much revenue was received in operating the St. Lawrence Seaway in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. What was the cost of operating the Welland Canal during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

4. What was the total revenue received from operations of the Welland Canal during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

29180—688

Questions

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows: 1. The cost of operating the St. Lawrence Seaway including the Welland Canal, for each of the years 1960-68 is as follows:

	$
1960	5,908,943
1961	6,729,848
1962	7,346,573
1963	7,970,325
1964	9,602,856
1965	12,414,128
1966	15,498,125
1967	15,242,135
1968	16,743,334
	97,456,267

2. The revenue received in operating the St. Lawrence Seaway, including the Welland Canal, for each of the years 1960-68 is as follows:

	$
1960	9,360,642
1961	10,447,256
1962	10,691,922
1963	12,045,224
1964	15,050,107
1965	16,848,181
1966	19,396,118
1967	19,384,762
1968	22,051,023
	135,275,235

3. The cost of operating the Welland Canal during each of the years 1960-68 is as follows:

	$
1960	3,788,936
1961	4,577,945
1962	4,415,627
1963	4,851,603
1964	6,316,208
1965	8,900,925
1966	11,112,295
1967	10,275,507
1968	10,972,084
	65,211,130

[Mr. Robinson.]

4. The total revenue received from operations of the Welland Canal during each of the years 1960-68 is as follows:

	$
1960	2,072,794
1961	2,217,208
1962	1,439,726
1963	779,474
1964	941,495
1965	797,677
1966	1,063,104
1967	2,093,949
1968	2,703,323
	14,108,750

Note: Cost does not include interest on loans and provision for replacement of machinery and equipment.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,480—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Transport provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. (April 1 to March 31): 1968-69, $159,008; 1967-68, $136,205; 1966-67, $119,577; 1965-66, $96,665; 1964-65, $82,996; 1961-63, Not available; records retained for five years only.

2. Accurate figures for the Department are not available. Information Services issues: (a) a bi-monthly staff magazine; (b) departmental annual report; (c) press releases. Cost: (1960 to 1964 is not available—records retained for five years only.)

	1965 $	1966 $	1967 $	1968 $
(a)	1,600	1,908	2,169	2,063
(b)	1,800	2,040	2,975	2,927
(c)	9,000	8,300	11,000	10,000

(Cost for (c) includes paper; typing; mimeographing; collating; stapling; addressing and mailing.)

3. (i) (a) 103,200 annually; (b) 700 annually; (c) 1,800 each release. (ii) (a) Departmental staff—active and retired; other Government departments; Radio and Television stations, and daily newspapers, aviation and marine publications; (b) Members of House of Commons and the Senate; Libraries in Canada and abroad; other interested agencies; and Government departments; (c) Includes press; radio; TV; Members of Parliament; Department of Transport officials; Aviation and Marine publications and Associations; airlines, and other interested agencies. (iii) (a) Mail and messenger service; (b) Mail and messenger service; (c) Mail, messenger service and telex.

ANDRÉ DUMAS—MANNER OF APPOINTMENT

Question No. 2,482—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Was André Dumas appointed to a position in the Department of Transport and, if so, was he appointed by the Public Service Commission and did his appointment result from a competition or notice within the provision of the Public Service Act?

2. If the Public Service Commission followed the regular procedure was a competition called and how many applications were received for the position in question and, if not, for what reason?

3. What is the position that Mr. Dumas has been appointed to, what is the annual salary and what are his qualifications?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Mr. Dumas was appointed from competition No. 66-366-185, a continuous staffing competition, one of the regular procedures used by the Commission to make appointments to the Public Service. In a continuous staffing competition, applications are solicited for particular kinds of work rather than for a particular position. The number of applicants in competition 66-366-185 varies from time to time from 800 to 1,200.

3. Mr. Dumas was appointed at the level of Administrative Services 7 in the office of the Deputy Minister of Transport. His salary at the date of appointment was $14,441 per annum and was subsequently adjusted to $16,534 as a result of the salary revision for the Administrative Services Group. His qualifications include: (a) knowledge and experience related to the duties of the position; (b) managerial and administrative skills related to the duties of the position; (c) service as a pilot in the R.C.A.F.; and (d) proficiency in both official languages.

STUDENTS EMPLOYED BY PASSPORT SERVICE

Question No. 2,484—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. How many students are employed for the summer by the Passport Office?

2. How many students have applied for summer jobs in the Passport Office to date, this year?

3. What are the official criteria for hiring students for summer jobs in this office?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. 140 students are presently on the staff of the Passport Office.

2. No record of enquiries regarding summer employment in the Passport Office has been kept. All students who enquired were directed to the Canada Manpower Centre.

3. All students for summer employment in the Passport Office were hired through the Canada Manpower Centre in accordance with selection standards established by the Public Service Commission for the Administrative Support Category.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF AUDITOR GENERAL

Question No. 2,507—**Mr. Fortin:**

Does the government intend to introduce a bill to amend the terms of reference of the Auditor General and, if so, will the Auditor General's recommendations in this regard be taken into consideration?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): In its Third Report to the House of Commons on June 28, 1966, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts expressed its opinion that all of the characteristics, duties and functions of the Office of the Auditor General should be set out in a separate Act of Parliament instead of being a part of the Financial Administration Act, and noted that the Committee had requested the Auditor General to consult his legal advisers and to cooperate with them in drafting such an Act for submission to the Committee and to the Government. In accordance with the Committee's direction, the Auditor General in 1967 submitted a draft of the proposed legislation. This draft, presumably, is still under study by the Committee. Any recommendation by the Committee in this regard will be carefully considered by the Government.

AGREEMENT WITH BERNARD A. ROY, WINDSOR

Question No. 2,513—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. Was an agreement entered into between the Department of Transport or other government departments and Bernard A. Roy, Windsor, Ontario?

Questions

2. When was the agreement signed and for what purpose?

3. What are the terms of the agreement?

4. What is the type of business performed by Elyroy Company Ltd., Windsor, and what agreements has the company with the Department of Transport or other government departments?

5. Who are the directors of the firm Elyroy Company Limited and their position?

6. What income is derived from the present occupation and use of lands by Elyroy Company Limited?

7. What is the present market value of the land being used and what is the present income?

8. What remuneration or consideration does the government receive from Elyroy Company Ltd. for the use of the lands?

9 Who acted as solicitors for Elyroy Company Ltd. in respect of this agreement?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. Two agreements were negotiated between the Department of Transport, one with Mr. Bernard R. Roy and another with his company Elyroy Company Ltd.

2. The purpose of the agreements was to manage airport land thereby relieving Department of the responsibility for weed control. The agreement with Mr. Roy was dated November 3, 1966 and the agreement with the Elyroy company was dated December 28, 1966.

3. The Department paid $1 a year under each agreement and the contractor retained the crops. Types of crops were subject to Department's approval. The agreement with Mr. Roy was for the period October 21, 1964 to December 31, 1970 with provision for renewal at the discretion of the Minister. The agreement with the Elyroy company was for the period commencing September 1, 1965 to August 31, 1972 with provision for renewal at the discretion of the Minister. However, both contracts were surrendered effective June 1, 1969.

4. Elyroy Company Ltd. formed to engage in agricultural operations. To the best of our knowledge company has no agreements with other government departments.

5. Bernard R. Roy is the President and his wife Cecile is the Secretary.

6. (a) Bernard R. Roy, no income reported; (b) Elyroy Company Ltd., 1966 not known; 1967 estimated at $7,500 cropping plus $2,100 building rental; 1968 estimated at $600 cropping plus $2,100 building rental.

7 and 8. For restricted agricultural use this land is valued at $150 to $200 per acre. No income is received for the use of this land at present, but with the termination of the management contracts the Department will call for tenders for the purpose of entering into agricultural leases subject to crop restrictions to control the bird hazard.

9. Bernard R. Roy acted on his own behalf and for the Elyroy Company Ltd.

NATIONAL REVENUE PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,514—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue have a public relations staff and, if so how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. No.

2. N/A.

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGETARY REVENUE PROJECTIONS

Question No. 2,521—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Which government department makes revenue projections for the budget?

2. What are the econometric techniques and the assumptions used in making these projections?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. The Department of Finance.

2. The revenue projections for the budget are produced using economic and demographic forecasts and projections generated through macroeconomic analysis and the use of standard statistical methods which in turn are checked through the Econometric Model of the Department. Revenue forecasting employs regression analysis to establish the correlation existing between pertinent economic or demographic variables and the yields of the various taxes. A description of the techniques used to forecast federal tax revenues appeared in the November-December, 1968, issue of *The Canadian Tax Journal* under the name of C. D. P. Bernier, an officer of the Department of Finance.

NATIONAL REVENUE INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,525—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes

	Supplies and Services $	Salaries $	Total $
1960	56,900	12,500	69,400
1961	57,000	12,500	69,500
1962	48,900	12,500	61,400
1963	25,900	12,500	38,400
1964	21,500	12,500	34,000
1965	216,900	9,000	225,000
1966	517,500	20,000	537,500
1967	515,500	55,000	570,500
1968	525,600	69,000	594,600

2. Number of publications, information sheets and public releases: 1960, 2; 1961, 3; 1962, 2; 1963, 4; 1964, 15; 1965, 3; 1966, 15; 1967, 11; 1968, 11.

Cost of publications:

	Taxation Statistics $	"21 Million a Day" $
1960	8,000	
1961	9,000	
1962	9,500	
1963	10,000	
1964	11,500	
1965	11,500	
1966	12,000	20,900
1967	13,000	
1968	15,000	

3. Distribution of publications: Taxation Statistics, 1,350 copies: Parliamentary Press Gallery; Financial Press; Other Federal Departmental Libraries; Provincial Governments; Canadian and American University Libraries; Foreign Embassies; Head Office and District Office Taxation Officials. "21 Million a Day", 23,000 copies; Members of Parliament and Senators; Foreign Embassies; Universities and Institutional Libraries; Tax Consultants; Banks and Trust Companies; Provincial Governments; High Schools; Taxation Staff.

Distribution is by local carriers and ordinary mail.

PUBLICATION OF "TAMARACK REVIEW"

Question No. 2,526—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. When was the periodical *Tamarack Review* last published?

2. How much has *Tamarack Review* received in grants from Canada Council and what were the dates and amounts of the grants?

3. What was the purpose of the final grant to *Tamarack Review*?

4. What are the criteria used in selecting periodicals to qualify for Canada Council grants?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. The latest issue of *Tamarack Review*, No. 48, appeared in December, 1968, We are informed by the publisher that a double issue, Nos. 49 and 50, which was due to appear in mid-April, was held up by a printers strike in Toronto and will now be issued on or about July 1st, 1969; No. 51, on or about September 1st, 1969, and the other issues at three-month intervals.

2. The *Tamarack Review* has received Canada Council grants for publication, as follows: April, 1959—$3,000; August, 1960—$3,000; May, 1962—$5,000; August, 1963—$5,000; August, 1964—$5,000; November, 1965—$6,000; November, 1966—$6,000; December, 1967—$10,000; March, 1969—$12,000.

3. The most recent grant, for $12,000, approved on March 31st, 1969, is for continued publication of the *Tamarack Review* in 1969. It is payable in instalments as required to publish four issues.

4. (a) For periodicals concerned with the arts, the criteria for grants are a clear predominance of artistic interest, a high quality of content, service to an interested public, and demonstrated financial need. (b) For learned journals in the Humanities and Social Sciences, the criteria are that they maintain those standards of excellence that will earn them recognition as prime reference material in the disciplines concerned and as outlets for the most significant results of Canadian scholarship.

LAST OAK PARK DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,539—**Mr. Southam:**

1 Has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development received from the Government of Saskatchewan a proposal for the development of Last Oak Park?

2. If such a proposal has been received, what action has been taken?

3. If no action has been taken, when can action be expected?

4. Is the Department aware of the importance of this program to Indian people of the four bands concerned?

5. Since the program is considered viable, when can it be expected to commence?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Not by the Department of

Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

2. It is under study.

3. Not applicable.

4. Yes.

5. If and when it is found to be viable.

SYDNEY COAST GUARD COLLEGE

Question No. 2,542—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What was the total cost of the land, buildings and equipment for the Canadian Coast Guard College in Sydney, Nova Scotia?

2. How many graduate officer cadets is it anticipated will be graduated from the college yearly over the next five years?

3. Is it necessary to be bilingual as a prerequisite to attending the college?

4. What is the total yearly cost of the Canadian Coast Guard for each of the years since its inception?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. $1,501,777.

2. Approximately 25 for the Coast Guard. Additional officers may be trained for other Departments.

3. No.

4. 1965-66, $260,075; 1966-67, $509,447; 1967-68, $704,675; 1968-69, $866,078.

TOTAL GRANTS OF CANADA COUNCIL TO "TAMARACK REVIEW"

Question No. 2,544—**Mr. Harkness:**

1. What is the total of the grants made by the Canada Council to the *Tamarack Review*?

2. How many of these grants have been made and what was the date and amount of each?

3. Has the *Tamarack Review* published a single issue since it received a Canada Council grant more than a year ago?

4. What are the reasons for these grants having been made to this publication?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,526—Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

2. As above.

3. Since December 1967, the time of the grant to which reference is made, the *Tamarack Review* has published issues No. 46 (February, 1968); No. 47 (June, 1968); and No. 48 (December, 1968). We are informed by the publisher that a double issue Nos. 49 and 50, which was due to appear in mid-April, was held up by a printer's strike in Toronto, and will now appear on or about July 1st, 1969.

4. The grants were made for continuing publication of this literary periodical. It was chosen for assistance by the criteria for periodicals concerned with the arts listed in the answer to Question No. 2,526—Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

GRANTS TO "TAMARACK REVIEW" IN LAST TEN YEARS

Question No. 2,546—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. How much money has been given by the Canada Council to the periodical, *Tamarack Review*, in grants over the past ten years?

2. What was the amount of each grant?

3. Was receipt of each grant followed by publication of an issue of *Tamarack Review* within the year following?

4. Does Mr. Naim Kattan of the Canada Council have any part in deciding what periodicals receive grants?

5. Was Mr. Kattan at any time a member of the editorial board of *Tamarack Review* or connected with the periodical in any other capacity?

6. Did the Canada Council at any time ever give a grant to the periodical *Edge* and, if so, when were these grants given and in what amounts?

7. Did the Canada Council ever withhold a grant from the periodical *Edge* and, if so, on what grounds?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Answered in response to Question No. 2,526—Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

2. As above.

3. Yes, four issues in each case. On one occasion there was a double issue.

4. As an arts officer of the Canada Council directly concerned with support of literary periodicals, Mr. Naim Kattan receives and studies each application, seeks expert advice where needed, and prepares the application in summary form for the Council, which decides whether or not a grant will be made.

5. Mr. Kattan was a member of the editorial board of the *Tamarack Review* until October, 1967, when he joined the staff of the Canada Council. At that time he resigned from *Tamarack Review's* editorial board.

6. Yes. In February, 1967, *Edge* Magazine was awarded a grant of $1,000 specifically to pay poets for their contributions to the magazine.

7. Yes, *Edge* was refused a grant for general assistance to publication on the grounds that it did not meet the criteria for support of

arts magazines, as outlined in the answer to Question No. 2,526.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS TO "TAMARACK REVIEW", 1967 AND 1968

Question No. 2,547—**Mr. McBride:**

1. What was the amount of the grant from the Canada Council to the *Tamarack Review* (a) in 1967 (b) in 1968?

2. How many issues of the *Tamarack Review* were published (a) in 1967 (b) in 1968?

3. Is it the policy of the Canada Council to provide grants to periodicals carrying political opinion?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,526—Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

2. (a) 4; (b) 3.

3. No, unless there is a clear predominance of artistic interest.

TORONTO HARBOUR AIR CARRIER AIRPORT

Question No. 2,553—**Mr. Robinson:**

Did the feasibility study of locating an Air Carrier Airport in the eastern area of the Toronto Harbour indicate that it was practical and, if so, what would be the estimated cost to provide the necessary acreage of reclaimed land deemed necessary?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The feasibility study to which reference is made is a preliminary engineering study only. This study indicated that it is technically feasible to construct, by means of reclaiming land, an area of sufficient size to accommodate two closely spaced uni-directional runways.

Comprehensive air space, meteorological and ground transportation studies associated with this proposal have yet to be finalized.

The cost of the reclaimed land based on the preliminary study is estimated to be $56 M. or $80,000 per acre.

TORONTO WATERFRONT AIRPORT FACILITY

Question No. 2,554—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the intention of the federal government to consider the feasibility of providing an airport facility as part of the development of the conceptual waterfront plans for Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, in competition with other possible sites in the Toronto area to serve the Southern Ontario region.

POSTAGE STAMP SALE REVENUE

Question No. 2,560—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. What was the total revenue to the Post Office Department from the sale of postage stamps for the years (a) 1967-68 (b) 1968-69?

2. What was the total revenue to the Post Office Department from the sale of stamps through postage meters?

3. What amount was paid to the British American Bank Note Co. Ltd. and to the Canadian Bank Note Co. Ltd. during the years (a) 1967-68 (b) 1968-69 for the printing of all the stamps sold?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. In so far as the Post Office is concerned: 1. (a) $118,831,756 including the sale of stamped postage supplies; (b) $125,466,254 including the sale of stamped postage supplies.

2. For postage meter and postage register sales: 1967-68, $152,462,666; 1968-69, $175,778,131.

3.

	British American Bank Note Co. Ltd.	Canadian Bank Note Co. Ltd.
	$	$
(a) 1967-68	88,800	1,175,000
(b) 1968-69	491,000	662,000

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO "LIBERTE"

Question No. 2,563—**Mr. Thompson (Red Deer):**

1. What grants were made by the Canada Council to the Quebec separatist publication, "Liberte", during the years 1966-69?

2. What grants have been paid by the Canada Council to the "Tamarack Review" during the last ten years?

3. Has the "Tamarack Review" been published since the date of the last Canada Council grant received by that publication?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. The policy of the Canada Council is not to make grants to politically oriented publications, separatist or otherwise. Grants for publication were made to the Montreal literary magazine Liberté from 1966-69 as follows: April 1966, $6,000; April 1967, $6,000; February 1968, $8,000; April 1969, $10,000.

2. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,526, Mr. Yewchuk, June 13.

3. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,544, Mr. Harkness, June 17.

Questions

TAX BENEFITS RECEIVED BY U.S. PROFESSORS

Question No. 2,565—**Mr. Anderson:**

1. How many U.S. professors or teachers came to Canada during 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 and benefited from Article VIIIA of the Canada-U.S. Tax Convention, which permits exemption from Canadian taxes for the two years following entry to Canada?

2. How many professors and teachers have come to Canada from the United Kingdom during the same years and benefited from Article 18 of the Canada-United Kingdom Income Tax Agreement, under which such teachers may remain in Canada for two years prior to Canadian income taxes being levied?

3. With respect to U.S. and United Kingdom teachers and professors in Canada, does the Department of National Revenue insist upon proof of payment of either English or American taxes before granting such persons exemption from Canadian income tax?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1 and 2. This information is not available.

3. No.

CALGARY AIRPORT PARKING FACILITIES

Question No. 2,569—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. What firm or individual was chosen by the Department of Transport or other government departments and agencies for the operation of parking facilities at the Calgary International Airport?

2. When was the agreement made, for what term and for what additional purposes, if any?

3. Who are the directors of such company, and who are its principal shareholders?

4. What method was used to choose such firm or individual for the purpose of this agreement?

5. What other agreements exist between such firm or individual and the Department of Transport or other government departments and agencies?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. Allied Parking Services Limited.

2. March 16, 1969, for a term of five years. Agreement covers management of car parking lot only.

3. Directors and principal shareholders: W. Crinchic, President; J. G. Crinchic, Vice-President; D. Crinchic, Secretary.

4. Tender Call—lowest bid to manage the car parking lot.

5. Management contracts for car parking lots at Halifax and Ottawa International Airports.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND POST OFFICE CLOSURES

Question No. 2,576—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. What are the names of the rural post offices in Prince Edward Island that have been closed down in the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968?

2. (a) What are the names of rural post offices in Prince Edward Island which have been closed out to date in the year 1969 (b) what further rural post offices does the Post Office Department propose to close out in the remainder of the present calendar year (c) what further, if any, rural post offices have been designated to be closed down in the calendar year 1970?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. 1965: Midgell, Ocean View, Newton Cross. 1966: Bristol, Beatons Mills, Piusville, Johnstons River, Fort Augustus, French River. 1967: Alma, Summerville, Cherry Valley, Iona. 1968: Brackley Beach, New Glasgow, Stanhope, McNeills Mills, South Rustico, Union Road, Hampton, Oyster Bed Bridge, West Devon, Bear River, Tracadie Cross.

2. (a) Hopefield, St. Mary's Road, Wilmot Valley, Bedford Station, New London, Kellys Cross, Armadale, Howlan. (b) Clyde River, Dundas Centre, Kinross, Malpeque, Milton Station, Stanley Bridge, Carleton Siding, Conway, Fredericton Station, North River, Peakes. (c) Portage.

P.E.I.-CAPE TORMENTINE FERRY SERVICE

Question No. 2,577—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. With regard to the two new car-ferries to be constructed and ready for operation in the Prince Edward Island-Cape Tormentine ferry service in 1971 (a) are both these ships to be operated on the Borden-Cape Tormentine run (b) if so, is there at least one further vessel to be brought into service on the Wood Islands-Caribou run by 1971 (c) what will be the approximate capacity of these two ships (d) will either, or both, be an icebreaker designed for year round service and capable of carrying railway cars?

2. Has the Department of Transport any plans for installing new and more powerful engines in the *MV Abegweit*?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. (a) Yes. (b) Future plans for the Wood Islands-Caribou service are being prepared but are not yet finished; (c) Approximate capacity of these two ships is 500 passengers and 150 cars each; (d) No. Neither ship will be an icebreaker or capable of carrying rail cars.

2. No.

REMOVAL OF TAX ON INCOMES BELOW WELFARE LIMIT

Question No. 2,586—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of removing income tax requirements on wage earners who receive less in annual income than the amount they would receive if on welfare?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): This is a matter of Government policy. If any amendments to the Income Tax Act to change the exemptions for individuals should be contemplated they will be announced at the appropriate time.

UP-DATING OF ARMED FORCES PENSIONS

Question No. 2,591—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the intention of the government to take steps as soon as possible to up-date the Armed Forces pension structure with a view of removing discrepancies, and increase to an adequate level pension benefits of all pensioners, widows and dependants?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence): The question of increasing the pensions paid to former members of the Canadian Forces continues to receive active consideration.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

EMPLOYEES NOT SUBJECT TO OPERATIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Question No. 1,648—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What are the Crown corporations or other government agencies whose employees, in whole or in part, are not subject to the Civil Service Act?

2. What is the general policy of each of these corporations or government agencies with regard to the right of their employees to participate in political activities?

3. What provisions of the Act or what regulations apply in this regard in relation to each of these corporations or agencies?

4. In each case, what penalties are provided for employees who fail to comply with these regulations?

5. In each case (a) how many times have these penalties been applied, and (b) how many cases have been considered?

Return tabled.

TASK FORCE ON SPORTS—SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Question No. 2,295—**Mr. Mahoney:**

With respect to the Task Force on Sports for Canadians (a) where, and on what dates did the Task Force meet to receive submissions or to hear witnesses (b) from what persons and organizations were briefs or submissions received and considered (c) what were the names of the persons who were interviewed by the Task Force and their respective affiliation or connection in sports (d) how many questionnaires were distributed and how many returned?

Return tabled.

PRIVILEGES UNDER NEW POSTAL REGULATIONS

Question No. 2,311—**Mr. Hales:**

1. Since the new postal regulations became effective on April 1, 1969, has any information been made available as to what publications previously granted 2nd class privileges are now obliged to mail under 3rd or 4th class?

2. Will this information be made public and from whom may such be available?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Question No. 2,474—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. How much money was spent last year by the federal government on financing university education for foreign students (*a*) at the undergraduate level (*b*) at the post-graduate level?

2. How much money was spent last year by the federal government on financing university education for Canada's native people (*a*) at the undergraduate level (*b*) at the postgraduate level?

Return tabled.

PAYMENTS UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

Question No. 2,485—**Mr. Robinson:**

1 How much money has been paid under the Canada Assistance Plan per year since its inception in 1963?

2. How much was paid to each province in each year since the inception of the plan?

3. Do the provinces still contribute to the Canada Assistance Plan?

4. How many people in each province receive benefits under the Canada Assistance Plan?

Return tabled.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADJUDICATION REPORTS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the serious situation revealed by the adjudication report of W. S. Martin in the dispute between the Council of Postal Unions and the Post Office. Considering the vital and essential nature of efficient postal service to all Canadians, and considering that there have been two nationwide strikes in this service in recent years, the importance of such a debate cannot be overstated.

In addition, given the fact that negotiations are now under way for the labour contract to replace the current contract which will expire before parliament is likely to reconvene, and given the fact that there will be no opportunity before these negotiations take place for parliament to debate this national issue of the

attitude the Post Office should take in upcoming negotiations, it is vitally urgent that there be a full and comprehensive discussion of this matter in the House of Commons at this time.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, a number of factors have to be taken into account in determining if the house is to be adjourned under Standing Order 26 as suggested by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie). In particular, the Chair has to consider whether the situation proposed for immediate debate is in the nature of a sudden and new emergency. If the issue raised by the proposed motion is in effect a continuing grievance, then the motion cannot be allowed.

It should be mentioned at the outset that similar motions dealing essentially with the same matter were proposed on March 10 and March 11 last. This fact in itself shows that the situation of which the hon. member complains is more in the nature of a continuing grievance.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Even the new circumstances outlined by the hon. member for Hillsborough do not appear to constitute a sudden emergency nor do they suggest an impending crisis the progress of which might be influenced by an immediate parliamentary debate.

Hon. members will also recall that the general subject of postal services was considered at length last May 15 on a motion pursuant to Standing Order 58 which motion had been proposed by the hon. member for Hillsborough and was resolved by division at the conclusion of the debate.

I think I should add one word in connection with the form of the notice given by the hon. member for Hillsborough. I have suggested to hon. members in the past that according to the terms of Standing Order 26 only a statement of the question to be debated should be indicated in the motion proposed for consideration by the Chair. The purpose of the new rule is to eliminate argument as to whether the matter should be debated urgently, and if hon. members as part of their notice are allowed to include argument on this subject, it would be only fair to allow argument by other members who may feel differently than does the mover of the proposed motion.

For this reason I have to insist again that the motions proposed by hon. members for the consideration of the Chair should be restricted as far as possible to a statement of the fact, and should not include argument. In any event, on the substance of the proposal advanced by the hon. member for Hillsborough I must rule that the motion cannot be put to the house at this time.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ALLEGED IMPROPRIETY IN SUPPRESSION OF ADJUDICATION REPORTS—APPLICATION OF FINDINGS—RE-NEGOTIATION FOLLOWING ALLEGED BREACH—COMMITTEE INQUIRY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Communications and Postmaster General. Will he say for what reason the adjudication reports of the decisions made on April 30 and May 15 on disputes between the government and the Council of Postal Workers were suppressed until Friday, July 4, a delay of seven and nine weeks?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say on that really, except that I have been pressing to have the reports myself almost weekly since May 1. I think the question should be directed to the Public Service Staff Relations Board. As the Leader of the Opposition said, one report was dated April 30, another May 15 and a third one May 16. I am at a loss to understand why they have not been released before now.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question for whoever is speaking for the government today. May we have some explanation as to why these reports have been suppressed for this length of time?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister will have to do better than that on a matter of great importance. It cannot have come with any surprise to the Acting Prime Minister and to other ministers of the government that the house is interested in this question today. It is a prima facie case of serious suppression, and I think the house is entitled to an answer to the question.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege arising either out of the government's inability or its unwillingness to disclose information as to the delay in the publication of this

report. I say that the privileges of the members of this house in particular have been affected, in that the house has had to deal with this particular question all along. May I say, with due respect to Your Honour's decision a moment ago, that this situation has arisen as a result of the unavailability of the report at the time of the discussion prior to today in the house.

Therefore I say that at the moment there is a question of privilege as to why the house and all those concerned have been denied this report. The question is whether the report has been delayed this long in order to relieve the minister involved from having to answer any question in the house on a point on which the ministry and its officials have been found to be guilty of dereliction in not living up to the standards laid down in labour relations.

I therefore put it to Your Honour that we just cannot be fobbed off continually, letting the question be avoided in one way or another. At this point in the session the whole matter should be dealt with.

Mr. Kierans: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, relating to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I wish to repeat that I have no knowledge at all of the reasons for which the reports were not released until just now. I have been as anxious as anyone else to obtain them. The implication in the statement of the hon. member for Edmonton West is that I have been afraid to face this house. Mr. Speaker, with an opposition like that, what is there to be afraid of?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): We shall see.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the Minister of Communications to be afraid of anything. I am asking him to be honest and straightforward with this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: In view of the fact that one report of the adjudicator granted the grievances of five workers, and since other grievances may fall within the same realm of facts, and since this means additional pay for those workers, will the minister undertake that the five workers concerned and others in a like situation will receive that pay retroactive to May 15, the date of the award.

Mr. Kierans: I have already instructed the officials of the department to contact the leaders of the unions and of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers to determine the best way of proceeding as a result of this report.

Mr. Lewis: May I also ask this question: in view of the fact that the other report, dated April 30, found that government agencies—more the Treasury Board, perhaps, than the Post Office—had violated section 40 of the agreement by not consulting the union prior to making up their minds with respect to changes in working conditions, will the minister now revert to the conditions which obtained prior to February 9 and negotiate with the union as the agreement requires?

Mr. Kierans: I am glad the hon. member raised that question. There were three principal conclusions reached in the report. I should like to quote from the adjudicator: "The employer, under the collective bargaining agreement, had the right to implement single mail processing." Now comes point No. 2, and again I quote: "The error lay in the method of implementation." The third point is this: Both parties erred. I quote: "It is held as a fact that neither the representatives of the employer nor the union were mentally disposed to engage in meaningful consultation."

On May 15—and you have already referred to this, Mr. Speaker—I said something along the same lines in this house:

> There has been on both sides perhaps a tendency to interpret that contract too literally; to look at the words than to treat it as a human document.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You ruled in your judgment that the motion of the hon. member for Hillsborough could not be entertained and that a debate should not take place at this time. I want to say that the Postmaster General has taken sentences out of context; that the adjudicator went further than to say that both parties were responsible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether I might interrupt the hon. member. I might say that prima facie the point raised by the hon. member is well taken. I did not know at what time to interrupt the Postmaster General. At the same time the question asked by the hon. member for York South in a way prompted the lengthy reply. I suggest to hon. members that there should not be debate at this time, that questions should be short and the answers equally brief.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lewis: Then I repeat my question, Mr. Speaker, which was whether or not the minister will revert to the procedures used prior to February 9 in view of the findings of the adjudicator.

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, the adjudicator has not asked us to make any change from the single mail processing system. The adjudicator has asked us simply to ensure that there be more consultation prior to issuing new directives, and with this I am heartily in accord. I agree with the spirit—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Postmaster General have no knowledge of the contents of the report until he read the report when it was issued on July 4?

Mr. Kierans: Not a word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which I should like to direct to the Minister of Labour. On March 18, as reported at page 6742 of *Hansard,* the Postmaster General replied in the affirmative when he was asked whether "the services and the ability of his colleague, the Minister of Labour, are being used" in the handling of the postal dispute. My question is this: When does the minister intend to dissociate himself publicly from the arrogant and high-handed labour tactics of his colleague the Postmaster General?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Postmaster General mean to indicate that he had asked through the appropriate channels for this report before July 4, that he had failed to get a copy and that one was withheld from him until July 4?

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of May I kept asking how long it would take to get the adjudicator's report. From then on I kept asking whether the adjudicator's report was in yet, and so on. That is exactly what I meant by my reply.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question. To whom did the minister direct his inquiries, and what reasons were given for the delay?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Kierans: I inquired of my officials, including the deputy minister, asking them to find out whether there was any information as to when the report would be forthcoming.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made earlier by the Postmaster General, that the blame for the delay in getting these reports was to be placed on the Public Service Staff Relations Board, and in view of the fact that that board comes under the authority of the Privy Council, may I ask the President of the Privy Council whether he can give us the reason for the delay?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad, as the Acting Prime Minister has indicated, to make an investigation into this matter, and I will respond in due course.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he would discuss with the Prime Minister the possibility of reactivating the task force on information to inquire into the secrecy and furtiveness practised by this government?

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the President of the Privy Council? Now that it appears that the house itself will not have an opportunity to discuss this matter, will he take the initiative to have this newly revealed report, which must have been sent by mail, referred to an appropriate standing committee before negotiations begin, so that the committee may look at the report?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I shall allow one more supplementary, after which we might go to another subject. Perhaps we may return to this matter in a few minutes. For the time being I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to ask the Postmaster General if he can tell us on what date he received the two reports.

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, I heard a verbal report of the reports on Friday night. I studied the reports this morning.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): They must have been sent by mail.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT CANADIAN PRODUCER FROM IMPORTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, but in his absence, perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could answer it.

Since there is a joint and firmly established plan among egg producers in Quebec for the marketing of that product and since those people are having a hard time of it due to the importation of eggs, could the minister tell us whether the government has taken or will soon take steps to prevent the importation of eggs and to protect our Canadian producers?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member would not agree with me that this important question could profitably be discussed at the time of adjournment this evening.

Mr. Lambert: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour about the strike of telephone workers in British Columbia which has been going on for some time. Since Mr. J. Ernest Richardson, the president and chief executive officer of British Columbia Telephone Company, has refused to meet the officers of the union may I ask the minister if he intends to intervene in the strike in an endeavour to bring both parties together, so that free collective bargaining may take place.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the strike of the British Columbia Telephone Company is unfortunate. The hon. member knows that the services of the Department of Labour are available to both sides. There has been no request from the union for any assistance by the Department of Labour in a mediation role. Until one side or the other asks for such assistance the Department of Labour does not intend to interfere in a legitimate strike.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the chief executive officer of the British Columbia Telephone Company will not meet the officers of the union, does the minister not consider it incumbent on his department at least to bring the parties together in an endeavour to have them take up the process of collective bargaining?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the union went on strike of its own volition. It had the right to go on strike, just as the company had the right to lock workers out when legal delays expired after certain reports were tabled. If the union feels that Mr. Richardson's attitude is unfair, they can ask for the assistance of the Department of Labour. They need only to ask for it and we will then review the matter and make whatever contacts are needed with the company. In the meantime, until we are requested by either one side or the other to intervene, we have no intention of intervening.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the union were to ask the minister to try to bring the parties together, would he be willing to undertake this assignment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This further supplementary is hypothetical.

[*Translation*]

HARBOURS

CHANDLER (P.Q.)—INQUIRY AS TO WHARF CONSTRUCTION

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works.

Since a member of the Liberal caucus has said that the people from the Gaspé peninsula are about to rebel because the federal government failed to keep its promise to build a new wharf in Chandler, will the minister now undertake to erect a new wharf as first promised?

Mr. Speaker: I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that his question, as put, is out of order because it deals with a statement made outside the house.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Since

there are in western Canada thousands of students who are looking for work, I wonder if the minister will look into the activities of some departments of government which are sending to western Canada thousands of students from parts of the country other than western Canada. Those students are taking up jobs which might be filled by western Canadian students seeking jobs.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be glad to look into that.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—ROLE OF CANAIRELIEF AND RED CROSS—BLOCKING OF NIGHT FLIGHTS BY FOREIGN PILOTS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister now tell the house about the results of the constructive meeting he had with Canairelief and Dr. Johnson, about which on Thursday he expressed hope, with respect to relieving the grim situation in Nigeria-Biafra?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson put certain suggestions to us which might help in attaining some acceptable method of inspecting cargoes being flown into Biafra. These proposals are being pursued.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs say whether Canada has joined with the government of Great Britain in suggesting specifically to the federal Nigerian government that night flights be resumed on a temporary basis in order to avoid imminent mass starvation?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, some days ago, as I reported to the house, the government was in touch with the Nigerian authorities, urging them not to interfere with the provision of relief. That would include night flights. I repeat what I said before, that there would be a good deal less trouble, less danger for the pilots, and greater opportunity for provisioning of the people in Biafra if daylight flights were permitted.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact there is imminent danger of starvation, can the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicate whether any further steps are being taken by the government of Canada to join with Britain or any other countries in bringing about the necessary measures to ensure that the relief will come to the people who are threatened with starvation?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do not think we should lose hope about the possibility of getting the International Red Cross to resume flights on conditions acceptable to both sides. We are working very hard on these objectives, which I am sure are shared by everyone.

Mr. Stanfield: It is not difficult to ask us to be hopeful about the International Red Cross, but can the minister expect to be hopeful about the Canadian government's efforts?

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform the house whether he has any information as to the report that foreign pilots, presumably Russian and British, are flying the new sophisticated aircraft that are blocking night flights as far as relief to that area is concerned?

Mr. Sharp: I have only the reports I have seen in the press. From the knowledge I have I would say the reports I read in the paper are exaggerated.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

SURVEY OF EFFECTS OF POSTAL RATES ON MAGAZINES

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): I wish to put a question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

As regards the implementation of the new Post Office Act and postal rates, does the minister intend to have his officials study the implications of the disappearance of several magazines and publications and to issue a report on the matter for the information of hon. members?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the matter at length with the newspaper owners and all those affected by the increased postal rates and explained the difficulties involved in an eventual deficit of $130 million. To reply directly to the hon.

member's question, I must say that we have no intention whatsoever of changing the postal rates.

Mr. Fortin: I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker, we were not asking whether the government intended to change the postal rates, but whether the Post Office and Communications Departments would be ordered to make a study of the economic possibilities and the consequences of the new Post Office Act, for the information of hon. members.

Mr. Kierans: Perhaps we could discuss the consequences of the postal rates when the estimates of my department are considered, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE STRIKE OF LONGSHOREMEN

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware of the very real danger of a longshoremen's strike this summer at the port of Vancouver? If so, what action is he taking to try to prevent it?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am always aware of the possibility, since their collective agreement expires at the end of July. On the other hand, I am not as pessimistic as the hon. member. I think both parties appreciate the futility of a long and costly strike in that particular port this summer.

WHEAT—DESIRABILITY OF AVOIDING RESTRICTED MOVEMENT THROUGH STRIKE ACTION

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): In the absence of the Prime Minister, I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. In light of today's Richardson's Grain Marketing Review stating that no offers of wheat were made this week to the Japanese food agency by the Canadian Wheat Board because of the distinct possibility of a strike in the very near future by the Vancouver port longshoremen, will the Prime Minister use his good offices to prevent this threatened strike, and thus avert making even more serious what is already recognized as a serious grain pile-up?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government is very much aware of the desirability of continuing the shipment of grain and preventing any strikes. I am sure the Minister of Labour, who is one of the more effective negotiators we have had in our time, will do a good job.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, both ministers said they are aware of the danger of a strike. What really is being asked the ministers is what action or policy the government has to prevent such a hold-up at the ports, which would of course cause another deterioration in our grain market?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this government does not adopt the policy that there are two types of workers, those entitled to strike legitimately and those who are not. The longshoremen in British Columbia have a very legitimate right to strike, provided they meet the full requirements of the law as presently enunciated on the statute books. I am not quite sure whether the hon. member suggests we should order the companies to give the unions all they want, or order the unions to accept the terms that the companies think are valid in this time and age.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As a member of the opposition, I am not suggesting anything. I am asking the minister what his policy is. He says the labourers have rights: Surely the farmers have some rights. I ask him—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has already asked a question. I am not sure he is satisfied with the reply given by the minister, but he has already asked the question.

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe I could rephrase it in a little more gracious manner, with your assistance, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the minister could give us any positive suggestions as to what he has in mind by way of keeping in balance his views on fair play and a due consideration of what is necessary for the economics of the country?

Mr. Mackasey: I think I should answer graciously, Mr. Speaker, and assure the hon. member that the one thing we should not do at this moment is panic. This is the type of advice I can give to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Woolliams: One thing about this government, they never move until there is a crisis.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PENITENTIARIES

INCREASED SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS TO PREVENT ESCAPES

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): May I direct a question to the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker? In the interest of protecting the public, I ask the Solicitor General if immediate steps are being taken to increase the security arrangements for prisons and penitentiaries in view of the increasing number of escapes, culminating in three escaping yesterday from St. Vincent de Paul, two of whom are guilty of homicide?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I will be very glad to take the hon. member's suggestions under consideration.

SHIPPING

CHURCHILL—INQUIRY INTO EXTENSION OF SEASON

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): In the absence of the Minister of Transport, I wish to direct my question to the acting minister. In view of the extensive assistance being provided by Canada in relation to the test run of the *Manhattan* to determine the feasibility of year round navigation in the Arctic, will the minister also combine this to a comprehensive study in relation to an extended shipping season at Port Churchill?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the department will respond to questions tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ALLEGED VIOLATION OF FEDERAL PLAN FOR EASTERN QUEBEC

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Was the minister told in advance of the decision to cancel some projects in eastern Quebec, and did he approve such a decision which constitutes a violation of a federal undertaking in respect of a development program for Eastern Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would agree to have the matter discussed with the others tonight at the time of adjournment.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PRESENCE OF RUSSIAN NAVAL VESSELS OFF EAST COAST

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister in a position to relate any information to the house concerning the presence of Russian naval vessels off the east coast of Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are some Soviet naval vessels, three destroyers and one submarine supply ship, in non-territorial waters some 150 miles off the coast of Newfoundland, and proceeding southward. As is normal procedure, our maritime forces are carrying out a surveillance of this Soviet force.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. In connection with the meetings that were held last week with Russian officials, did the minister tell the Russians about the plans which his government has to throttle opposition here in the Canadian parliament?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

COMBINES

DRUGS—ACTION BY QUEBEC PHARMACISTS TO REDUCE DISCOUNT ADVERTISING

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs of which I have given him notice. Can he indicate to the house whether the Combines Branch of his department is investigating the action taken by the Quebec College of Pharmacists ordering reductions in drug advertising by discount pharmacists, which has the effect of creating price monopoly in the sale of drugs to the consumers?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to look into this matter on June 11 and it would appear that a valid regulation has been passed pursuant to section 5 of the Quebec Pharmacy Act, legislation which is totally within the control of the Quebec government.

HARBOURS

CHANDLER, QUE.—INQUIRY AS TO WHARF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works in reference to the harbour project in Chandler. When this project was changed from the original plan to the new plan, were the local authorities contacted, was there any consultation or exchange of ideas with them, or was the decision taken unilaterally by the officials of his department who feel that there is too much money being spent in the Gaspé peninsula?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate that his question in its present form cannot be considered in order at this time, and should he wish to have it debated at the time of adjournment, I will gladly see to it that it receives the priority which it deserves.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I would like you to tell me with your usual good nature why my question is not in order.

Mr. Speaker: We could discuss the matter when the orders of the day have been called.

EXCHEQUER COURT OF CANADA

PUBLICATION IN FRENCH OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

Is he now in a position to advise us when the rules of procedure of the Exchequer Court are to be published in good French?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the situation is just the same as it was the last time I replied to that question. However, I shall contact again the president of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The minister says that the situation is the same, and I rise on a point of order.

The last time I asked that question, the minister said that his officials were doing everything possible, and if things are still at the same point, this means that they did not really work.

Since I have asked that question several time since the beginning of the session—and since I always get the same reply—may I ask the Minister of Justice to do his utmost to make sure that the rules of procedure will be published before the end of the session, the summer recess seems a long way off.

Mr. Turner: This matter is as important for me as it can be for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN STRUCTURE—RESIGNATIONS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. In light of the elections now in progress to establish a permanent council of the Company of Young Canadians will the minister say whether anything is being done to alter the original intention or structure of the C.Y.C. before the permanent council has been elected and has met, and in particular will he report to the house upon the status of the program department of the C.Y.C.?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, it is not contemplated to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act, at least at this time.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: As a supplementary question will the minister say whether any of the members of the program department have submitted their resignations to the executive director, giving as their reasons dissatisfaction with a change in the program department?

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question might be placed on the order paper.

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—REPORTED USE OF U.S. STRIKE BREAKERS

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, this is really supplementary to a previous question asked about the telephone strike in British Columbia, and I direct it to the Minister of Labour. In view of the persistent reports that the B.C. Telephone Company is using American personnel as strike breakers in some of its operations, has the Department of Labour fully investigated this aspect of the strike and, if so, what type of investigation was carried out, and what were the findings?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if they are persistent reports as much as persistent rumours. We have investigated the rumours, but in the fairly complete investigation that we have made in the last couple of days we have found no evidence, of Americans coming into Canada to act as strike breakers in this particular dispute.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister which I had wished to direct to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing. Can the Acting Prime Minister throw any light on whether that minister intends to make a statement this week with respect to urban renewal projects throughout the nation? I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, because I understand that we were to hear from the minister prior to the time that the house adjourns for the summer recess, and it now appears that we are getting close to that time.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I expect that the minister concerned will be in the house tomorrow, and since I do not expect that we will adjourn before tomorrow I will bring this question to his attention and urge him to take the necessary action, if he is in a position to make a statement.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, can the Acting Prime Minister say whether the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Resources will be in the house tomorrow, or at least some time this week, to answer questions?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to think he will not be here at his accustomed time.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF GROWTH CENTRES UNDER INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES MEASURE

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can he indicate to the house when he intends to announce the growth centres as provided for under the Industrial Incentives Act?

[Mr. Harding.]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to announce the growth centres. What we are going to announce are the designated regions.

Mr. Broadbent: As a supplementary question and with that change in terminology, when does the minister intend to announce the designated regions?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker. I hope before two or three weeks have elapsed.

NATIONAL REVENUE

INGERSOLL, ONT.—STEPS TO RESTORE CUSTOMS SERVICES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue, In view of the serious disruption to certain major industries in the area, would the minister take immediate steps to restore customs services at the port of Ingersoll, Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest to the hon. member that this is the type of question which can always be debated with profit and advantage at the hour of adjournment.

Mr. Nesbitt: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND WESTERN FARM GROUPS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister may I direct this question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of reports of his intended trip to western Canada, is the Prime Minister planning to meet with the farm unions or other farm organizations?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will put that question to the Prime Minister. I am sure that he would like to meet with all groups in western Canada to discuss the problems and the opportunities of that area.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE ON DELIVERY QUOTA

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In

view of the fact that two thirds of the delivery points in western Canada are still on a three or four bushel quota, can the minister tell the house what plans the government has in hand that will enable those points to reach the objective of a five bushel quota as of August 1?

Mr. Speaker: I have the impression, without being an expert in these things, that this is a question which was asked during the last few days. If I am wrong I am sure the minister will want to ask the house to revert to motions for the purpose of making a statement.

LEVEL OF INITIAL PAYMENTS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether there has been a determination by the government to establish the initial payment on wheat, oats and barley at the same level or higher than that of last year?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVOLVEMENT OF GREEK EMBASSY IN TERRORIZING COMMUNITY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister now prepared to report to the house on the results of his investigation into the alleged involvement of the Greek embassy in a pro-junta group that was allegedly terrorizing members of the Greek community in Canada? I may add that this question was originally asked about a month ago.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have been investigating these complaints. I should like to say that we have received a preliminary report, but it is rather inconclusive and I would hesitate to make a definitive statement at this time.

MURIEL MILLARD—TREATMENT BY CANADIAN EMBASSY IN URUGUAY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary question and is related to this general subject matter. Is the minister investigating the complaint of Canadian singer, Muriel Millard, that when she was arrested in Uruguay and sought help from the Canadian embassy our attaché there said she "was lucky to find him because he was going to play golf", and that his only assistance was to send her a basket of fruit and some cigarettes to make her stay in prison more pleasant?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member would want to place that question on the order paper.

TORTURING OF GREEK POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, about a week or so ago I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs about allegations in respect of the torture of women political prisoners in Greece. He said he would look into that matter. Has he had an opportunity to do so, and what is the government going to do about this?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet completed inquiries.

INCOME TAX

UNILATERAL DECISION ON JOINT COMMITTEE STUDY

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council asking him whether he has received a request from the chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on behalf of its members for an explanation of the unilateral decision taken by the President of the Privy Council for the establishment of a joint parliamentary committee on income tax reform without consultation with the committee and, if so, can he give a reply to this request or indicate whether an answer has been provided?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, my understanding was, when I put the motion forward and furnished copies to the house leaders of other parties, that there had been consultation at the committee level. I found later that in fact there was not this consultation by the persons responsible and I can only apologize for having put it forward. I believed that consultation had taken place. I gather that further consultation is now going on in order to arrive at a harmonious compromise acceptable to members of the committee on both sides of the house.

Mr. Saltsman: Can the President of the Privy Council assure the house that this kind of action will not take place in the future?

Official Languages

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISIONS RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.

The house resumed, from Friday, July 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for the second time against passage of this bill I have no apologies to make to anyone. I have no desire to prolong the debate unduly or to add to the bitterness and ill will that the introduction of this piece of legislation has already provoked across Canada. But I feel compelled, in conscience and on principle, to speak out against what I, together with many thousands of other Canadians, feel sincerely to be an iniquitous measure.

When I spoke on this bill on second reading I said I was aware that what I said would be twisted and misinterpreted to belittle me as a bigot and a reactionary. I realized that anyone who spoke against the bill, even with genuine sincerity and from honest conviction, would be ridiculed and derided. While I have been somewhat surprised at the source and nature of some of these attacks, I have been greatly heartened by the overwhelming support my stand has received from a wide representation of the Canadian people. Regardless of criticism or support, however, I intend to make this last attempt to persuade the house that this legislation should not now be proceeded with. My reasons for doing so are simple. I believe Bill C-120 to be not only unconstitutional but also anti-constitutional. Above and beyond that, I believe it to be undesirable and unnecessary.

When I spoke on this measure at an earlier time I explained in some detail just why I believed this legislation to be unconstitutional. There is little purpose in repeating those details at this time; they are all on record.

Any Canadian who reads section 133 and section 91(1) of the British North America Act in conjunction with the provisions of Bill C-120, particularly clause 2, can see at a glance that this measure is patently unconstitutional. Its unconstitutionality is so obvious, Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the government, with all the constitutional and legal perception represented in the cabinet, can honestly hold it to be otherwise. I am therefore driven to the conclusion that this government, even while knowing its measure to be flagrantly unconstitutional, is still determined to ram it through parliament and make it law.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

One can only speculate on the motive behind such a cynical misuse of the parliamentary process and such an arrogant perversion of accepted practice. But the motive is comparatively unimportant. What is of vital importance to parliament, to every Canadian, and most particularly to the people of the province of Quebec, is the precedent that passage of this legislation will create. If the parliament of Canada knowingly accepts an unconstitutional measure and enacts it into law, then we have destroyed our constitution. Perhaps this is the motivation—perhaps this is the purpose. No Canadian government will ever again feel any necessity to be bound by the provisions of the British North America Act which, despite whatever shortcomings we may consider it possesses, is our constitution.

Let us never forget that while the constitution may impose difficulties and delays upon the federal government in putting its legislative program and its social and economic theories into effect, it is also the only political rudder we possess, the only stabilizer we can rely on in the constitutional storms we periodically experience in this troubled confederation. The British North America Act provides the only jurisdictional blueprint for development of a nation with divided governmental interests and responsibilities. The British North America Act provides the only protection for minority groups, for regional interests, for provincial rights. No province should be as aware of the British North America Act or cherish it more than the province of Quebec.

If we create a precedent of flouting our constitution by passage of the bill now before us, who or what can set a limit on the acts of any future Canadian government with the majority and determination to ram legislation through parliament as this government has done? It may sound far-fetched today, Mr. Speaker, but if the constitution is made simply another scrap of paper by consent of this parliament, who could argue against or stop a government which suddenly decided to legislate provincial boundaries out of existence? That is why I say this legislation is more than unconstitutional—it is anti-constitutional. Its passage will create a precedent that will emasculate our constitution.

I have yet to hear from any government spokesman any good explanation of why this bill must be rushed through parliament without the reasonable preliminary of having its constitutionality approved by the Supreme Court of Canada. If the government is so sure that it is in fact constitutional, surely no harm can be done by having this attested by the nation's highest judicial authority.

The government's stubborn refusal to listen and its arrogant determination to jam this bill through can only lead to speculation that it is to them merely a political expedient, a device for deluding the people of French Canada into believing that something is being done to further their aspirations. I cannot believe that we will be doing the people of French Canada any favour by destroying their constitutional protection, the protection they welcomed and cherished at the time of confederation. The protection the French speaking people of Quebec received under the constitution was one of the main factors that brought about confederation.

• (3:00 p.m.)

From the first moment this legislation was announced by the government I have been struck by the undemocratic manner in which it has been advanced and supported. The whole debate, if we can call it a debate, has been tainted by pressure and propaganda tactics reminiscent of some of the more infamous totalitarian regimes of recent times. As was said by one of my colleagues on a former occasion, I also feel sure that Dr. Goebbels would feel quite at home in the atmosphere that has developed around the consideration of this bill.

I mentioned earlier the derision and ridicule that have been heaped upon anyone daring to question this measure. We who have dared to speak against it have been accused of malice and stupidity. This is the technique of the schoolyard, and is to my mind childish. No dialogue is possible in these circumstances. Instead, we have the monologue of the closed mind. In many recent intemperate outbursts there has been a distinct overtone of desperation. It now appears that the time has passed when conscience or principle can command any respect, or reasoned argument can carry any force in this house.

I noticed with regret that the bill's chief proponent, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), in a recent television appearance was so bankrupt of ideas and arguments that he could only attack with abuse critics of the bill. His favourite word was "nonsense"; everything anyone else said or believed was nonsense. It was a perfect example of the closed mind of the true fanatic. It brought a strong whiff of the inquisition and the witch hunts of Old Salem. Surely a measure as important as this is held to be deserved a better defence, a more reasoned argument.

Part of the campaign of derision and ridicule to which the supporters of the bill have resorted is reflected in the juvenile pursuit of name-calling and the derogatory remarks by the Secretary of State in respect of certain western members in his most recent speech in the house on this issue. Anyone can pick up *Hansard* and read what the Secretary of State has said. One of the favourite descriptions employed by members of the government and, unfortunately, their partisans in the communications media is that Canadians, especially western Canadians, who oppose this bill are "afraid". I would like to quote in this regard some words written by Dennis Braithwaite in the Toronto *Telegram* of June 11. He was speaking about westerners, in particular his red-necked Saskatchewan relatives. He made six points which I would like to record in *Hansard*. With regard to the first point he said:

> We are not "afraid" of any aspect of the languages bill. We simply regard it as unnecessary, politically motivated, costly to implement, divisive and, as it affects the non-English, non-French third of the population, wholly discriminatory.

His second point was:

> It is unnecessary because the status of French as an official language was spelled out in the British North America Act and has been sturdily upheld for 100 years. There is no threat to the French language except that posed by history, which is that it must inevitably give way to the dominant language of this country, this continent and the western world, English.

His third point was:

> Institutional bilingualism, as the Prime Minister calls it, will be costly to maintain in the courts and government bureaux. As it continues to nudge our own provincial government along the road to a dual language society, without regard to real need, the thrust of federal bilingualism will impose a heavy burden on Ontario taxpayers for the provision of French secondary schools and universities.

This is already reflected in the increase in the Ottawa schools mill rate. Dennis Braithwaite's fourth point was as follows:

> The language bill is divisive because it arouses more tensions and hostilities than it allays. French Canadians living outside of Quebec long ago were reconciled to having to use English in dealing with the institutions of the various provinces. Agitation for government services in French came from Quebec. English speaking Canadians naturally

resent having to provide a service that is not needed and the demand for which is merely an expression of Quebec-based nationalist extremism.

This was his fifth point:

The languages bill cannot help but discriminate against those Canadians who came here as immigrants and who voluntarily submerged their national loyalties and cultures to become free and equal citizens of a new nation. Discrimination lies in the implication that, for example, Toronto's 300,000 Italians count for less with their federal government than the 50,000 French here, or that the Ukrainians on the prairies have no culture or language worth preserving.

His sixth and final point was:

Finally, the bill helps to encourage the rewriting of Canadian history and gives legitimacy to the squishy doctrine that in Canada, if nowhere else on earth or above it, a part can be equal to the whole—so long as it votes as a block at every federal election.

These are frank statements by the press, but I believe them to be a fair representation of what many Canadians from east and west, including myself, feel about the bill. I could go on to elaborate these points, but I have become convinced that there is little hope of the government listening to the opinions of others.

I would like to add briefly to my previous remarks about the questionable constitutional status of this legislation. I have mentioned that clause 2 of Bill C-120 effectively amends section 133 of the British North America Act, and that clause 2 and subsequent clauses constitute amendments to the British North America Act in defiance of specific restrictions set out in section 91(1) of that act as amended by the St. Laurent government in 1949.

It is interesting in this regard to note that not even the B and B Commission went nearly as far as does this legislation. In its report of October 8, 1967, the commission recommended that section 133 be amended to include the statement "English and French are the two official languages of Canada". I wish to emphasize that the British North America Act does not, and never did, state that the English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for any purpose, much less for all purposes of parliament; and by no implication can the provisions of section 133 include those languages as the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the government of Canada, or as clause 2 adds, "and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the parliament and government of Canada".

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Although other changes were proposed, the commission went nowhere near as far as clause 2 of the legislation now before us. In fact, it went out of its way to point out that section 133 of the British North America Act is "firmly entrenched". It pointed out that the 1949 version of the act as amended in that year "specifically excluded from the operation of the new amending power the use of the English or French language and obviously thus excluded section 133". There is nothing new in this. I dealt with it in detail in my previous speech outlining the unconstitutionality of Bill C-120. I merely cite it now to try to convince advocates of the bill who also swear by the B and B Commission.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my suspicion that those in the government who are determined to have this legislation passed, in the full knowledge that clause 2 effectively amends section 133, do so hoping that later clause 2, then being law, may be cited in support of a move to officially amend or disregard altogether the British North America Act. Let me simply say that I deplore the whole manner in which this legislation has been brought forward. I deeply regret the damage that has already been done to national unity by discussion of the bill's intent and by the attitude of the government in forcing its passage. I stand against its principle and effect. Above all, I am unalterably opposed to Bill C-120 because I believe it to be unconstitutional and, as I have said, anti-constitutional. If I had the financial resources and the requisite legal assistance, I would personally challenge the legality of this bill in the highest court of our land.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Knowing the situation in the house, which is dictated by an arrogant majority government, I am under no illustion that my amendment will carry. Neither do I have any doubt that this bill will shortly thereafter be voted into law. In these circumstances I have no choice but to abstain from voting when final approval is sought. I have done my utmost to persuade the government that this measure is obviously and entirely unconstitutional. While any chance remained of making this view prevail and having the legislation withdrawn, I have taken a full part in the proceedings. All attempts to condemn the bill as unconstitutional having been unavailing, I am not able to take any further part.

I will not lend myself in any manner whatever to what I believe to be a calculated and deliberate breach of the constitution. Let my

abstention on third reading stand as a clear indictment, one which I trust will be even more positive than a vote against this legislation.

With this clear understanding of my position I nevertheless move, seconded by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock):

That the said bill be not now read the third time but that the government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I should like to refer the said amendment for a decision by the Chair.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it that Your Honour is reserving judgment on the admissibility of the amendment?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): That is what I said, that I was referring the amendment to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): May I take it that at that time hon. members will be given an opportunity to make representations?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): That is correct.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in the debate on third reading of Bill C-120, but having listened to the previous speaker, the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh), I believe it is my duty to say a few words on the bill said to be unconstitutional.

If, according to the hon. member, the constitution does not state that both English and French are official languages, did he find anything in the same constitution which would prevent the recognition of English and French as the official languages of Canada? I think parliament is absolutely free to take a decision which could affect the implementation of the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, when Bill C-120 was introduced, I personally thought, and I still do, that it was an error of judgment by the government creating or giving the impression that every Canadian had to know both official languages, that is English and French, while such is not the object of the bill.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit Manitoba, where I met Canadians of German, Ukrainian and Polish origin. Those people are somewhat afraid of Bill C-120, because the necessary explanations have not been provided. The government is responsible for that. People are under the impression that it absolutely wants to impose bilingualism throughout the country. This is surely not the object of the bill.

Moreover, the minister said the other day that the bill would change absolutely nothing in Canada, not even in the public service. So, if the bill changes nothing, why has it been introduced? Why not instead continue to get people to realize the importance of understanding both languages throughout the country?

Here is what I said in western Canada to representatives of the provincial governments, with regard to education: Treat the French minorities in your provinces as Quebec treats the English minority. I feel that such an opinion is better accepted than Bill C-120. Canada will not become a bilingual country within a few weeks or a few months. However, provincial governments, which have jurisdiction over education, should be led to teach both languages from the very first grade and, within five or six years, a whole new generation of Canadians will speak and have a working knowledge of both official languages.

The federal government or the minister will say that this is outside his field, that the bill does not say that, and as for the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, he will say that it is unconstitutional. In fact, he said earlier that this bill frightens the people in the western provinces. It can, if it is not explained. Not only does the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek not bother to explain it in his region, Saskatchewan, but he tells the people that they will have to learn French, which is not very nice of him. In that case, it is not the government that plays the game of those who spread division in the country, but the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek.

The hon. member quotes Section 133 of the British North America Act, which does not provide that English or French must be learned, or that French must be regarded as an official language.

In the province of Quebec, we are free to accept the English language or to reject it. We have accepted it with pleasure. We have studied it, we have learned it because we think that one who knows two languages is

the richer for it not the poorer. I am convinced that if the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek had learned French at the time I was learning English in Amos, Abitibi, where there were not two English-speaking citizens, perhaps he would understand better today the importance of national unity.

[*English*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Where did I ever in any of my speeches say that the people of Canada will have to speak both languages? I have been one of those who said that this is not in the bill. My point is that the bill is unconstitutional. The hon. member should not put words in my mouth. I can speak for myself at any time. In particular, he should not attribute to me statements which I did not make.

Mr. Caouette: This is not a question, Mr. Speaker, but a statement by the hon. member. What I know is that you people are not trying to explain the bill. All you say is that the bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. McIntosh: You are the one who is making the argument now.

Mr. Caouette: You said it a moment ago.

Mr. McIntosh: I did not.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the hon. member has just said: Bill C-120 is not constitutional. On what does he base his allegation? He does not even know. He wishes to refer the bill to the Supreme Court of Canada so that a further six months or ten years will pass before everyone in Canada recognizes the importance of knowing two languages. It is very important that they be official.

The hon. member even gives another reason: it relates to immigrants from Germany, Poland, the Ukraine, etc. Yet, immigrants, before settling in Canada, are well aware that two languages are used here, namely English and French, and they are entirely free to learn either one or the other.

All such immigrants were welcome to Canada.

In Manitoba, the other day, I met people of German descent, who speak German generally at home. It is a pleasure to hear them. However, they have learned English. If they had settled in a French-speaking area, they would probably have learned French.

If, for some reason or other, the authorities in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or any other province decided to have the second official language taught at school, I think that the mess which now appears likely to last in Canada would quickly disappear, probably in a matter of a few years only, and that would allow people to understand one another better.

Panic is now created by saying: No one has to do it, the constitution does not permit it. But parliament has the required power to pass such legislation. It is its responsibility. If someone wants to question the constitutionality of the bill before the Supreme Court he needs only to lay his grievances before the said court and to take proceedings against the governement if necessary.

To come back to the immigrants, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that bill C-120 is depriving them of anything whatsoever. I know some Ukrainians in Rouyn who continue to speak in their tongue at home and who use English frequently. However, their children express themselves in French just like me because they were taught so in school. This means that in my region Ukrainians, Poles and Germans are not protesting because the two official languages are recognized. No opposition is shown either in eastern or in Western Canada, so long as people are explained exactly what it is all about.

But here, we hear all kinds of statements. We hear people protesting against the use of French, because that language has never been acknowledged as an official language. It is probably a pity that step was not taken at the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in 1896, because the matter would be settled by now.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about political jingoism; I am not referring to the political belicfs of anyone, but, since the bill is under study, I suggest that we should recognize that both languages are official, not only in western Canada, but also in the East, in the province of Quebec, as elsewhere.

At a time when some people in Quebec claim that we must come back to the use of the French language in Quebec, we are of the opposite opinion. We believe that both languages are necessary, that we must use both languages for they facilitate self-fulfillment and above all the development of the human personality.

In my opinion, anybody from Quebec who learns both languages is enhancing his cultural knowledge, and people from the West would enhance theirs if they had the same attitude.

So, I cannot see why there is all this misunderstanding or lack of unity because we have to pass legislation to recognize two official languages in Canada, without affecting other languages.

Ukrainians, or Germans for that matter, who cannot speak or use their language in Rouyn, Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg or elsewhere, should not complain, and we would be the first to protest if they were the victims of any discrimination, since we believe that they are as fully Canadians as we are, even though we call ourselves the founders of the country. On a recent trip to Manitoba, I noticed that those people are sincerely and deeply attached to their Canadian nationality but will not forget where they are from, would not brush aside what they have been.

There are top-notch Canadian citizens in Manitoba or Saskatchewan, far better than those who explode bombs in Montreal—and we had another one this morning—who perhaps are neither Ukrainians, Poles or former Germans. The bombings are the work of cocky little French Canadians. I think they could find another way of standing up and helping the cause of French-speaking Canadians.

At any rate, I have nothing more to add on this bill, but I feel that for the sake of a well-meant Canadianism, and not for reasons of sectarianism, we must set an example to the Canadian people by passing this bill which sanctions both French and English as the official languages of all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to rise in my place at this time to make my views known on the third reading of Bill C-120, the official languages bill, a piece of legislation which in my opinion is not only controversial but unnecessary. I shall begin with a quotation:

> A well organized minority in a democracy can easily impose its opinions upon an indifferent majority. These views, if unanswered and unopposed can, depending on the issue, cause serious trouble.

That statement was made by the Right Hon. Vincent Massey, former Governor General of Canada, in an address to the Canadian Club in Toronto, and it can be applied with startling relevance to the role Quebec is playing in the life of Canada today.

As is well known, I voted against this legislation on second reading, as did 16 others of my colleagues, and I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that by the time the history of another election is written in Canada many more members from all parties in this house will wish that they, too, had voted against this innocuous piece of legislation. In referring to the stand that 17 of us took on second reading I would like to say, if I may be excused for paraphrasing that great statesman, Sir Winston Churchill: "Never in Canadian history did so few have to speak for so many."

My reasons for opposing this bill are many but three important ones come to mind:

1. The legality of the bill;

2. The bill is divisive rather than unifying, and

3. Economically it is disastrous.

Let us look at the legal aspect first. All four western provinces questioned the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on this point at the February federal-provincial conference. Some even stated they would challenge the bill in the Supreme Court of Canada. I certainly hope they will. Even the province of Quebec is not too sure it wants this kind of legislation.

Nothing in the B.N.A. Act states that Canada has two official languages, nor is it stated that it should have. The present government is trying to bring in through the back door what it cannot do legally through the front door, at least not until there is an amendment to Canada's constitution, and members opposite know very well they are not likely to get an amendment along these lines.

The Hon. J. T. Thorson, one of Canada's foremost legal authorities, former chief justice of the Exchequer Court of Canada and a Liberal, no less, has publicly stated time and time again that this proposed language bill is not legal. His most recent public statement was made at a large meeting in Edmonton, Alberta, on June 2, 1969, and I would like to quote the following from Mr. Justice Thorson's speech:

> In spite of the facts of history, there have been intensive efforts, particularly since 1963, to give life to this concept of a dual French-English nation on the alleged ground that its acceptance is essential to Canadian unity.
>
> It has been asserted that Canada is a bilingual country in which French and English are the official languages throughout Canada and that our

constitution guarantees their equal status throughout the country. The assertion has been repeated so frequently and with such intensity of feeling that Canadians have been in grave danger of being brainwashed into the belief that it is true. The contention is not true, either as a matter of law or in fact. Indeed, the pretension is a false pretence.

Many other legal minds in Canada and elsewhere are of the same opinion as the Hon. J. T. Thorson, including the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), three times prime minister of this country.

Another instance which gives rise to suspicion in my mind about the legality of this whole issue has to do with a point raised by my right hon. friend from Prince Albert prior to the debate on second reading, when he questioned the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) on the government's authority to bring in this legislation. The Minister of Justice quoted the law officers of the Crown, but when my right hon. friend requested that the documents substantiating this authority be tabled in the house for all to see, the Minister of Justice refused to do so. What goes on over there, Mr. Speaker? What political subterfuge is being used?

• (3:30 p.m.)

My second reason for opposing this bill is the divisiveness of this obnoxious piece of legislation, the discrimination that could develop between the various ethnic groups of this great country if everybody started to assert language rights. How can Canada thrive, grow and become a leader among nations if we are going to balkanize ourselves? If one needs any evidence of what trying to force two languages on a people can do to break down unity and cause eternal strife, one has only to look at the wonderful little country of Belgium that has been torn apart for centuries over a parallel issue. Why look any further for warning of danger? How can there be peace and harmony in this country if our people of French origin want a special status, separate schools, two languages, two cultures, a separate pension plan, a separate medicare plan, and want to opt out of this and opt out of that? The very prefixes "bi" and "tri" have the connotation of division rather than unity.

Where is this government taking us? I ask hon. members to look at the discrimination that is already rearing its ugly head in our civil service. I have here an article written as recently as July 5 which appeared in the *Globe and Mail*. The writer of the article is

William Morris and it is headed "Language lessons that are no joke". The article reads in part:

The Newfie joke is out and the bilingual joke is in around here these days.

One joke tells of a man who swam beyond his depth, thought he was drowning and called for help. The lifeguard on shore shouted back: "I can't swim, I got my job because I was bilingual."

For many civil servants, bilingualism is no joke.

Rumours float around that technicians are hired, without proper qualifications, in preference to people who are competent, but can't speak French.

The word is passed that a French name will automatically give you an advantage in a civil service competition.

Civil servants write anonymously to newspapers complaining about a reign of terror. They don't speak out openly against its discriminatory practices, they say, because of fear.

"If a man speaks two languages, he is bilingual; if he speaks one language, he is English," a saying goes.

Mr. Stanbury: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Southam: Certainly.

Mr. Stanbury: Would the hon. member read the next sentence in that article?

Mr. Southam: I would be glad to read the whole thing because it is very edifying. Mr. Carson says that many people—

Mr. Stanbury: No—the next sentence, please.

Mr. Southam: The heading is "Bearing The Brunt".

Mr. Stanbury: I mean the sentence that begins with the words "Although it is".

Mr. Southam:

Although it is the Trudeau government which is bearing the brunt of the jokes, the policy is one it inherited from the Diefenbaker and Pearson governments.

Mr. Stanbury: Thank you.

Mr. Southam: This, of course, is the writer's way of trying to get Mr. Pearson and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) off the hook, but nevertheless they are the facts. Mr. Carson is a very knowledgeable man and cites the facts as they are today.

Mr. Stanbury: Read the article as it is.

Mr. Southam: Mr. Carson, who is very knowledgeable about the civil service, has this to say, according to the article:

—many people are using bilingualism to hide their own inadequacies.

One group of civil servants that has protested is the Professional Institute of the Public Service. Without success, it appealed to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau late last year to remove "areas of apparent contradiction" between the policy enunciated by Mr. Pearson, with its emphasis on safeguards, and current government administrative practice.

Leslie Barnes, director of the institute, in a recent interview said: "What we object to is the arbitrary whitewash of the entire civil service, not the policy announced in the Pearson formula. If there are no abuses why are they so afraid of safeguards? If there are safeguards, we would know we had nothing to worry about. But until they do something about this situation, the suspicion will always remain that the government, under the guise of bilingualism, is promoting an ethnic policy.

"We know there are abuses. We know that some people are being promoted because they are French or have a French name. But because there are no safeguards, no right of appeal, there is nothing we can do about it.

"For many of our people, learning German or Russian would be a more useful undertaking for these are now the languages of science. But we can't interest the government in educational leaves to upgrade or update the qualifications of scientists.

"For example, a scientist on an experimental farm in an area of Alberta, which by no stretch of the imagination could be considered bilingual, is going to be discriminated against.

"In the normal course of his promotion he will have to spend a period of time in Ottawa. Now, is he going to be denied his promotion because he doesn't know French, or if he gets here, spend two months out of every year learning French when it has nothing to do with his job. Ultimately, he would likely be promoted back to Alberta. It doesn't make sense."

That is the sort of thing one finds written about discrimination in the civil service in our newspapers these days.

Last October the Prime Minister made the now infamous statement that he would find jobs for English-speaking civil servants running elevators at the back of buildings if they did not learn to speak French. I also ask hon. members to read what the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) said on his tour of western Canada. If anybody wants further proof of the disunity that this bill is causing among Canadians, I ask them to read an article that appeared in the last issue of *Maclean's* magazine on the "Coming Showdown In The West". I fear that the Prime Minister will be in for a rough time on his forthcoming trip to western Canada in view of some of the statements he has already made.

I should now like to deal for a few moments with my third objection to this bill, namely, the effect it will have on our economy. Herein, in my opinion, lies the whole crux of the problem. I have many friends among Canadians of French origin. I have 3,500 of them in my riding of Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain and, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, a great many of them support me. Many of them see the problem as I do. The problem is really one of an inferiority complex which is based on economic factors. To a large degree the matter is an emotional one, but in cases like this, it is essential that we let our heads rule our hearts and not, as do our separatists, let our hearts rule our heads.

In Quebec the cruel fact is that language is only one of the root causes of the problem. The educational system is another and very important factor, as is land tenure and the father patriarch approach which has resulted in thousands and thousands of small uneconomic farms being established. Another hurdle is the religious concept that one should not control the birth rate; and there is also the system of the French elite. These and other factors have combined over the years to keep the vast majority of our French speaking Canadians in Quebec at the bottom of the economic totem pole. No wonder there is unrest.

As a Canadian I am desperately sorry to see this situation. As a member of parliament I publicly plead with my Anglo-Saxon constituents and other ethnic groups to have patience, forbearance, sympathy and understanding for French Canadians in Quebec in the hope that, given time and proper leadership, the situation will change and the problem will be gradually rectified. However, proper leadership is very essential, and we are not getting that leadership from this government.

Coming back to the language factor and to the economic aspect to which I referred, the cold hard fact is that Canadians of French origin should be learning English as fast as they can, instead of the English learning French. I exclude from that statement the small percentage of English speaking Canadians that do have a special aptitude or facility for learning more than one language.

I had an interesting experience several months ago when returning home on a plane. During the journey I started to talk to a professor from the University of British Columbia. He did not know I was a politician, but during the course of conversation I casually asked him what he thought of the proposed language bill. This man was a professor of languages and I assumed he was a linguistic expert. His reply was that he thought the government had got the whole

thing out of joint, that bilingualism was really not feasible. He explained to me that the facility for learning a language was rather like the facility for learning music. He said only about 20 per cent of the population could be trained to be musicians, and only one-quarter of those would be good musicians. He thought that regardless how much time was devoted to the study of language, bilingualism was just not attainable, that all that would happen would be that we would bastardize the two languages.

This professor of languages thought that far more emphasis should be placed on helping people become articulate in one language. Those with special aptitudes could be trained to fill positions in the civil service such as in the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Trade and Commerce, and other departments requiring bilingual personnel, until such time as all Canadians were able to speak English. I thought this suggestion was rather interesting, because I have heard many stories about English being easier to learn than French. If you put a number of French speaking children with English speaking children and leave them together for some time you will not find that the English children learn French but that the French children will learn English. It seems that English is the easier and more reasonable language to learn.

• (3:40 p.m.)

May I now refer to factors of geography and population. In the United States 210 million people speak English. In Canada 19 million people speak English or are bilingual; the remaining two million do not speak English. Let us see what the effect of this is on the Canadian in Quebec who speaks French only. In this connection may I refer to an article that appeared in February, 1969, in a Canadian magazine. It is entitled, "The High Cost of Speaking French", the reference obviously being to French Canadians who speak French, and goes on to say immediately beneath the heading:

The first volume of the full report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism contains the following survey, which traces the relationship between ethnic origin and socio-economic position in Canada. The English press took no notice of it, but *Le Magazine Maclean* published the following summary in October, 1968.

The writer of the article also cited statistics put out by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I wish to read certain of the statistics into the record because they are enlightening. I cannot understand why they did not enlighten Messrs. Dunton and Laurendeau who headed the B and B Commission. That commission speaks of a crisis in Canada; the truth is that it ought to be speaking of the crisis in Quebec. Statistics indicate that in Quebec there are 14 different ethnic groups. It is interesting to note that French Canadians who speak French only come third from the bottom of the list so far as income is concerned, immigrant Italians and native Indians being the only lower groups. This is a most serious situation. I apologize to hon. members if the article I am about to read proves to be monotonous, but I feel constrained to read it into the record. It reads as follows:

The salaries of French Canadians—non-agricultural, male—are 80 per cent of those made by Canadians of British origin, in Canada as a whole.

The salaries of French Canadians in Quebec are 65 per cent of those of English Canadians in Quebec.

Also, in the matter of occupations, French Canadians are found at the bottom of the list, immediately above Italians, both in Quebec and in the rest of the country.

We think French Canadians perceive the differences in income (and in standard of living) and in occupation that distinguish them from Canadians of British origin.

We think, equally, that such division of income along ethnic lines exercises a profound influence on the prevalent thinking about the future of Canada.

In these terms, three economists put their finger on the connections between the famous constitutional debate and "bread and butter" issues.

Why are French Canadians poorer? Is it education? Regional disparity? Discrimination? The answers will have a profound effect on the political and social positions of the communities in question.

In Canada, the factor which carries the most weight in explaining the unequal distribution of income is regional disparity. People are poorer in Abitibi and Newfoundland than in Montreal and Toronto.

But this doesn't explain the differences in salary between ethnic groups living side by side in the same economic region.

Above and beyond regional factors, ethnic characteristics remain very, very important. Canadians of British origin have incomes 10 per cent higher than the average in every province except Quebec, where they earn 40 per cent more than the average.

In Quebec, if one arranges ethnic groups in descending order by salary, one gets the table you see on this page, where it is found that French Canadians, Italians and native Indians are the only groups which earn less than the provincial average.

These statistics refer only to the labour force. If one takes account of demographic factors in

each group (women, aged, children who don't work) and calculates the per capita revenue of each ethnic group, one finds the French Canadians are even poorer.

The French Canadian population being younger, it makes up the majority of children and young workers; its level of work is the lowest in Quebec.

Education is one of the most important factors in the determination of salary. The various ethnic groups have quite different levels of education. The French Canadians, with an average of 7.08 years of study, come just ahead of the Italians, with 6.05 years.

Jews lead with 10.05 years and the English have 9.43. The economists point out that the English in Quebec are better educated than the English in any other province except British Columbia.

If the advantages of education are analysed, one concludes that "French Canadians derive the least from education." When a French Canadian passes from elementary school to university, he profits less, financially, than Canadians from other groups.

Studying ethnic groups according to occupation, the report concludes: "The respective status of English Canadians and French Canadians is absolutely systematic in all provinces. If occupations are divided into ten categories, one finds that the English Canadians are over-represented in the first (and wealthiest) four categories and under-represented in the four lowest (and poorest). French Canadians are the diametric opposite: under-represented in the first four, over-represented in the poorest categories."

Is the situation getting any better?

On the contrary. "Since 1941, while the English, Jewish and 'other' groups have been progressing strongly on the occupation scale, the Italian and French have been dropping just as dramatically. In the case of Italian Canadians, the reason for this disparity is unquestionably their recent immigration (new arrivals generally have the least money) but in the case of French Canadians, the drop cannot be explained away."

Beyond that, for equal work, the salaries of French speaking people are again lower than those of the English, and the gap increases with time, so that the French Canadians appear clearly handicapped in their ability to advance in their careers.

One might have believed that bilingualism would be profitable at least in Quebec. According to the economists, "the answer is overwhelmingly negative. Unilingual English Canadians earn as much as bilingual English Canadians while French Canadians who speak only English (the assimilated) earn considerably more than bilingual French Canadians. And bilingual French Canadians earn considerably less than unilingual English."

In total... unilingual English Canadians earn $5,502 while bilingual persons earn $4,772. In short, it isn't the knowledge of two languages that is beneficial to the French Canadian in Quebec, but rather the knowledge of one language—English.

"In Quebec," the authors add, "as in the rest of the country, it is better to be a unilingual English Canadian than a bilingual French Canadian."

And they conclude the survey: "English Canadians have very little reason to become bilingual, even in Quebec, while for French Canadians, bilingualism is a prerequisite to income. And even if bilingual, French Canadians cannot hope to equal the salaries of unilingual English."

I apologize for taking up so much of the time of the house in reading the article but I think it is important for hon. members to realize that when we say this country must plunge headlong into bilingualism we shall be enacting legislation that will help mainly French Canadians who learn English.

Another factor so far as the economics of the language bill are concerned which must be considered, this factor having been unceremoniously sloughed off by the Prime Minister several times when he was questioned on it, is what this two language splurge will cost the Canadian taxpayer. The cost will be fabulous, Mr. Speaker. Only last Friday the Ottawa *Journal* carried the following headline: "Multi-million Dollar Federal Plan To Aid Teaching of French." Goodness knows how much the entire program will cost once the provinces kick in their contributions. The cost of the program in terms of duplication alone will be almost inestimable. It is just another economic millstone around Canada's neck and a penalty we cannot afford.

We as Canadians are striving day by day to compete in this fast moving world. Already we have economic problems stemming from our living in perpetuity alongside our great neighbour to the south with ten times our population. Climatic factors weigh heavily in favour of the United States. Since we live on the northern half of this continent we shall never have the net income on an individual basis of our United States friends. I base that assertion on climatic factors alone. Why, then, should we saddle ourselves with another economic millstone as unproductive as a two language binge? These are serious questions, Mr. Speaker. For these reasons I implore the government and its supporters to look again at where they are taking us. These, too, are some reasons why I cannot support this bill.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): It is not my intention to speak very long, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the amendment for a very simple reason. It seems that the government and the people of Canada have gone far enough now—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member that to the best of my knowledge the amendment is not actually before the house. This might be a good moment to interrupt the proceedings

and invite hon. members to indicate to the Chair their views regarding the acceptability of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. I would be pleased to hear these opinions, after which I will be in a position to give a ruling in the light of this wise advice and counsel.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual amendment challenging at the third reading stage the constitutionality of the proceedings on a bill which has proceeded through virtually all stages before the House of Commons. I have not had the opportunity to do as much research on the authorities as I should have, but I offer for what they are worth some submissions on the admissibility of the amendment. At page 417, of May, 17th edition, it is observed that the debate on third reading is limited to the contents of the bill and a reasoned amendment should not urge the rejection of the bill on the ground of what it omits or, I assume, any failings that may attach to it. The effect of moving an amendment of this type would restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on the question.

I think it is the practice in this house, though it is difficult to substantiate it, Your Honour, because I doubt that it has very often been questioned, that a bill is presumed to be constitutional when before parliament and within the power of parliament to enact unless and until its constitutionality is challenged and successfully attacked before the courts. To use the issue of constitutionality at this stage to impede the progress of the bill seems to be dilatory and tardy, and if undertaken in a regular manner in the house would tend to render our proceedings null and void. It also brings up the question of whether the house can proceed with the matter once it has been submitted before the courts and become sub judice.

I also want to refer Your Honour to page 419 of May, 17th edition, where it is stated that at certain stages of debate, among which are listed the second and third reading stages only certain recognized forms of amendment are permissible. We are then referred to pages 526 and 527 of May's 17th edition. I am now dealing with what has been called a reasoned amendment, Your Honour, and I quote:

> It is also competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill—

[Mr. Speaker.]

When I refer to second reading, I think there are sufficient authorities to apply this to third reading as well.

I now refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 418, page 288:

> When a motion is made "that the bill be now read a third time", the same kind of amendments are permissible as on the second reading—

The three or six months hoist is then referred to. I take it, Your Honour, that my argument, if it applies to the second reading, would also apply to the third reading stage. I quote from pages 527 and 527 of May's 17th edition:

> It is also competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill—

I assume this also applies to third reading on a bill.

> —to move what is known as a "reasoned amendment." This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word "that" and to add other words; and the question proposed upon the amendment is, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question. A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper in the form of a motion and may fall into one of several categories.
>
> 1. It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

I submit to Your Honour that the amendment in this case does not fall within that category. It declares no principle adverse to the bill.

> 2. It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

I fail to see, Your Honour, how the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek can qualify under that heading.

> 3. It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.

That is the head which gives the precedent for delaying third reading and referring it back to a committee for further information. Of course, the hon. member has not sought that type of remedy. Those are the prime arguments, Your Honour.

I now wish to refer to some citations in Beauchesne's fourth edition which may be helpful to your judgment. I wish to refer to citation 202(10) at page 170:

> 10. An amendment cannot be made, by the addition of words, to the question for reading a bill a second time.

I read the words "a third time".

The same rule applies to the question for the Speaker's leaving the Chair or going into Committee of Supply.

I now refer to 202(13):

13. An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

I will now read citation 203(5):

5. An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

I submit this would then qualify the amendment as well. Finally, and this is usually a basket argument, there is the rule of relevancy. An amendment must be relevant and cannot raise a new issue. The amendment sought to be admitted by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek raises a new issue. It raises the constitutionality of the bill. It does not deal with the contents of the bill as such.

For these reasons, I urge that Your Honour hold this amendment to be irrelevant and inadmissible and not pertinent for debate at the third reading stage.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, believe it or not I had not intended to take part in this debate, but some of the things the Minister of Justice has said prompt me to say just a word, and the word I offer has to do only with the procedural aspect of the amendment. In my view the course suggested by the amendment is not necessary but it seems to me there is a case to be made for the hon. member's right to move it.

The one point I should like Your Honour to consider arises out of the fact that when the Special Committee on Procedure of the House presented its third report on Friday, December 6, 1968, it included in that report paragraphs of comment concerning second reading and third reading. The paragraphs are a bit lengthy, so I do not think it is necessary for me to read them all, but the first of those comments was the view of the committee that the significance of the second reading stage had been exaggerated in the past and that the decisive stage should occur later in a bill's passage after it has emerged from a committee.

Then in the comment on third reading—I am looking at page 433 of *Votes and Proceedings* for the date I have indicated—there are these words:

At present the third reading is seldom debated and has become almost a formal stage. Your committee does not envisage that a debate should necessarily take place at the third reading, but it attaches great importance to the preservation of the opportunity for debate at this stage.

Perhaps I should have commenced this quotation by reading the sentence before that which says:

This wording would indicate clearly and unambiguously that the final and most crucial decision relating to the passage of a bill would be taken at the third reading.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I think some of the citations that are in the authorities have to be looked at again in the light of the changes we have made in our legislative process. In the old days there were citations that said that some of the things that could be done at second reading could not be done at third reading and there were certain precise limits on the third reading stage. But if we have decided as a parliament that third reading is a more important stage, a more crucial stage, and if in practice we debate it more than we used to do, then it seems to me there is a case for providing an opportunity at this stage to raise an issue of importance to the bill.

I do not see that the hon. member has introduced something new into the bill itself. He is simply asking for a delay in order that something might be done before we vote on this third and final reading. I think I made it clear at the outset that I do not look favourably upon the substance of the amendment. Indeed, I do not think it is necessary, but I have pleasure in defending the hon. member's right to move it.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their advice and counsel in respect of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. Essentially the argument advanced by the Minister of Justice is based on citations in May's 17th edition, which of course have to be taken very seriously, and I think that the Minister of Justice was quite right in bringing this particular difficulty to the attention of the Chair. The argument of the minister is that this kind of amendment cannot be moved on third reading if it goes beyond the scope of the bill itself or, to use the words of May as quoted at page 417:

—a reasoned amendment should not urge the rejection of the bill on the ground of what it omits.

Although this is a good citation and one which certainly ought to be kept in mind at all times, I doubt that it applies to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. It seems to me that the hon. member is not suggesting that the bill be set aside on the basis of a proposition which the bill omits. He only proposes that certain action should be taken by the government before the bill is accepted by parliament. In other words, his amendment, to my way of thinking, is essentially a reasoned amendment. He indicates his view, in the terms of a reasoned amendment, why the proposed bill should not be proceeded with further.

There may be a slight difficulty in connection with the wording of the amendment itself. We have accepted in recent months a series of reasoned amendments, either on second or third reading, following closely enough the wording of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek but which had four additional words, and these would make this amendment read as follows:

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the government of Canada take such steps—

In order to facilitate future procedure I wonder whether the hon. member might be allowed to include these four words which would make this proposed amendment conform with the procedure which has been followed in the past, so that the amendment would read:

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the Government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said bill.

I assume that hon. members would have no objection to having the amendment amended in this regard so that this would be the way in which it would formally be put to the house.

I have to add that I had also considered the point of view raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Certainly some of the citations which appear now in May, Beauchesne or in some of our other authorities, Canadian, British or other, are not entirely relevant to our rules which have been changed fundamentally. The relative importance and significance of second reading and third reading have changed materially, and in this way I would think that citations which previously might have been relevant when dealing with amendments on third reading are no longer valid. Taking all this into account I would think that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek should be accepted as a reasoned amendment and should be put to the house at the present time. Mr. McIntosh, seconded by Mr. Gundlock moves:

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the Government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said bill.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I assumed that the amendment was going to be accepted but I had not realized it would be in exactly this form. However, I am still of the opinion that we have gone so far through this linguistic mess in Canada that we should not go backward now that we have reached this stage.

I have always been interested in hearing the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) when he speaks on this and other national subjects, and have been surprised at the similarity of view expressed by the two areas, the riding of Timiskaming in Ontario and the riding of Témiscamingue in Quebec. There is a great similarity between these ridings, and the hon. member for Témiscamingue represents about the same percentage of English speaking people as I represent of French speaking people. Further, over the years there has been a great similarity in the way the minorities in both ridings have been treated.

When I was a child going to school a number of French Canadians attended the same school, and no English was spoken in their homes at all. They learned their second language at the public school. Similarly, I know of many people in the province of Quebec, particularly in the Noranda area, who did not know French until they learned it at school, and then grew up to become totally bilingual. There has not been any particular difficulty in either of these areas, with the French minority in Timiskaming, Ontario, or the English minority in Témiscamingue, Quebec.

It is of interest to note the methods through which these people have been given a great deal of equality and, for a period of years, a great degree of assistance in developing their ability in their own language and in a second language.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to interrupt

him again. Perhaps I am imposing by interrupting his trend of thought a second time. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek has been put to the house. It seems that hon. members should confine their remarks to the limited scope of that amendment, at least until the amendment has been disposed of in one way or another. If there is to be any kind of order to our debates we must apply as much as possible the rule of relevancy. Inasmuch as this rule still exists in respect of our debates it should apply to the extent that hon. members should limit their speeches to the subject matter of the amendment before the house. After the amendment is put to the house and disposed of in one way or another members will then be in a position to make a contribution of a more general nature, having reference more directly to the bill itself.

Mr. Peters: Question.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to speak specifically on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh). It is the lack of reference to the Supreme Court that has created my greatest problem regarding this bill. Had the government taken steps to make such a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada in respect of the constitutionality of the bill, or had it indicated there was agreement by all the provinces to amend the British North America Act, requiring action to obtain passage of an act by the parliament of the United Kingdom, I might have been willing to support the bill.

A great many Canadians are bound to feel that the government is embarking upon something it has no right to embark upon. Many Canadians may well be deprived of certain rights they now possess. The leader of the Ralliement Créditiste referred to this aspect which is of such concern to me. He spoke of the constitutionality of the bill and asked why parliament did not have the right to legislate on the basis of the principle embodied in this bill. It was very obvious that the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste had not read the British North America Act and certainly had not studied section 91(1), which was brought about by the St. Laurent administration.

Let me ask the leader of that party whether he would feel the same about the government if it proposed a bill to eliminate completely the rights of French speaking Canadians as contained in the constitution, particularly in section 133? If the government did that there would certainly be great alarm immediately in the province of Quebec regarding those rights they have considered theirs since the British North America Act was conceived.

The St. Laurent administration brought in an amendment to the British North America Act. That government was told by many constitutional experts in this nation that it was putting a constitutional straitjacket on the nation by amending the act and placing section 91(1) in it. I must assume that at that time Prime Minister St. Laurent had more concern about the diminution of French speaking rights than about their extension. As a result of that concern he proposed an amendment which was adopted and is today part of the constitution.

To leave the impression with the public that there is no concern about the constitutionality of this bill is to deceive the public. When a jurist of the stature of J. T. Thorson places before the Canadian people his concern about the constitutionality of the bill, I would think the government would be quick to make a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada to clarify this aspect in the minds of all Canadians. There could have been no great objection to this bill had such a reference been made to the Supreme Court of Canada and that body had found the bill to be constitutional. Let me read from a speech delivered by Mr. Justice Thorson in Edmonton, Alberta, on June 2, 1969. He said:

> There is no provision in section 133, or in any other section, or in any law, that makes French an official language throughout Canada or gives it the status of equality with English as an official language across Canada.

Later he stated:

> It must be accepted also, that, except as provided by section 133 and perhaps in New Brunswick by reason of its recent legislation, the only official language in Canada is English.
>
> It is clear, beyond even a shadow of doubt, that this was intended by the Fathers of Confederation. The section guaranteed to the new province of Quebec, formerly lower Canada, equality of status of the French and English languages in the legislature and in the courts of Quebec and it guaranteed similar equality of status in the new parliament of Canada and in the federal courts.
>
> This guarantee was gladly accepted by the French speaking Fathers of Confederation. It is significant that this equality was not extended to the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There is no justification for assuming that the Fathers of Confederation intended any such extension. On the contrary, it is clear that they intended that it should not extend to them. This intention was deliberate. Indeed, it may fairly be

assumed that if there had been any attempt to make French an official language in the legislature or the courts of Ontario, George Brown would have left the coalition government of the province of Canada, with the result that Confederation would have been set back or would never have been accomplished at all. Similarly it may fairly be assumed that if any attempt had been made to make French an official language in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick it would have been strenuously opposed by Charles Tupper and Leonard Tilley. There is support for this assumption in the views expressed by Professor D. G. Creighton, our most distinguished Canadian historian.

I believe I can also say that if the Fathers of Confederation could have looked in on parliament discussing this bill within the confines of what they conceived to be our constitution, they would not have appreciated that it was the same constitution or the same British North America Act.

I realize that times are changing and that in times of change people arrive at a different appreciation of what words in the constitution mean. I appreciate that the Supreme Court of Canada might today very well give a broad rather than a narrow interpretation to sections 133 and 91 (1) of the British North America Act. That is possible. But that is not what we are talking about now. We are talking about a bill that, as far as I am concerned, is completely ultra vires the parliament of Canada until it has been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and a decision secured as to its constitutionality. If the government were as certain of the constitutionality of the bill as it indicates it is, there would be no hesitancy in referring it to the Supreme Court of Canada. It has not been referred to that court because there is real concern about its constitutionality.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has a smile on his face. I say to him that Mr. Justice Thorson was a former minister in a Liberal administration who was appointed by a Liberal government to the second highest judicial office in the land, and I think his attitude and opinion should be given very serious consideration by a Liberal or any other government. Further, his appointment came about only after an illustrious legal career during which he was Dean of the Manitoba Law School.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This matter is not as simple as the government would have the public believe. It is serious because I believe this institution is not competent to consider the legislation without first having its constitutionality clarified by the Supreme Court of Canada. I believe the amendment we are considering should have been proposed as soon as the bill was introduced. If the bill had been referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and the decision of that court had been that the government had the competence to act, there would be no dissenters in this house and Canadians would believe, rightfully so, that the government could legislate as it intends to legislate. But because the bill has not been referred to that court and there are grave fears in the minds of many Canadians as to its result, I have no hesitation in opposing it. Indeed, my conscience would not allow me to do otherwise.

I appreciate the words of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. I realize that his amendment will be defeated, but I shall support it. I am pleased the amendment is before the house because at least future generations of Canadians will appreciate that every attempt was made to secure clarification of the constitutional aspect of the bill. Some people may be misguided into thinking that an attempt may be made by an individual to challenge before the Supreme Court of Canada the constitutionality of the bill. The government is well aware that this cannot be done. As far as I know, only the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have enabling legislation with which to attack the constitutionality of the bill. No individual Canadian can do this before the Supreme Court of Canada. Therefore we will be placed in the position where there will never be a clarification of the constitutionality of the bill. There will always be a cloud hanging over the bill because Canadians were not allowed to be informed by the Supreme Court of Canada since this government would not act in the interest of all Canadians and be certain of its rights. As a result, I shall support the amendment. Although I anticipate it will be defeated, I hope it will pass.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise for just two or three minutes to say that we cannot support the amendment, and to give very briefly our reasons for taking this position. First of all, it is clear from the speeches in favour of the amendment that hon. gentlemen are trying to persuade parliament to express doubts about the constitutionality of the bill that is before us. In other words, if the amendment were passed parliament would be saying that we do not really believe the bill is within the competence of parliament to pass. I notice that the hon.

member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) nods his head.

Hon. gentlemen are trying to get parliament to say at this stage that the bill is not within our constitutional competence. I respectfully suggest that this is an impossible position for members to take. We gave the bill second reading and referred it to a committee of the house. We have, in fact, said that the bill is within our competence. To ask us now to say it is not within our competence seems to me to be something parliament cannot do at this stage.

Second, I disagree with the hon. member when he suggests that unless the government refers the bill to the Supreme Court of Canada for a decision before it is passed there can never be any settling of the constitutional point, if there is such a point. I shall suggest in a moment that in my view there is no constitutional problem. However, surely the hon. gentleman is wrong in that respect. I know that the province of Ontario has an act which enables it to refer a constitutional matter to the appropriate court. To my knowledge most of the provinces of Canada have such legislation. It would certainly be possible for any individual affected by the operations of this act, if he has occasion to take the matter to court, to raise the constitutional validity of any section of the act that is related to his particular situation.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Coates: Will the hon. member permit a question? In view of the fact that the hon. member sat through the debate in the special committee that was set up for the purpose of considering the bill, would he give me an example of how a Canadian citizen may be able to challenge its constitutionality before the courts?

Mr. Lewis: Let us assume for a moment that someone is adversely affected by the operation of this act and thinks he has a case which he can take to court on a motion for an injunction to stop the deputy minister from doing something to him as the result of a report of the commissioner, or any such set of circumstances, and that citizen of Canada went to court; he could challenge the validity of a particular section or the whole act which has affected him adversely. There are all sorts of ways in which this matter could come to court for a constitutional decision if the occasion arose.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This is how lawyers make their living.

Mr. Lewis: Unfortunately that is so. I do not claim to be a constitutional expert but I simply cannot accept the argument that this bill is in any way contrary to section 133 of the B.N.A. Act or to section 91(1) of the same act. It seems to me that the bill in no way impinges on the provisions of those sections and is limited strictly to operations within the federal departments and within the federal sphere of constitutional competence.

As a lawyer I do not share the fears that some people have expressed about the constitutionality of the bill that is before us. In any case, since when has parliament had to make such a decision at the stage of a bill at which we are now? That decision was made by the government on the basis of the opinion received from the law officers of the Crown and whatever other opinions they sought. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) travelled across the country and met with the Attorneys General of the provinces, as a result of which certain amendments were proposed to the special committee, and later adopted, to meet some of the objections that were raised. I repeat that since parliament has already passed this bill on second reading and therefore said that it is within its competence to deal with this measure, it seems to me illogical for parliament to say now that we should reverse ourselves on that point, which is what the amendment in effect means. I can understand the present amendment being one way of attacking the bill if one is opposed to it, as some hon. members are, but the majority which supported the bill in principle on second reading cannot, it seems to me, accept such an approach.

I want to add that in my view the injection into this discussion and into the discussion across the country of the legal point of whether or not there may be constitutional objections to this bill does not do a service either to the law which we are attempting to put through the house or to the objectives which we are attempting to achieve, assuming that those objectives are achieved by the bill which is now before us. I do not think it serves the purpose of Canadian unity or Canadian understanding to insist that parliament deal with this measure, not on the basis of the principles involved in the measure, not on the basis of the means provided in the measure to deal with the question of language rights in this country, but on the basis of an argument about whether or not the bill is constitutional. Some of us, who are perhaps as competent as others, are firmly of the opinion that there is no constitutional obstacle

to this bill. Others, equally competent are of the opinion that there is. That is something which may be decided in the future by some court, if the matter is brought to court. However, I suggest that is not something on which the house should spend very much time.

Our problem is to deal with this bill in terms of the objectives it seeks to accomplish for greater unity and greater understanding among Canadians. Our purpose is to see to it that the bill is implemented in a way which will promote greater unity and understanding and not implement it in a way which may cause even more divisiveness in the future than we have had in the past. I submit that these are the purposes to which our attention should be directed, and they are the purposes to which our attention has been directed. A good many of the amendments moved by members of the official opposition and by some of us have been directed to making the bill better from the point of view of the objective of national unity and national understanding. That should be our purpose in this parliament, not a rather arid legal argument.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about the amendment.

Since the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) has asked me what stand I would take if this bill meant to abolish the French language in Canada—it seems that he wants to imply that the bill under consideration tends to abolish the use of the English language in Canada—I shall answer him that it is not at all the purpose of this bill.

The amendment is intended to refer the bill to the supreme court or to a court authorized to decide upon its constitutionality.

Mr. Speaker, let the hon. member from Nova Scotia compare the situation which prevails now in his province, where there are conflicts with regard to the French language, with that which is found in Quebec.

Was it necessary to appeal to the Canadian constitution to have both official languages respected in the province of Quebec? If somebody attempted to abolish one of the two languages in the province of Quebec—the English language for instance—the hon. member would be the first to say we are mentally retarded and that we do not understand the importance of national unity.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Does this concept of unity, Mr. Speaker, apply to the sole province of Quebec? In that case, I would be the first to object to discontinuing the teaching of English in Quebec. In my opinion, and from the point of view of constitutionality, the province of Quebec should follow the example of Nova Scotia where they abolished in 1864 the use of the French language at school.

In 1871, French was abolished in the New Brunswick schools. In 1890, it was abolished, as an official language, in Manitoba. In 1915, French was abolished, for all practical purposes, in Ontario schools. Was the constitution invoked at that time?

If, in Quebec, an attempt had been made at that time to abolish the English language, would the hon. member not have risen against the fact that the English were being discriminated against? He would not have cared a hoot about the constitution.

But, at this time when the leader of the Progressive Conservative party accepts the principle of the two official languages, we still find some mentally retarded in the Conservative party who would prevent national unity at any cost, by launching a useless debate here in the house which once again will incite the English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians to tear each other apart, while the problem in Canada is not one of languages but one of economics.

Even if the right to two official languages throughout Canada were to be recognized, the retarded member for Cumberland-Colchester North would not be obliged to learn French. I hope he never learns it because he does not deserve to know two languages.

Mr. Speaker, there are limits to being spoken to in this way. The Progressive Conservative party cannot even agree on that matter. Why not? Because there are people who are trying to play politics with the question of the official languages.

Mr. Speaker, national unity must not be tampered with. The basic principle of national unity, that people be tolerant of one another, must be respected. But we find in the Progressive Conservative party disunity which spreads to or is felt in all the Canadian provinces.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by the Progressive Conservative member is a stupid amendment, which is going to widen the gap existing at present between two ethnic groups in this country. And that is why

the Ralliement créditiste is going to vote with all its might against that amendment through which, as I said, some members of the Progressive Conservative party are trying to serve their own ends and purposes by playing politics.

Mr. Speaker, some of the representatives here are neither French- nor English-speaking. For instance, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), is not British at all nor a Frenchman from France and he states plainly, wherever he goes throughout Canada that he supports the recognition of two official languages. I believe the hon. member for York South serves the cause of national unity in taking such a stand.

I think that we promote national unity, like the government, when we do not sing two different tunes, one in the West, the other in the East, when we hold the same beliefs across Canada, when we say that we are one Canada. And I repeat again that there is only one Canada and not two nor ten.

Since the bill is under study, it is important that the principle of the recognition of both official languages be accepted without the question having to be submitted to a court. Nothing in the bill compels an hon. member to learn French or compels me to learn English. However, the legislation is to the effect that he, English-speaking, and I, French-speaking, must be equally respected in Canada. What we want is respect for the individuals.

The hon. member said that when he spoke like that, he was thinking of the welfare of the future generations. Now, having heard these explanations, I think that if we continue in the same direction, the future generations will be just as backward as the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North was a while ago when he proposed his amendment.

There are limits, Mr. Speaker, to playing politics about a serious subject. I admit that we should be discussing other things than official languages at this moment when the economy is going downhill. However, since the bill has been introduced and since the government does not want to withdraw it, we favour the principle that both languages be officially recognized in the whole of Canada. We want English to be equal to French in the province of Quebec and that French be equal to English in Ontario, in Nova Scotia and in the other provinces so that Canadians will be united and our national unity will come true. Let us stop saying that this subject must be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada so that judges may decide whether hon. members can make decisions by themselves or whether they are in a fog, as the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North clearly seems to be.

[*English*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I wish to speak briefly on this amendment, Mr. Speaker. I tried to persuade Your Honour not to admit it but now it is before us I should like to speak briefly to it.

I shall not go deeply into the constitutional arguments because I agree with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) that this is not the forum in which to decide whether this bill in its finality is constitutional or otherwise. Only the courts can do that. But I shall summarize the arguments I attempted to adduce on second reading in the strongest terms that on the best advice we have, the advice of the law officers of the Crown and others, supported by that of the law officers of most of the Attorneys General across Canada, this bill is constitutional and within the competence of parliament to enact.

Two constitutional arguments have been raised against it and they were referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates). The first is that the 1949 amendment to the B.N.A. Act, which is now found in section 91(1), prohibits this legislation. That article says: that the parliament of Canada has, among other powers, the power to amend from time to time the constitution of Canada except—and there are some items listed—as regards the use of the English or French language. The answer to the argument that this bill transgressed section 91(1) of the B.N.A. Act is that it does not amend the constitution in so far as it affects the use of the French or the English language.

The second part of the argument against the constitutionality of the bill is that the legislation contravenes section 133 of the B.N.A. Act. Section 133 reads:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

This section merely says that in four particular situations it shall be open to any citizen of Canada to use either the French or the English language. There is nothing in the section which is limiting or restricting. There is nothing which says that the French or the English language can be used only in those situations. I would point out that if this were the case we would not have been able to extend the use of the English language across the North American continent. If that section is a bar to the extension of the French language it is equally a bar to the extension of the English language and this, surely, would be an absurd construction to place upon such a provision. The section is permissive, it is not restrictive.

Finally, since this bill relates to federal institutions operating within the federal power and within the competence of parliament, it is our submission on the basis of the legal opinion given to us that it does not constitute an amendment to section 133 and, not being an amendment to that section, it is not affected by 91(1).

This, in brief, is the answer to the argument that the bill is unconstitutional. We are firmly of the view that it is constitutional. But I am not going to decide it. No hon. member of this chamber will decide it. We have to operate, I believe, on the assumption that any measure which is put forward by the government is constitutional unless and until it is successfully attacked in the courts. If we were to operate in any other way we would never do any business here.

For the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North to say that if the Minister of Justice were sure of his ground he would have gone to the Supreme Court of Canada first is unreasonable, since that argument could be applied to any piece of legislation introduced into this chamber. Once a bill has been introduced on the basis of the best advice obtainable, parliament moves on the assumption that it is constitutional until some citizen who feels himself aggrieved, or some province which feels itself aggrieved—I trust it will not happen in this case—challenges the constitutionality of the measure. Parliament must go on the assumption that it has power to enact bills put forward, an undertaking having been given by the government that, on the best advice available, parliament is competent to deal with the legislation.

We have to urge the house to reject this amendment so that we can reach the final stage and decide whether or not this legislation is to receive third reading.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, at an earlier stage in this debate, following a speech setting out his position by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) who moved this amendment, I was obliged to differ from the point of view he put forward. In doing so I said—and I repeat it now—that I respected the sincerity of his motives. He has maintained a constant position. To use the words of Voltaire, while I may disagree with him I defend his right to say what he has to say and make his views known.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Speaking for this party, I must declare that we cannot support this amendment. I will give in two or three sentences my reasons for being unable to follow the hon. member's reasoning. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, in reply to something that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said may I say that merely because a government brings in a measure which has received the approval of the law officers of the Crown, and which it is advised is properly drafted and is constitutional, is no reason at all that the house must accept it. If I honestly and sincerely believed that this or any other measure was unconstitutional I would be derelict in my duty if I failed to attack it.

Outside the house I have attacked a great many statutes of the federal parliament and of provincial legislatures. In some cases I have been successful in persuading the courts that I was right. Without in any way disparaging the knowledge and professional skill of those who work in the minister's department, having been here a great many years I do not have that sublime faith in their ultimate judgment that the minister must necessarily have. Therefore I enter the caveat that if at any time in the future it is my honest belief that a measure introduced in this house is constitutional, I shall not hesitate to say so and to attack it.

In this case I cannot do so. The pertinent section here is section 133 of the British North America Act. The language of section 91(1) drives one back to section 133, and that is the section we must consider. As I see it, clause 2 of the bill deals with what in my opinion are the administrative rights of the federal government, rights that have been

exercised in one way or another over a great many years. In my opinion, clause 2 meets the pith and substance of section 133 of the British North America Act and fits within the scope and pattern of that section.

In my view, and in the view of this party, one cannot find that there is a conflict on this issue, and consequently that clause 2 of the bill and other aspects of the bill are unconstitutional, thus requiring a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada as outlined in the amendment. Therefore we are unable to support the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the amendment? All those in favour will please say yea?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment (Mr. McIntosh) negatived.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before the interjections concerning the amendment, I have been very concerned about how this bill has been received throughout the country. I had referred to the fact that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and myself represented the same sort of riding, his with a predominance of French speaking constituents and an English minority and mine with a French speaking minority and an English majority. Yet both ridings have met the same problem in similar fashion. It is also of interest to note that at least 25 per cent of our constituents are members of other ethnic groups, yet little difficulty has arisen in either riding. I would hope that this would be true in similar situations elsewhere in Canada.

Since I sometimes differ with the views of my colleagues I am often asked, and I was asked as recently as last weekend, whether or not I find it difficult to justify the stand I take on this issue in relation to the people I represent in my riding. When I was asked this question the other night I replied that this was one instance where I was not sure what my constituents would like the result to be. In fact, I am not really too sure what my own position is.

In my opinion the Canadian people should have faced a long time ago the question whether or not bilingualism is desirable for Canada as a nation, though there are many other problems we should have faced as well. It surprises me that after all this time this issue has become so important. I have heard hon. members who have taken part in this debate declare that this bill will encourage bilingualism; I believe the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) espoused that view. In my opinion this bill will not encourage bilingualism; indeed, the very opposite may result.

This bill raises a much more fundamental problem, that of education. It seems to me that if we are to have a nation with a distinct culture, one tempered by the many nationalities that have chosen Canada as their home, one factor that will make our culture distinct from that of the United States will be our ability to speak the two languages. If that is a desirable state of affairs, and I am of the opinion that it is, then those who are interested in the subject must decide what are the educational requirements to bring this about. If this bill is used to promote a bilingual civil service, which in effect will mean that jobs will be allocated in the main on linguistic ability rather than on merit, it will be the most divisive piece of legislation the Canadian people have ever had to face. On the other hand, if we are tolerant and make it possible for all areas of Canada to benefit from bilingual education, this bill will have been worth while. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is interested in this subject. If all our school children are to become fully bilingual the federal government may have to step into the field of education.

• (5:00 p.m.)

At present the regulations with respect to bilingualism seem somewhat discriminatory and senseless. I have seen some public service employment application forms, and I was interested the other day to see that a dietitian working for the government has to be bilingual. I do not know much about dietitians, my experience of them having been confined to the armed services. I and my friends always look upon dietitians as people who make up bland diets. Why a dietitian needs to be bilingual I do not know. About the only benefit in having a bilingual dietitian is that

she will understand the abuse that is hurled at her in both languages. It is clear, therefore, that the authorities will have to exercise discretion in the selection of applicants for appointments. A bilingual candidate need not necessarily be the best candidate for the job.

I live in an area which to all intents and purposes is bilingual. Not long ago a man was moved out of my area to another area in which he will not need to speak both languages. Unless that man can perform his job satisfactorily to begin with, it will not matter whether he is fluent in one or both languages because his services will satisfy no one. I remember an occasion not long ago when several young French speaking people were compaining about certain problems having to do with unemployment insurance and the local manpower centre in my area. They came to me with their troubles and I asked them who it was they had dealt with. They told me. Evidently they had been to see a French Canadian who was not much good at his job. In the end I told them to go to somebody else. They went to that man, discussed their problem and it was solved. I have mentioned this incident merely to illustrate the fact that if you want a job well done you must hire qualified personnel and that it does not matter whether the person you are hiring speaks one language or two languages. Of predominant importance is that person's ability to do the job well.

On a number of occasions I have heard of men who think that because they are fluently bilingual they are in some ways superior to the rest of us. They expect to receive preferential treatment when they apply for jobs. People like that are not interested in bilingualism as such; they are only interested in promoting their own advancement. That sort of thing we do not need. This bill only transforms into law what has been happening in Ottawa and in the public service for several years. For many years the public service has been hiring increasing numbers of bilingual employees, the idea being to develop bilingual services in various departments of government. That seems to be a good idea and, frankly, I do not see why we should not extend the philosophy underlying bilingualism right across Canada.

I believe that all our school children should be taught to speak French. But when some of our public school teachers who teach our youngsters French are put alongside French speaking people, one finds that the French teachers and the French speaking people cannot talk to each other. Clearly we are not teaching our school children conversational French, and we should be. If we do not teach our children conversational French we will not teach them to be truly bilingual, and we will all be the losers.

Although I have been perturbed at the utterances of some hon. members on the other side of the house with regard to what this bill is to accomplish, I must say it is my impression that French speaking and English speaking Canadians are broadminded enough to put aside their prejudices in an attempt to make this legislation work. Fundamentally, all the people of this country will have to decide whether the concept of bilingualism is to work. If we are to become a bilingual nation we shall have to create a federal department of education so that both languages may be taught to all Canadians from coast to coast. We shall have to begin training our youngsters in kindergarten when they are five years old. All our children must become like the children of an hon. member of this house whom I have known for many years. Only recently did I realize that his family was equally at home in either language. That is how well trained all our children must be. As I said, our French teachers must teach our children conversational as well as written French if our children are to become bilingual. Our schools will have to use a system similar to that used by the Berlitz school of languages. Unless we treat all Canadians equally and give them all a chance to learn the two languages, we shall merely be legislating preferential treatment for one limited group.

All political parties will have to consider how best to implement the policy of bilingualism. The question is, do we or do we not want to become a bilingual country? That is the major problem we must face, and unless we face it and solve it adequately I say that this bill could cause unlimited division. Nothing but bad feeling will flow from any policy which insists that jobs be allocated on a language basis.

A few minutes ago I was speaking to an hon. member who told me that a man who applied to the Public Service Commission for a job was turned down on the ground that his name was too English-sounding. They wanted a bilingual person to fill the job and his name sounded too English. The hon. member took

this matter up with the commission and indicated that the man had been an instructor in French at McGill, had taught in the government's language school for one year and was the head of the French department in a United States university. The people in the Public Service Commission probably did not read his application but only his name. I suggest that if that kind of result flows from this bill we will have divisions which will cause the type of concern that some hon. members have shown.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I hope the minister responsible for the administration of the bill will use every discretion possible. I hope there will be no need for the commissioner to investigate individual problems because every time a problem is investigated, whether it is satisfactorily concluded or not, everyone in that department will know about it. In my opinion this type of concern will lead to divisions that will be very hard to heal.

Members of the House of Commons and the press should give serious consideration over the next few years to this problem. It can only be solved if the federal government will provide the educational facilities in all schools in Canada so that the next generation, although they may not avail themselves of it, will at least have the opportunity to be bilingual, something which most of us in my generation were denied.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to recognizing the hon. member for Vegreville, I wish to advise the house of the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social Security—increased pensions to meet cost of living; the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert)—Agriculture—income of Quebec manufactured milk producers; the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Health and Welfare—call for services of medical doctors.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROVISIONS RESPECTING STATUS AND USE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER, ETC.

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau for the third reading of Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on third and final reading of this measure, it is not my intention to add further to the bitter feelings already stirred up by its introduction. Further, it certainly is not my intention to fan the fires of racial animosity or attempt to increase the damage to national unity. Indeed, it is because this legislation does these very things that I have serious reservations about it. I believe this bill has aroused unnecessary bitterness and controversy and has seriously undermined the high degree of national unity achieved in Canada prior to its introduction. I think this bill represents a retrograde step because it will stir up more animosity than it will overcome. It will erect a series of artificial boundaries within this country when the great need is to remove barriers that already exist.

I seriously question the theory of bilingual districts incorporated in this legislation. I maintain that it will tend to segregate rather than unite, consequently doing more damage to racial relations at the community level, and it is upon relations at the community level that national unity rests.

In the past we have had our full share of ethnic, religious and social differences, but over the years these were largely overcome. By 1967, the 100th anniversary of Confederation, these differences were well on the way to being completely removed. That year, in fact, brought a tremendous upsurge of national feeling, of love for Canada, one country and one people. It was the time of real birth of a Canadian nationality. Introduction of this bill by the government and the subsequent discussion of it have plunged us back and precipitated a new wave of suspicion and distrust.

As I have said, throughout the past 100 years, certainly there have been differences among the people of this country—social differences, religious differences and linguistic differences. However, and I speak here of western Canada, at no time has there been deliberate discrimination against any minority

group by any majority, most certainly not against those of French origin. All have been treated equal, with no special rights or privileges, all working in a spirit of co-operation, sincerely desirous of building a great country founded on a multicultural mosaic wherein each group is given the opportunity to add to its character.

We in the west can in no way be attached to the so-called guilt complex of discrimination which seems to exist in the central part of Canada and resulted in bringing forth this legislation. The people of our land are of some 40 different origins. People came to this country of their own free will, with nothing but their own two hands and the desire and courage to make this country their homeland. These people have since intermarried. They have raised their families with one thing in mind, the promoting of Canadianism. The last thing that is considered is the brand of hyphenated Canadian that one is. In my part of the country there is only one kind of citizen, whatever his origin may be, and that is Canadian. There is no place in this country for second class citizens.

I believe that this bill has a tendency to create two categories of citizenship. For this reason I take particular objection to clause 38. We in the Conservative Party tried to amend it in order that the numerous members of Canada's third force might feel they have a place in the development of the nation's cultural life. But the government appears adamant that status within Canada shall be confined to two groups only, the English language group and the French language group. I know there are many hon. members on the other side of the house who feel as I do. Why did they not stand up and support our amendment? Perhaps they have been threatened by the powers that be and are not able to vote as their consciences dictate.

This bill is supposed to symbolize the government's choice of the multiple society over the melting-pot society. In my estimation its provisions simply ensure that instead of one melting pot there shall be two melting pots. Canadians of Ukrainian, German, Italian or Scandinavian origin will have no choice but to be absorbed either in the French melting pot or the English.

Another one of the principal points of this legislation that I believe should be made crystal clear is its effect upon public servants and public service careers. We tried to clarify the matter by proposing an amendment in an attempt to dispel fears of discrimination within the civil service. However, the government, which evidently has a monopoly on all good ideas, rejected the measure. The fact is that the bill certainly raises a great deal of apprehension among members of the civil service.

We heard one minister, a Minister without Portfolio, explain to a western audience that no Canadian will have to be bilingual in order to be appointed to the public service, or once appointed, to be promoted. He suggested that a bilingual secretary in one's office may suffice. Yet we heard shortly after and in unmistakable terms from the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) that henceforth bilingualism would be a necessity in the public service and the chance of a unilingual person being hired, let alone promoted, would be nil. I believe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should immediately give the country reassurance on this point and spell out in clear, concise terms just what this bill will mean to public service careers.

The general idea behind this bill may be fine and quite acceptable to all reasonable Canadians, but its detail and the cloud of confusion and doubt that surround its portable workings have made many people suspicious of its purpose and its operation. Certainly there remains a great deal of suspicion and doubt about the duties of the language commissioner, his interpretations of the bill, his administration, his degree of neutrality and his degree of scrupulousness, which we in this party have tried to clarify. We have been sincere about making this a workable, practical bill, but here again our suggestions and proposals have not been accepted. Why, Mr. Speaker? Is it because the government purposely wants to leave certain clauses and regulations vague in order that it may apply its own interpretation?

• (5:20 p.m.)

The Prime Minister has blamed the press for failing to explain the bill adequately. Surely the onus for explanation rests primarily upon the Prime Minister and, second, upon the members of his government. If there has been, as he claims, a misrepresentation of this legislation, the blame rests solely on the shoulders of the government and no one else. I believe it is the government's duty to clear up this mystery in the interests of the nation.

Why does the Prime Minister not clear up some of the fears and doubts that exist about this bill, particularly in western Canada? In western Canada the bill is regarded merely as

yet another in a series of concessions to Quebec. It is taken as further proof of the government's exclusive interest in central Canada. It is one of the prime reasons for the growing feeling of alienation from the rest of the country that is becoming so prevalent in western Canada.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons that in the series "Canada 70" conducted by the Toronto *Telegram* we find a majority of 52 per cent of those polled in western Canada placing their attachment and dedication to their region rather than to Canada as a nation. Is it because that part of the country has been overlooked, ignored and discriminated against? I submit that perhaps it is, and I suggest that as a result the bonds of Confederation are more precarious today than at any time in our history. However well intentioned, legislation that produces results such as this cannot be anything but harmful to national unity.

As I have said before, one of the weaknesses of the bill, and the one that seriously affects the majority in western Canada, is that it is vague in its guidance to minority ethnic groups throughout the country. It provides no reassurance or guarantee as to their status in the national pattern of living. It simply states that their rights will not be taken away but fails to open any doors to future cultural development or promise them a share in the cultural development of Canada. It excludes them and, I maintain, reduces them to a position secondary to that of those of English or French background.

If we are truly serious about maintaining and promoting the mosaic concept, positive measures must be taken to encourage, promote and preserve the cultures of the minority groups. There is nothing in this legislation to suggest any encouragement, only a minor clause to indicate that there are other languages and cultures.

My leader suggested a preamble to the bill in his remarks as recorded at page 8792 of *Hansard*. We moved an amendment and it was rejected. I submit that with this attitude it will only be a matter of time until the third group will be forced to assimilate into either the French or English melting pot, giving up their cultural and linguistic heritage which forms such an important and refreshing part of our society.

The just society announced by the Prime Minister finds no echo in this bill. The multicultured whole that was to be the new Canada under his government has been reduced to a severely restricted dual culture nationality. The Canadian mosaic is shattered by this bill, and the pieces will be swept out and forgotten when this measure is enacted.

Many of the people of racial origins other than Anglo-Saxon or French are Canadians by choice. They have fully accepted our Canadian customs, our Canadian institutions and our Canadian heritage. They have always demonstrated an intense loyalty to this country. Yet with this legislation we now tell them that by an accident of birth and ancestry they cannot aspire to a full life as 100 per cent Canadians. We should not forget, Mr. Speaker, that these people of whom I speak are a good third of all our people. Surely it is of the utmost importance to bring this third of the population fully into our national life and not exclude them on a part-time basis.

In my constituency of Vegreville where the population is made up of approximately 50 per cent Ukrainian, 30 per cent English, 7 per cent French and the balance of other ethnic origins, we are going to have a bilingual district. In light of these figures, what justification is there for creating a boundary which singles out a minority group and grants them special privileges? I wonder whether they are particularly pleased about being singled out and granted special consideration when they live within a community of understanding, of brotherhood, and in a climate of regard and respect for their fellowman regardless of culture, race, religion or creed. Their prime motivation is to work together on equal grounds as equal Canadians in creating a community of good will, a community of progress, in a spirit of good fellowship and understanding. How are those of other ethnic groups, who are a majority, to feel about such a measure being enacted? Nothing can be created but a mood of animosity and bitterness detrimental to national unity at the community level.

The government believes that this bill is essential in building national unity. I believe it could be destructive of national unity. I believe we should be trying to get back to the original concept of a multicultural society. I have always felt that one way to do this is to get to know each other better. The greatest enemy of national unity is the regionalism forced upon us by the pattern of our settlement and development and by our geography. It is this regionalism which creates areas of economic disparity. Canada is a nation of regions, each with its own peculiar background, nature and way of living. These

regional differences must be rationalized if we are to know true unity. One method of achieving this could be by large scale exchanges of young people between one region and another. This idea has been tried on a limited basis and the results have shown that it works. When I think of the millions of dollars that have been spent on the B and B Commission I cannot help but think how much more could have been done for national unity if the money had been spent on projects such as youth exchanges between regions.

Canadians of all ethnic backgrounds are Canadians, and they must be able to feel so wherever they go in this country. To the extent that this bill will help Canadians of French origin to do so I believe it to be a good measure. However, I wonder whether the bill is likely to achieve this end. I think the bill will only succeed in entrenching English-French differences while reducing the potential for progress that is represented by the third group. It is even more unfortunate because I believe that the best way in which the historic differences between the two founding peoples can be bridged is by the intervention and intercession of the third group. I see the great number of Canadians of racial origins other than French or English as a catalytic agent that, with good will and good sense, could be made a successful neutralizer of ancient divisions and a base upon which to build a sound, cohesive, multicultural mosaic.

I wonder what the Fathers of Confederation wanted when they proposed the Canadian constitution. I think it would be well for us to review some of the thoughts of our only living Father of Confederation, the man who once said that he is "heart to heart, mind to mind" with the Prime Minister. That man is Joseph Smallwood, Premier of Newfoundland, often billed as the only living Father of Confederation. In a recent proclamation during Canada Week he said:

> This I believe:
>
> That Canada under God is one of the most beautiful and one of the greatest countries in the world;
>
> That Canada is potentially as great as her people are great;
>
> That Canada is one nation, indivisible, where no race or creed has special rights, and where all are equal, English and French, Italian and Russian, Portuguese and Ukrainian or whatever the ethnical origin may be;
>
> That Canada is not a melting pot but a country where peoples of many racial origins can live and work together as unhyphenated Canadians, yet maintaining cherished traditions and distinguishing cultures;
>
> [Mr. Mazankowski.]
>
> That our system of government is a good system, and the best to ensure that all Canadians have equal guaranteed rights and equal opportunities;
>
> That there should not be a rich Canada and a poorer Canada, but that material well-being and the good life should be as equal as can be.

To me, Mr. Speaker, there is somewhat of a conflict between the ideals of that living Father of Confederation and the aims of this bill. I can only hope that those who are responsible for its administration will pay particular attention to these clauses of this proclamation in order that we may truly work together to promote and preserve unity within this country, the country I love—Canada.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): This is one of the most important bills ever to come before this house, because the future of this country may depend on whether or not we make the principle of this bill work. If I thought only about the legality of this bill I might worry about it, and I have studied a little constitutional law. I am not at all sure that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), or the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), are entirely correct in their assessment of the legality or constitutionality of this bill. I beg hon. members of this house to consider it from a more important angle.

Is there anything in this bill which might tend to bring us together? You might consider these to be strange words coming from me because from time to time, in my rather rasping voice, I speak in this chamber on controversial subjects and I am considered in some respects to be a backer of lost causes. I have been told more than once to get off my white horse and come down to earth. At this time I want to do just that for a few minutes.

• (5:30 p.m.)

There is something of value in this bill and that is the spirit behind it, if nothing else. Let us go back perhaps 100 years and figure out what it was the Fathers of Confederation meant when they gave the people of French origin the right to their own language. Let me beg of those people of French origin, not only in this chamber but across Canada, to remember the second group of people who granted these rights. I am sure if they remembered this fact half the problems of Canada would disappear.

This agreement was signed by gentlemen. They had faith in the future and great respect for that great Gallic race alongside of whom they had lived for something over 1,000 years. They had reason to respect that race. The

only successful invasion of the British isles was carried out by those people, and my ancestors were among them. I refer to the Norman French. These people learned to live together in England and have done so for 900 years. They developed a parliamentary system, about which we will have more to say during the rest of this week. The English and French signed an agreement 100 years ago in an attempt to carry out a bold experiment. They wanted to see whether they could live peacefully together after all the useless bloodshed that had taken place in Europe for years. They wanted to try this experiment on this northern half of the North American continent.

There are bigoted families living on both sides of the Ottawa river. In spite of this we have developed a great nation. I have a great hope and belief that this nation is not about to fall apart. Those people on both sides of the river who might do this nation damage are in the minority. Let us look at the legality of this bill and try to remember that gentleman's agreement of 100 years ago which began this experiment on the basis of a certain equality.

There are many things about this bill which could create great fears, some imaginary and some otherwise. The bill provides great power, and power could be abused. There are powers given by the Criminal Code in respect of the arrest of individuals. A bad policeman could abuse those powers. I know something about this, but I did not abuse them.

Let me attempt to take a positive approach. One cannot write a statute that does not contain powers which cannot be abused. Let me gives the government the benefit of the doubt in this respect. This may not be a perfectly worded statute but it does contain these powers which may create stronger fears in some sections of our community than in others. I have in mind those roles played by one party and another party over a period of years. The civil service has been supported by one party or another party, and this in itself is reason for fear. The morale of the armed forces has not always been excellent as a result of the exercise of political authority, whether or not the exercise of that authority has been carried out by bilingual, unilingual or multi-lingual people.

I intend to speak of something other than the fears often expressed by members of our armed forces. I have said all I intend to say about politics in this area. Let me move to a discussion of whether or not it is worthwhile spending a great deal of money—the price of a battleship or two—for cultural purposes. Is it worthwhile to spend this considerable amount of money to advance the French language? I have spent a lot of money trying to learn this language and have found it is difficult once you get beyond a certain age to learn a second language.

I hope the government will not abuse the powers written into this act by preventing a person who has spent the major portion of his life in the civil service from obtaining a well deserved promotion in either the civil service, the mounted police or the armed forces. I should hate to think a man who has distinguished himself in battle and risen to the rank of Brigadier-General could not be promoted to Lieutenant-General or a full General because his cultural aptitude had become calcified. It would be strange if that cultural aptitude did not become calcified over a period of time.

It would be very useful for a member of the diplomatic service to have two languages, or if one were selling corsets in Quebec. I do not intend to stress that. Let me return to the main theme. Within this bill there is an aspect of national unity. I have in mind one Canada, strong and free. This cannot be accomplished only by "Les Anglais", and it cannot be done only by people of French origin. This must be a team effort. This is something that cannot be settled by a third group in Canada, those who came here by choice. This is something which first of all must be settled by those of us who have perhaps neglected our duty in respect of our French speaking brethren. I have no hesitation in saying that our French speaking brethren from time to time have been somewhat lacking in their tolerance of us. I could cite an example of this which took place no longer than a day or two ago.

When we pass this bill, and I say "we" because I intend to vote for it, let us take another look at the whole situation. The passage of this bill will provide us with a new opportunity to go ahead in Canada in our 102nd year to show the scoffers that they were wrong. We want to keep Quebec in Canada, not to make this country strong in numbers but because we like the people of Quebec. This is not idle chatter on my part. If you come to Alberta, my province, you will see that in some districts at least one third of the population is French speaking. We like

these people; they are hard working, co-operative, aggressive, happy-go-lucky Canadians earning a good living. They are great people. Some of them are getting rich. At the present time some are not getting rich quite as quickly as they or we would like. But we like them as Canadians.

• (5:40 p.m.)

If we who are not of French speaking stock feel self-confident, then we need no special privileges. I appeal to my own people in this regard. The strong can always afford to be generous. I think this is a generous bill. If passed, it will bring up to date in Canada's 102nd year something which may well have been neglected in the past 102 years. Let us bring ourselves up to date. I appeal to those to whom the bill is directed to be generous, patient and gentle with us, as we hope to be with them. Nations, like people, are strong only when they are right. I believe it is always right to be as generous and as gentle as we can.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I shall speak very briefly in this debate. I support the intent and principle of the bill, but I do not agree that a crash program should be instituted at this time for the implementation of bilingualism, whether it involves the learning of the English or French language. It was stated before the committee that in the next four years over $7 million will be spent on this crash program. I imagine this will be the greatest underestimate ever given. In my opinion, bilingual education must begin in the elementary schools. Rather than instituting a crash program at this time in our history, let this federal money be allocated to the elementary schools system across Canada. I agree 100 per cent with my colleague and the leader of the Creditistes who suggested that bilingual education should begin at the elementary school level and not with the top civil servants. Having read articles about unilingual schools, it has become apparent to me that such a system means segregation rather than integration. It means we are compelling our children to be segregated by background, rather than using a forward-looking approach. We should have across Canada truly bilingual schools, with the federal authorities picking up the added cost of such instruction rather than the property taxpayer, who is now completely overburdened.

I am sure every member of the house agrees that there must be unity and understanding if this bill is to be effective. I believe

the bill must be passed and I shall support it on third reading. We all know it is long past due. At the same time, before passing a bill of this nature there should be attached to it an addendum to the effect that the full intent and provisions of the legislation will not be enforceable for a period of time. I am sure we all realize that many people have to prepare themselves for the change in system. There should be a period of time set down before the provisions of the bill come into effect, so that people may prepare themselves in this fast-changing society. I believe that if Canadians were given this assurance by the minister who will draft the regulations under this bill, there would not be the apprehension there is at the present time. In addition, such a provision would give the provinces an opportunity to effect an orderly system of education which is so necessary at this time in our history. This is my opinion. I express it as an individual and not as a representative of the party of which I am a member. If we are to have an effective bilingual education system, we should start not with older civil servants but with school children; we should make sure they are brought into the picture at an early age.

The federal government should at long last accept its responsibility and effect a federal system of education. There should be no hesitation or concern on the part of the government because of the constitution or anything else. Why cannot the federal government carry out such a program with regard to education? Civil servants, members of the armed forces, members of parliament and many other people move from province to province and there is no concern about the effect this movement has upon the education of their children. I believe this is a matter the house should consider. Liberal members opposite should have the courage to rise and suggest that it be considered.

We have been asked why one would support the amendments proposed to the bill. The answer is simple. The government, particularly in the last two weeks, has proven itself suspect in the eyes of Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is suspect in the eyes of the people of Newfoundland because of its complete disregard for the Terms of Union. It is suspect in the eyes of people of western Canada who are fighting to survive against great economic pressure. It is suspect in the eyes of the Indians because consultations are not being carried on with them. The government is suspect in the eyes of members

of parliament who believed there was sincerity in statements made in the house and they could place their trust in them.

This is why I believe amendments proposed by the official opposition merited consideration. Those amendments may not have been necessary to complement the legislation, but they spelled out in clear language exactly what the people of this land wanted. I suggest that the indifference of the government is sufficient justification for the suspicion that exists in the minds of many Canadians. Nothing is more damaging to our democracy than the mistrust and suspicion of our people, yet the government has accomplished that feat in just one year, and at a time when justice and understanding for all of Canada is urgently required if we are really and truly concerned about achieving unity.

I suggest to the ministers responsible for Bill C-120 that if they are concerned about unity in this country they had better do something about it; they should get out on the hustings, accept their responsibility and explain to the people of Canada what the bill is all about. I believe there is unity and purpose in Bill C-120, but the actions of government members, particularly those of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), will never achieve this desirable goal. The amendments that were not acceptable to the government were probably unnecessary in many instances, as I have already said. But safeguards must be written into the legislation if it is to be effective. I was particularly amazed at the government's refusal to consider having representation from every area of Canada on the advisory board. I believe this is an absolute must if the government is concerned about national unity at this time.

When one considers the smart aleck remarks of the Secretary of State, as reported at page 10823 of *Hansard,* is it any wonder that we are suspicious? I remind the minister that approximately one hour after his damaging speech on the bill, almost all his honey-covered colleagues put on the greatest demonstration of rudeness I have had the displeasure of witnessing. When the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) rose to speak, the majority of members opposite showed their rudeness by the interjections made at that time. The Secretary of State should consider what was done on that occasion before he refers to the rudeness of the opposition.

The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) asked a question in all seriousness. All we heard was sarcasm before any attempt was made to answer the question. I can assure the Secretary of State that he will hear a great many noises from one end of this country to the other if he does not show fair play in implementing the regulations of Bill C-120. This is a matter that concerns me. Once the bill has been passed, members of parliament will have no knowledge of the regulations under which it will operate. I dealt with this matter on a previous occasion.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I believe the regulations should be before the members of this house so that we can have a thorough knowledge of what we are really talking about before passing this bill. The principle of the bill is brilliant, but the regulations are not here.

I would like to say that I do not want to associate myself with the remarks made by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh), particularly in view of the fact that my constituency borders on his. In fact, a short while ago I was amazed that the amendment introduced by the hon. member was voted upon in his absence. It amazes me that anyone should introduce an amendment and not be here to vote on the amendment.

Mr. McIntosh: You know the reason.

Mr. Skoberg: I suggest that the people of that area are quite prepared to accept the principle of this bill but at the same time expect fair and just treatment from the minister responsible for the implementation of the regulations. The people of that area will give fair play if they receive the same treatment. I believe that deep down the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek agrees with me that we have in our constituencies the fairest minded people of all of western Canada. They are prepared to accept change if they know what the change is all about. But this government has failed completely to tell the house and the country about the change. They sat on their laurels and said nothing. They debated, they criticized, but they did nothing to let the people know what this measure is all about. According to *Hansard,* the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) in fact suggested that a member of this house was not interested in this bill and would have nothing to do with it. I believe that this is a disgraceful statement for a minister of the government to make. I can assure the minister and the government that the people of Canada are entitled to decide,

when the final ballot is cast, who their elected representative will be. When a member is elected and comes here he is entitled to have a say, whether or not the minister likes it. In the next election there may possibly be a change in the area bordering my constituency. Any responsible and sensible member of the house who is even remotely concerned about the nation and its unity must support the principle of this bill, and those who do not are intentionally damaging the esprit de corps of our great nation.

This government has done one of the worst selling jobs in history in explaining the bill, and no amount of explaining or passing the buck, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) suggested, will take them off the hook in this regard. I suggest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of this country, if and when he goes to the west, he will have a wonderful opportunity at that time to explain to the people what the bill is all about. I am sure he will hear many people express to him what they think about it. They are open minded, if they receive the truth from responsible people.

I am sure that all members of this house must know that the French and English speaking people are prepared to meet on equal ground as equals, and to have a mutual understanding to a degree which would surprise even an imaginative mind in this house. We have heard a lot of talk about imagination and about people not accepting each other. These people are prepared to accept one another, and most of them will realize that if given a chance. Our young people will lead the way in proving that this bill is workable. I have to remind the house that only a short two years ago a band from St. Jerome went to our city of Moose Jaw and in exchange a band from Moose Jaw went to St. Jerome. After these two bands visited back and forth, they found they got along very well. This does not amaze me because an intermingling of the two races is bound to bring harmony. I am sure that if the Secretary of State were to provide sufficient funds for student exchanges from east to west, he would find this so-called problem which he expects in some areas would not exist at all.

I should like to conclude by saying that the greatest danger which I believe exists with regard to the implementation of Bill C-120, is in having too many jackasses trying to fit either the French or the English speaking people into some patterns in our society. All that is needed is an opportunity for everyone in this country to live together in an economic atmosphere which will provide an equal opportunity for all, be they of English, French, Scandinavian, European, Asiatic, Indian, African or any other ancestry.

I am sure that the Secretary of State will realize that these people are really concerned about economic problems. They are also concerned about living together in harmony, and this will not be achieved by sarcasm from a member of the government.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I will take only a very few moments to express a few views that I have with regard to the bill and to relate what I gather are the viewpoints of people in my part of Canada. So far as I am concerned, I thoroughly approve the principle of the bill and intend to vote for it. I think that everybody in Canada who belongs to the two major races is entitled under our constitution to the provision of federal government services in their own language, wherever they are grouped in sufficient numbers. It is bad enough trying to figure out the intricacies of the Income Tax Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act in your own language, let alone trying to do so in some language with which you are not too familiar.

The hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and others have suggested that the government might well give consideration at a future date to the provision of services to new immigrants in their own language. Often people who are fairly well advanced in years and who have newly arrived in Canada have difficulty in learning a new language. They may learn it sufficiently to become Canadian citizens, but they are not fluent in it. If we are going to establish a program of expanded immigration into Canada I hope the government will consider the provision of federal services under the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Income Tax Act to new Canadians in their own language for a short period of time wherever the concentration of that one linguistic group makes it appropriate. I do not want to be misinterpreted and I do not want it to be said that I am trying to fragment Canada by language. I am not. My point is that elderly people coming to this country have difficulty learning a new language, and I think something might be done to help them if we wish to encourage immigration.

I am thoroughly in agreement with the principle of the bill and intend to vote for it

as I have before at other stages, but the administration of the bill is a matter of concern to me and to many Canadians. I have heard this from many people in my own part of the country. In my view far too much latitude is given under this bill with regard to the administration of the regulations by the commissioner. The commissioner is given powers such as were wielded by men like Torquemada and Robespierre. The hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) may shake his head all he wants, but this is my view of it, and I am also entitled to my view.

The editorial in today's *Globe and Mail*, a newspaper which is usually uncritical of the government to say the least, is critical of the government in this respect. However, I will not elaborate on that because I am sure that everyone either has read the editorial or is able to do so. The power given under this bill to the commissioner is very great. In my view some of the terms of this bill may well violate the Bill of Rights. The fears that many people have regarding how the provisions in this bill will be implemented will certainly not be alleviated in any way by the government's refusal to accept any substantial amendments from the opposition. A few minutes ago the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) pointed out that the purpose of most of the amendments put forward by members of the opposition was to try to improve the bill and to get it to work. However, the amendments were met with an adamant rejection by the government. Despite the eloquent, smooth and slick explanations given by the Minister of Justice many of us were not entirely convinced that these amendments should not be accepted, especially the right to appeal.

• (6:00 p.m.)

Additional worry in this regard has been caused by conflicting statements and remarks made by members of the government. As the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has pointed out, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) makes one statement, and other ministers make statements of a different kind. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) paraphrasing, as it were, a former Queen of France who lost her head, said: If they are not bilingual let them run elevators. Or something to that effect. Then, one of the heads of the public service division said that by the early 'seventies everyone must be fluent in both languages to obtain employment or promotion. No amount of explanation afterwards will allay suspicion caused by remarks of this kind. I am reminded of the famous speech of Lady MacBeth during her sleep-walking scene in which she said: "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Nesbitt: I heard someone say "six o'clock". I need about one minute more.

An hon. Member: Carry on.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to continue beyond six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nesbitt: Another thing which has caused concern to many of us is the unfortunate attitude of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) during the conduct of this debate. It has not done much to alleviate our anxieties. Nor has his peculiar use of mathematics in a C.B.C. interview the other Thursday evening. He said that if you were French speaking alone you would be eligible for 25 per cent of the jobs available, but if you were English speaking alone you would be eligible for 75 per cent of the jobs available. This makes 100 per cent. But what happens to all the others who have to be bilingual? I do not know where they come in. This kind of odd explanation does not reassure people at all.

In conclusion, I will simply say this: I hope the bill works. I think most hon. members wish it to work. But there is certainly a great deal of apprehension in the country at large as to the manner in which it may be made to work. I, for one, hope my fears and suspicions with regard to the administration of this bill and those who will be chosen to administer it, are unfounded. I certainly wish to enter one caveat in connection with my vote when I vote in favour of the measure. I hope the suspicions which are rampant in most parts of the country today are unfounded and that the government will administer the bill in good faith as has been promised.

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

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

Debating Time Allotment

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING TIME ALLOTMENT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the Standing Orders of the House be amended by adding the following new Standing Orders immediately after Standing Order 75:

75A. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to allot a specified number of days or hours to the proceedings at one or more stages of any public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

75B. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the Government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation; provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

75C. A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. Baldwin: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether there are two or three points of order or just the one. The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring Your Honour's attention to the fact that the translation system is not working and we have been unable to find out what is happening.

Mr. Speaker: I am just wondering whether the hon. member is complaining that he did not understand the French translation. He must have heard me put the question in English.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I have been reading, as you may understand, with great care and anxiety, and I hope with some benefit, the decision that was delivered by Your Honour last Thursday, July 3, and which appears at pages 10778 and 10779 of *Hansard*. In delivering your decision with respect to the point of order that I had raised the day before, a decision that is binding on the house and which is not being challenged in any way, Your Honour ruled that the point of order I had raised should not be upheld. However, as I construed Your Honour's words, I think Your Honour was ruling that the point of order had been raised prematurely; that what I had said at the time and been supported in by other members of the house was not sufficient for the Chair to hold that the government notice of motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council should not be transferred to government orders pursuant to standing order 21.

Your Honour went on to say, as reported at page 10779:

• (8:10 p.m.)

Once the motion has been transferred for debate under government orders it becomes the government's decision and the government's responsibility to decide whether it will proceed with its motion. It is at that point that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

I know Your Honour was not inviting further discussion, but I gathered from the words that were used that if there was merit in the substance of the point of order I raised I should be given an opportunity to raise that point again at an appropriate time, that time

being now. I could repeat the speech I delivered earlier but I do not think I need to. I have simply raised my present point of order because it may well be that Your Honour has further considered the matter and has further words of wisdom for our ears.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Peace River. I see the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) wishes to contribute to the point of order that has been raised. Of course, I would not presume to make a ruling without first hearing from the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to the anticipation rule. It seems to me that in the ruling Your Honour gave previously you agreed with the argument that had been made, which was that the report brought in by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) was one that he was directed to bring in by the committee. He was directed by the committee to seek concurrence in that report. This is not a private member's motion on some subject or other which the government can take over as its own. The substance of this report is one that has been directed, Mr. Speaker. I must emphasize that over and over again. There must be a clear distinction between a decision of this house and a decision of the government or a wish of the government. With the greatest respect, it is the duty of the Chair to enforce the decisions of the house and not the decisions of the government. I am not going to insist on that point any more at this time because I know Your Honour agrees with it.

There was a decision, as the result of which this house directed the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to deal with a particular motion. The committee did so. It came to a conclusion, and I am not going into the nature of the conclusion. The Committee then directed its chairman to bring in a report and to seek concurrence. I said the other day, and I repeat now, that the government, in trying to supersede the report of the committee, is actually in contempt of this house. It is the rights of the house and of all hon. members in it that must be considered, and not just the rights of the treasury benches. I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to be rendered by Your Honour will be very, very important. The committee report could have been the report of the Committee on Transport and Communications, or it could have been the report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. I was responsible for the insertion in the report of that latter Committee of two paragraphs which were highly critical of the government. Those paragraphs were accepted by the majority of committee members, including Liberals. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) may chuckle at that, but it so happened. But, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the action that is contemplated, that is if Your Honour approves of it, is that the government can take over any committee report; it can muzzle any committee chairman—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): —and then bring in an excised version of that report. If we couple that action with the allocation of time, which is the substance of this order, this house will be bound hand and foot, and delivered to the mercy of the government. That, Mr. Speaker, is not parliamentary government. This house is not the servant of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The first responsibility of the treasury benches is to parliament, and parliament must never be a mere rubberstamp for some ambitious ministers. Much more is implied in the point of order raised by my colleague for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), than merely whether the government can, by dressing up a motion on the order paper and adding a couple of words, take unto itself the report of a committee. I will not repeat my arguments, Mr. Speaker, but this is the clear implication of the point of order raised by my colleague, and that is what Your Honour must decide upon.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. members for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I shall restrict my remarks at this time to what I think are the two points that ought to be made at this stage of these proceedings. In the first place, I should like to confirm, by reading from the appropriate record, the statement made by the hon. member for Edmonton West that the chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization was instructed to bring this matter before the House of Commons and seek concurrence. Before I refer to the record, I wish to say that we agreed in our committee, once we realized we would get into a bit of a debate, not to rely on the minutes of our committee, since those

minutes are not a verbatim report but a summary written in paragraph form with regard to what was said. It was agreed, however, that we could refer to the record for motions and decisions. I draw attention therefore to page 148 of the minutes of our committee covering the meeting held on June 17, 1969. This is the entry:

Mr. Macdonald—

That is the President of the Privy Council:

—moved that the Committee report 75A, 75B and 75C to the House and that the Chairman be instructed to seek concurrence in the report.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): And how did the hon. member vote?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I shall refer to the record with alacrity and with pleasure—with pleasure, at any rate. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how under any organization's rules a situation can be tolerated in which a minister in a standing committee can bring in a motion instructing the chairman of that committee to take a certain action and then come into this house himself and move another motion that upsets the one he urged the chairman of the standing committee to move. The rest of the entry I referred to reads as follows:

The question being put on the motion it was adopted on the following division:

YEAS	NAYS
Deachman	Fairweather
Francis	Knowles
Jerome	Lambert (3)
Macdonald	
MacGuigan	
Reid (6)	

Yes, under the nays is mentioned that same hon. member for Edmonton West who just spoke. My hon. friend for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) was also on the committee. The hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out that this committee was acting in the light of instructions given to it by the house last December, those instructions being that it should deal with this question and report back to the house.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The committee dealt with the matter. It came to a decision that was a majority decision only. As I have noted, three of us, the only opposition members present on that day, voted against it. We did not approve of the report but nevertheless, when the majority of a committee has so decided that is the report of the committee. The crux of that entry I just read was that the committee chairman,

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), was instructed to seek concurrence in the report. He was instructed by a majority vote of the committee and it was on the motion of the same President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), who now comes into this house to move a motion to set aside the other motion, under which the chairman of that committee was directed to seek concurrence.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What kind of a deliberating free parliament is this? Where is all this talk about participatory democracy? Never mind what is being done to us on the opposition side of the house. We are being asked to deal with a set of rule changes which represented the will of the government only, but look at what is being done by the government, by the representatives of the treasury benches, to the Liberal members of that committee.

The instruction in the committee was that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton was to bring the motion before the house and seek concurrence. Before he could get to his feet to move it—mind you, he could have risen if he had not been told not to—the President of the Privy Council came in with this motion.

I said I had two things I felt should be drawn to Your Honour's attention. That is one of them. The other, Mr. Speaker, is related to something that happened this afternoon. Your Honour will recall that a third reading amendment was moved and that the procedural admissibility of it was protested by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), following which there was a bit of discussion. In the end, Your Honour ruled that the amendment was in order. Your Honour stated quite clearly that one of the reasons the amendment had to be admitted was that there had been changes in our rules. Many of the citations in the books no longer apply because we have altered the status of second and third reading. In support of my argument this afternoon that that was the case, I quoted from a few paragraphs of the third report of the special committee on procedure of the house which was presented on Friday, December 6, 1968.

I now wish to draw to the attention of Your Honour, hon. members, and if they will listen, the government, another paragraph from that same report. It is found at page 434 of

Votes and Proceedings for Friday, December 6, 1968:

V. The Committee—Structure of the House

12. It will be apparent from the recommendations already made in relation to supply and the legislative process that your committee envisages a significant extension of the functions of the Standing Committees and in consequence a substantial strengthening of their importance and influence.

How we are throwing those words down the drain, Mr. Speaker!

They would become the forums in which the details of expenditure and legislation would be closely considered. They would investigate the operations and continuing programs of government departments and would develop areas of subject specialization. We would expect debate in the Standing Committees to be well-informed and pertinent; their members to become influential in the areas of their specialized experience; and their reports to the house to assume a critical significance related more closely to the national interest as a whole than to simple political differences. We also anticipate that the business of the house would be greatly expedited and handled more efficiently through exploiting the potential of the committee system of the house to the full.

If we are going to do to standing committees what the government has indicated, Mr. Speaker, those words might as well be torn from the record. May I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the Committee on Procedure and Organization is not now just a special committee as it was last December, but is a standing committee of the house. In fact, we asked for that in paragraph 15 of the same report from which I have been reading, and I quote again:

15. Your committee believes that a Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization should be established with the function of keeping the rules and practice and the internal administrative organization of the house under continuing review, and that this committee should consist of not more than twelve members. If the recommendations contained in your Committee's Fourth and Fifth Reports are implemented, we would urge that this proposed Standing Committee be given an opportunity of reviewing the revised Standing Orders after they have been in operation for a certain length of time.

I ask Your Honour to put those two paragraphs, 12 and 15, together and note how clear their message is. This was a report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. It was not necessary to adopt this report because it contained expressions of opinion as to how the house should operate. It was the basis for a later report which provided for actual changes in rules.

This afternoon Your Honour agreed with the contention that there had been a change with regard to third reading. That change is reflected in this same report. Put those two paragraphs together, 12 and 15, and the message is very clear. We said that we wanted a new régime as far as committees were concerned. We wanted the importance of committee work to be strengthened, made more critical and crucial in the legislative process. We wanted members to develop expertise, specialized talent, in their particular fields. We wanted this to happen in all of the standing committees. With regard to procedure, we wanted the committee to have an opportunity to review the procedure and rules of the house so it could make recommendations back to the house. I submit this is not just exhortation. This is something the chair has to consider. There has been a change, just as this afternoon Your Honour had to say there had been a change with respect to the status of third reading.

I submit there has been a change in respect of the status of committees. They now exercise a more important part in the whole process of this parliament. For us to be faced with a situation in which a committee has given consideration to a matter, has made a report, only to have it completely upstaged by the action of a Minister of the Crown, is an affront to that committee. It is an affront to all members, especially those on the Liberal side, who voted for this proposition. It is an affront to parliament. We thought we were operating under a new régime.

Just as Your Honour had to say this afternoon that the old citations did not completely apply in view of the changes that have been made, so I suggest it is with respect to committees. Some new jurisprudence may be necessary. The facts are clear. Last December this matter was referred to the committee, which by that time had been made a standing committee. This committee was called upon to make a report. We spent months working on this and other issues. A report was decided on in the committee. My friends across the way like to laugh and say, I voted against it. I certainly did. I will get into that when we get into the substance of the matter. Technically speaking, the committee carried out its instruction. It brought back a report. It did so in the light of a new régime which says that the work of the committees has critical significance to the job that is being done in parliament. Then, we get here and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) puts this motion on the order paper which means that all the work we did last year in trying to upgrade the work of committees, to

make parliament function more efficiently on the basis of the committee system, was just so much waste of time.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I agree completely with the position taken by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), stated again by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), that this is not just a one shot decision. This is not just some minor point because we are involved in a fight over procedure, and I regret it has come to that. It would be far better if we were doing things by agreement, but this point involves more than a procedural matter. This is a ruling that will affect the whole question of how our committee system is going to operate. I am one who believes this parliament will work better if its committees are upgraded and are treated as important, and if the members on them, whatever party they belong to, are respected for the work they do. You will ruin it all if this procedure is allowed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my comments will be rather short.

Having heard the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on the point of order of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), we must draw some conclusions. Moreover, I was impressed by the argumentation of an expert in that field, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, especially when he stated that the work done in committee is becoming increasingly important.

Having read the reports of the proceedings of committees and studied the development of their work, I have come to the conclusion as did several of my colleagues that the work done in committee will have to be freed from the influence of certain ministers who wish to impose their views on the committees.

As a matter of fact, this is not the first time this year that we meet the same problem and we must agree that the point of order of the hon. member for Peace River is justified and acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, in the Votes and Proceedings of June 20 last, we read the following:

> Mr. Blair, from the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:
>
> Your Committee recommends—

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, this was an unfortunate decision, but it was made by a majority of the committee. However, Mr. Speaker, there is something else with regard to the proceedings of the committee.

What about those proceedings? The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), if I may use an expression I find very suitable in this instance, does not care a rap about that and goes his own way, just as if he was the one to decide, on behalf of the committee, of what it will do and how.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ruling you will give presently is, according to the Ralliement créditiste, of the utmost importance, because it will establish, in fact, to what extent the report of a committee is really consistent with the wishes of its members or those of a particular minister.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of sitting on the committee on privileges and elections. Sometime this year, that committee studied a problem concerning one aspect of the field of transportation. It stemmed from a report of the committee on transport and communications which, according to some hon. members, was not consistent with the proceedings. Now, the President of the Privy Council intervened in the house a few days later, to dictate a ruling concerning the report of the committee on transport and communications.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, the President of the Privy Council anticipated on the decision of the committee on privileges and elections. He assumed powers that he did not have. He passed judgment, which he was not entitled to do, and thus put the members of the committee on privileges and elections in a very awkward position.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore obvious that this situation has occurred time and time again, and that some day sooner or later a decision must be reached on the procedure to be followed. We feel that the time has come to decide to what extent the recommendations of a committee, since this procedure is becoming more and more important, must be decided upon independently of the will of the ministers. Otherwise, we will have to believe, or will be inclined to believe, that the will of the government with regard to the work in committee is the same as that which prompted it to propose Standing Order 75C which, to my mind, is dictatorial.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me

that very little need be said about the point of order brought forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in that it is really covered by the ruling of the Chair as recorded at page 10780 of *Hansard*. This ruling points out that the question of anticipation was not to be confused with the question of priority; that the notice of motion in the government's name was entitled to be transferred to government orders, and that at this point I would be entitled to seek priority for that particular motion. Therefore, I think the decision is quite clear on this point and little more need be said about it.

This whole matter will require few words from me because I do not think we need take seriously the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). They are two members who, according to the passage quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, voted expressly against the instruction to the committee chairman to introduce the committee motion. In other words, the two hon. gentlemen who, several days ago, found it expedient to vote against the introduction of the motion have now risen to their feet asking that it be called.

An. hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I hope it is true because I am only repeating what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre read out. If hon. members opposite insist I will be glad to read it again.

Mr. Bell: Read it many times.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I know hon. members opposite are afraid to get to the substance of this matter. I quote:

> Mr. Macdonald moved that the committee report 75A, 75B and 75C to the house and that the chairman be instructed to seek concurrence in the report.

That was the motion that was adopted. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) voted against it. So these hon. members, who several weeks ago did not want the report introduced in the house, are now complaining because it was not introduced. I think I can say on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side of the house that they concur in the notice of motion I have put on this particular matter. I believe they will agree that, while it is not verbally the same motion that the committee chairman was instructed to introduce, it does represent an improvement because of amendments made which will bring about greater certainty. The procedure now proposed will give the house what it did not previously have and, incidentally, for which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre argued last December when he suggested that this type of procedural change be not made by motion to adopt a report but by motion to concur in the actual wording of the rule change.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In committee of the whole.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In committee of the whole, yes; but I would point out to the hon. member that in 1965, when the then prime minister and house leader introduced a motion to amend the rules, he took no exception to the fact that it was moved by a minister with Mr. Speaker in the Chair. There is a good precedent for what is being done in these circumstances. I consider that this is the most efficacious way of dealing with this matter and, accordingly, I propose that we proceed with the motion.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of this ill-fated committee set up to make a report. I was not present at the time the vote was taken,—

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Aiken: —for a very good reason. If you follow the argument of the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), then the fact that I was not there to vote leaves me free today to criticize the action he has taken. If that is the viewpoint he takes, that is the one I adopt. I ask him where the Liberal members of this committee—the majority of six—are tonight. Where is the chairman of the committee? I see he is sitting in his seat, but why is he not moving the motion his colleagues asked him to move?

• (8:40 p.m.)

There has been no reason given to the house why this report has not been presented, and why the motion of the President of the Privy Council has been given priority. The committee spent many hours discussing a great many other matters than the allocation of time in respect of which the report was made. Many meetings were held and good progress was made. When the time came for the report the government was interested in only one item, and that was the allocation of

time rule. All of the good work done on the other items was allowed to go into limbo and will be allowed to die when this session dies. The sooner this session dies the better, in the light of the way it is progressing now.

Regardless of what the President of the Privy Council may or may not say, it is quite obvious that the only object in getting this report was to provide an opportunity to bring in the allocation of time measure. When the report did not appear to be identical with what the government wanted, it walked over that report and brought in its own motion.

Let me repeat briefly one point I made on July 2 when the issue was first raised. We are talking about a fundamental matter, and by that I mean a matter which goes to the basis of parliament. The House of Commons, when it is sitting, should be the master of the government, not the reverse. The house, not the government, set up the committee in question, asked it to consider various matters and report. This committee which the house set up proceeded to hold meetings. The committee voted on a majority report and presented it to the house. The orders of the house have been carried out and this report has been made. We now have that report on the order paper, and we are ready to proceed with it.

It is fundamental that if the House of Commons itself is to have priority and seniority in this country, the orders of the house should be followed and should have precedence over motions of the government. This involves a fundamental matter in respect of which Your Honour should make a determination. This does not involve just a matter of rules, but involves a matter of going beyond those rules to the basis of the power structure of this country.

Is the House of Commons the master of its own proceedings or can the government, by intervention, stall or stop these proceedings? This is a fundamental question which must be considered and decided in favour of the House of Commons. If it is not, then we have moved into the second stage of deterioration of the power of the people.

The first stage of this deterioration was when this report was brought forward by means of a government majority. I do not claim long experience but I have been here over 12 years, and for the last 7 or 8 years a member of most of the procedural committees set up under previous speakers. Each one of these committees brought forward a report. As a matter of fact the reports were unanimous and were brought in with no dissenters. It was never considered that this house could properly function unless we were agreed at least upon our rules. For the second time during this new parliament, which the people elected in June of last year, a majority report has been brought in without the concurrence of opposition parties. This exemplifies the first breakdown in the procedures of the house.

For many years we have agreed that committees set up by this house should consider and bring in unanimous reports in respect of our rules. The present occasion is the first example of a breakdown in this regard, to my knowledge. The government, having broken the first rule, is now proceeding to break the second rule by walking over a committee report on the procedures of the house.

This is not the report of a standing committee but the report of a special committee set up for a special purpose. It is essential at this time that Your Honour give very serious thought to the fundamental questions being considered. You should not consider this as just a parliamentary procedural matter, but as a fundamental matter on which the future importance of parliament may very well depend.

If Your Honour decides against the proposition we on this side support, that may well lead to a series of breakdowns in parliament, which in turn could lead to greater disrepute of this house. This may be particularly true if the government is allowed to overwhelm us by putting forward a principle contrary to the basic rules of this house. This is not the type of ruling which would be useful to parliament in years to come.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is a very basic and fundamental matter before you if you accept suggestions made by members on the other side. The basic and fundamental matter is whether or not any motion on the order paper does, in fact, rule out or prohibit the government from introducing a motion on the same or essentially the same subject matter. Obviously that is not so, because we have dozens, in fact scores of motions, bills and that sort of thing on the order paper relating to matters in many ways almost the same or at least dealing with the same subject matters as government legislation introduced some time later.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I agree completely with the ruling Your Honour made last July 3, that we must not confuse the issue of priority with the rule of anticipation. The rule of anticipation, of course, is involved here, but it should not prevent the transfer of this motion from notices of motions to government orders. That is what we are dealing with now. The second point that is extremely important is that after Your Honour was in the position where you transferred—as I said, in compliance with the decision you made—the motion to government orders, we were not dealing with the process under routine proceedings but were dealing with the sequence of those matters called by the government. Hon. members opposite will agree that is the proper thing at this stage. Then, of course, it is the prerogative of the government house leader to call any one, in any sequence that he sees fit, of those matters that are listed on the order paper under government business. That is precisely what is happening at this point in time. Therefore I suggest there has been no valid point of order outlined by hon. members opposite.

In this connection I would refer to May's 17th edition, page 400, which gives a number of prohibitions respecting the rule of anticipation and reads as follows:

> In determining, however, whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, the Speaker must have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the house within a reasonable time.

As has been clearly stated by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and other members who were on the committee, they did not wish this motion put before the house. Now, they are taking exactly the opposite side of the argument.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Baldwin: I never said that.

Mr. Olson: The record of the vote in that committee has been read out twice. They were not in favour of this motion being brought before the House of Commons. Having voted that way and having made that decision, it seems to me the absolute apex of hypocrisy to now argue for and insist upon the motion being brought before the house. In addition—

Mr. Danforth: What about the Liberal members?

Mr. Olson: That has nothing to do with the point of order; that is just a point of argument. In addition, as I am sure Your Honour is well aware, this motion is not exactly the same as the motion moved by the hon. member for—

Mr. Baldwin: No, it is worse.

Mr. Olson: That is the opinion of the hon. member for Peace River. This motion is not exactly the same as the motion moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). As has been said not only dozens and scores, but indeed hundreds of times, the government has to take the responsibility for moving motions under that section of the order paper which deals with government business. That is precisely what is being asked at this point in time.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Aiken: I ask the minister whether he considers that the order standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, is a government order. If it is not how does he justify its not having precedence under Standing Order 18, which gives only government orders priority?

Mr. Olson: Item 99 of government orders in our Orders of the Day, which is that part of the day with which we are now dealing, is the motion that has been moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), and any other motions on the order paper do not apply.

Mr. Stanfield: Why don't you answer the question?

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate because I had, if I may say so with respect, a great deal of sympathy for the position into which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) pushed Your Honour by putting a motion on the order paper. I was not at all sure that any contribution I could make would be of assistance to Your Honour in deciding the point of procedure. But I was raised to my feet by the arrogance of the President of the Privy Council—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: —and by the irrelevant insults of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: There may have been good reasons why the President of the Privy Council put his motion on the order paper. If there were reasons, I would have sat and listened patiently to the President of the Privy Council for having the decency and the necessary modesty to tell the house why he put his motion ahead of the motion of the chairman of the committee. Instead of that he said: I wanted to put this motion on the order paper. I had the right to do so, and you had better lump it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: It is this sort of behaviour that is souring the atmosphere in this parliament. It is this sort of behaviour that is making the people of Canada wonder what this parliament is about. I happen to be a relatively junior member of the house, and I have supported with all the strength I could the notion that the committees of the house should be strenghtened and given a more important role. I have made speeches not only in this house but across the country from one end to the other pointing out that the business of parliament has now become so complex, so difficult; that the issues before members of parliament are so numerous that it is impossible for the house as a whole to deal with all of them in the depth they require. The only way to overcome this difficulty is to strengthen the role of committees of parliament, to give them the necessary staff and the necessary status in the proceedings of parliament so that they become the avenues through which these important, complex and difficult issues are discussed and debated in depth.

This is what most of us have hoped for. This is what most of us have believed the committees of parliament ought to become. It is surely the duty of the government, above all, in this house, to see it that the status of those committees is honoured and observed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: In addition to the legislative duty of a government, it is the duty of a government to lead this house; to give the house a program; to see to it that parliament functions in a way which will promote the benefits and welfare of the country and the worthwhileness of parliament itself. That is the duty of the President of the Privy Council; that is the duty of the government house leader, namely, to assist this house, parliament and its committees to function properly. It is not his duty to step on the work of committees of the house. As I said, there may well have been a good reason why the President of the Privy Council decided that the government ought to put forward a motion to supersede the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair).

• (9:00 p.m.)

Why did he not tell us what those reasons were? If he had humbly said to this house "there are the reasons and I would like to listen to hon. members", it would have been better. But he did not say anything of the sort. He just said that the government wanted to put a notice of motion and therefore they did, no matter what the committee did.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has the nerve—and I cannot describe it in any other way—he has the unmitigated gall, to say to this house that what we are dealing with is a motion put on the order paper by a member and that the government should have the authority to put another motion in its place. If he meant it seriously, he was not thinking. If he was thinking, he was being hypocritical.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I give him the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Speaker, and say that he was thinking. He knows perfectly well that this was not a motion by any member of the house. This was a motion by the chairman of the committee who was instructed by the committee to put that motion on the order paper. What difference does it make how many members voted against or for it? Ever since I have been in this house, I have learned that there is no such thing as a majority report of a committee. I have been in the minority on committees of this house but I have not been able to file a minority report; the rules do not permit me to do that. All I can do is put out a press release and deal with the press outside. If anyone should know this, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Agriculture should know, that so far as the house is concerned there is merely a report of the committee—whether it is a majority report or a unanimous report is irrelevant.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure that the President of the Privy Council had good reason for making the Minister of Agriculture sit down, and I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture has learned to be sat upon before now.

Mr. Hees: Yes, knock him down, meat ball.

Mr. Lewis: In all seriousness, I am speaking in this way because of the annoyance I felt at the attitude of the two ministers in this debate. I appreciate the difficulty in which Your Honour finds himself. I draw your attention, as did the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), to your ruling the other day as recorded at page 10780 of *Hansard* where you said:

> Once the motion has been transferred for debate under government orders it becomes the government's decision and the government's responsibility to decide whether it will proceed with its motion.

The government has decided to proceed with it. Your ruling reads:

> It is at that point that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

As I understood the hon. member for Peace River and others who have spoken in support of this motion, they have drawn Your Honour's attention to your statement on July 3 and have said that now the motion has been transferred to government orders, now that the government is moving its motion, the question of anticipation becomes relevant. We ask you to say that the government's motion will in fact block consideration of the committee report, and that should not be permitted. As I understood it, that was the point of order raised this evening by the hon. member for Peace River, and may I say with respect that on July 3 you did not deal with that point of order. This is a new point of order which is precisely in line with the ruling you gave on July 3.

The sadness which I feel as I am about to sit down is at the way in which the work of the committees of this house, which were drummed up to be important and which everyone hoped would be significant, is being downgraded by the actions of this government which has the duty to make sure that the committees of parliament are in fact important.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with what the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) has just said about the behaviour of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) who, under his own authority, puts before the house a motion which is textually the report of the standing committee on procedure and organization, although that report has not been adopted by the house.

Mr. Speaker, what is the use of the committees if the President of the Privy Council can present to the house a motion which is textually—

Mr. Georges-C. Lachance (Lafontaine): No, no.

Mr. Caouette: The motion contains a few minor differences but it boils down to almost the same thing.

Mr. Lachance: The differences are important.

Mr. Caouette: The motion moved by the President of the Privy Council strangely resembles the report of the standing committee on procedure and organization.

So, as I said earlier, what is the use of having committees if at any time the minister can ignore everything and put himself before the house a motion that does not take into account the work of the committees?

For instance, has the President of the Privy Council any consideration for hon. members who sit on the committees? Are they mere ciphers? Are they appointed to a committee for the simple pleasure of knowing they will sit there and with no intention of considering the report they will make?

The President of the Privy Council presents a motion to set the new standards of parliamentary procedure. In my opinion, he is completely wrong in doing it that way and showing no respect for the wishes of the committee that presented its report on June 20 last. It was ignored.

And today the President of the Privy Council must face up to a situation which is unacceptable. He is afraid. It is all very well to say that the committee has nothing to do with his stand or his motion but it is quite obvious however, in the eyes of all hon. members, that the President of the Privy Council has disregarded the committee, that his action is meant to prove that a committee is totally inefficient with regard to the sound management of the nation's business. I would even dare say that the President of the Privy Council should apologize and withdraw his motion as long as the third report of the

standing committee on procedure and organization has not been adopted by parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of the President of the Privy Council is obvious. I understand that with a majority government it is possible to disregard the actions, decisions or recommendations of any committee, on the ground that the majority rules. However, if that is democracy, it is rather shaky and the President of the Privy Council has the duty to change his attitude with regard to the rights of hon. members who sit on the committee on procedure and organization.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the committee on procedure some years back and I have retained a cursory interest in this subject since then. As a result, I feel impelled to make a few comments on three points of argument which have been presented to us this evening from the government side. The first two points were advanced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and no doubt he intended that we should take them seriously, though it was difficult to do so. The third argument was advanced by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald).

The Minister of Agriculture contended that the government has the right to move government orders. This is a ridiculous red herring to bring into the debate on which we are now engaged, a debate which is being conducted in an extremely tense atmosphere. The right to which he refers is not involved at all. What is involved is whether the government is entitled to make its own substitute for something parliament has ordered somebody else to do.

On September 28 of last year this house ordered a special committee to look into certain questions of procedure, among other things, the allocation of time for debate, and to bring its views before us. The committee has now carried out this work. Whether we agree with its suggestions is not germane to the debate. The question is whether the government has the right to disassociate itself from recommendations which the committee thought were acceptable, and bring something like this before us.

The second argument advanced by the Minister of Agriculture was that the government must direct the manner in which the house runs its business. I say an emphatic no to this proposition, and I believe any member of the opposition would do the same. Indeed, I believe many hon. members opposite would share my attitude, though they have to express themselves secretly; they cannot present their true Liberal views openly on this particular point. I say it is not the business of the government to tell us how we are to run our own affairs. It is the business of each and every one of us.

We succeed best in this chamber when there is a consensus, and we succeed least when our course of action is dictated to us. I reject the reasoning of the Minister of Agriculture in this connection. The house must itself decide how to run its business. If it is not allowed to do so, there can only be trouble.

Finally, there is the argument put forward by the President of the Privy Council. He told us the Liberal members of the committee agreed that the government motion was the better one. What kind of an argument is that? As if these people, who had worked hard and long in the committee, would suddenly say: Well, after all, father knows best.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCleave: In the days ahead, when a large issue involving the freedom of parliament is concerned, or the right of parliamentary control of the executive—kings have lost their heads because they would not listen—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCleave: I say that in the days ahead, if the procedure envisaged in this motion is adopted and put into operation, the people of this country can expect no hope when they look to any member on the government side of the house.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether hon. members do not feel they have used all the arguments which could be advanced. Hon. members must recognize that discussion on a point of order is not for the pleasure of arguing the procedure but for the specific purpose of advising the Chair. I have a definite impression that all possible arguments on this point have been advanced, although I would not want to prevent hon. members from putting any further arguments which they might feel have not already been submitted. If the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) thinks he qualifies in this regard, I shall be pleased to call him and thank him for his assistance.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I always defer to your good judgment and wisdom, Mr. Speaker. I enter this debate not as

an expert on the rules, but as a backbencher who has seen two elections since taking his place in this chamber. Although I do not intend to go into all the technicalities of the rules, I do wish to bring out a few points which, so far, have not been brought to Your Honour's attention.

In the parliament elected before the present parliament, the 27th Parliament of Canada, we heard a great deal about the way in which the air of democracy had been polluted by the battles of the past. Regardless of partisan differences on questions of policy, especially at election time, we are all Members of Parliament. I read about hon. members opposite going into a seance at weekends with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and other members of the Privy Council to hold their lovefest or love-in. They came out saying: Now the Prime Minister is on our side; the cabinet understands us. Yet, within a week or so they are confronted with an action of this kind on the part of the government, and participatory politics becomes just a sham.

If parliament is hamstrung, every member on the back benches is silenced, no matter on which side of the house he is sitting. Members opposite attend their lovely soirées at the weekends—I am a little jealous, I suppose—and leave feeling that their point of view has been accepted—only to find themselves confronted with a proposal such as this, one which will profoundly affect the workings of parliament. We were told that parliament would recess on June 27. How misleading this has proved to be. I was a member of the former parliament when, as has been said, the atmosphere was polluted. I well remember speaking during tense moments in the early days of the 27th Parliament. Has a lesson been learned? In the first year of the 28th Parliament, for no good reason which rules 75A and 75B would not take care of, the government has decided to ram rule 75C through the house. They may succeed eventually. I do not know. But I suggest to Your Honour and particularly to the 100 or so members who came here little more than a year ago looking for the new politics, participatory politics, that as a result the atmosphere will again be so polluted that the present parliament will encounter all the pitfalls and sandtraps which bedevilled previous parliaments.

To turn, now, to the point at issue. The committee system is under attack. We ask the question: Is it a charade or will the President of the Privy Council be the puppeteer to pull the strings—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: I am sorry the President of the Privy Council does not share the enthusiasm and idealism of the hon. member for York South. Neither has he accepted the advice of some of the veterans on this side who have suggested that the fact our parliamentary committee system does not work is the responsibility of cabinet. If that is true, then let the cabinet inform members of all parties of this house that the committee system is a charade.

The present situation is the last straw. I should like to refer to reports submitted by three committees, of two of which I have been a member. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) knows more about the fifth report of the transportation committee than I do, but I would like to refer to the report on maritime transportation. While the committee was considering its report, the minister brought into this house the transportation bill without reference to the committee's report.

Then again, the Minister of National Defence, (Mr. Cadieux) honourable gentleman that he is, said that no decision would be made on defence policy until the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence had made its report. The committee went to Europe and had a very informative and illuminating tour, but I am not so naïve as to believe that basic decisions on NATO and/or NORAD and/or maritime command were not made before the committee submitted its report.

Then tonight, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Olson) who knows something about the rules, certainly more than I—though he did not display that knowledge this evening—set up a straw man. In view of all the wheat that still remains for him to sell, I do not think he should compound the problem by adding all the straw he built up tonight, to say nothing of some of the beef that he was distributing. Certainly, his performance was not a fair reflection of his knowledge of the rules. The hon. gentleman knows that the report presented by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) was not one that he composed himself, having sat and considered the matter for some months entirely on his own. The house gave the committee an instruction to bring in a report.

As the hon. member for York South so ably said, talk of majority reports and minority reports is hypocrisy. I have sat on committees with the hon. member. There is even one member on the other side of the house, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, (Mr. Allmand), who regularly issues his own minority press statement. But no issue has ever been taken over whether a committee's report is a minority report or a majority report; it is a report of the committee.

I suggest we might as well face the facts. Perhaps it is just as well that this debate is had during the first year of the reign of this Prime Minister in the 28th parliament, because it will show us how serious and sincere is the government about reforming the committee system. This debate will indicate whether the governments' action will constitute a challenge for the members of this house, and particularly whether members on the government side will be made to dance like puppets as the President of the Privy Council pulls the strings.

Mr. Speaker: Since there are no further contributions to this debate, I might try to make a ruling. For a while I was hoping that contributions would continue until ten o'clock, in which case I would have had further time to consider the interesting arguments adduced by hon. members in the course of this enlightening discussion on procedure.

I have to indicate to hon. members that, in my view many, if not all, of the arguments which were advanced by learned members of the opposition this evening in the course of this debate were essentially those which were presented for the consideration of the chair when the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) initially raised his point of order. He himself recognized this this evening, though I am sure that when he heard the lengthy presentations that followed his cursory submission to the house he must have felt a little unhappy that he had not taken the opportunity to repeat for the guidance of the Chair the lengthy and very cogent arguments that he had earlier submitted on July 2.

At that time I considered at length the arguments that were advanced by the hon. member for Peace River, by the hon. member for Edmonton West, by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. With the advice, counsel and guidance of the clerks and other advisers who assist the Chair in such difficult matters, I considered all aspects of the problem. Following this consideration I reached the decision that is recorded in *Hansard* for July 3.

I am afraid that the situation has not changed. We have exactly the same situation this evening as we had originally. I ruled on the former occasion that the motion that had been proposed by the President of the Privy Council for the consideration of the house should be transferred to government orders under the provisions of Standing Order 21. As pointed out by the hon. member for York South, (Mr. Lewis) I had said that it is at the point we are now reaching that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

If I were asked to rule on this point at this time, I would have to say that I agree that our proceeding with the minister's motion at this time does effectively block consideration of the motion that might have been proposed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

At the same time, I might say, having taken into account the arguments advanced by members of the opposition, that if the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton had moved his motion I would have recognized that the rule of anticipation would have given his motion precedence, that I would have allowed his motion to go forward in preference to the motion that is now before the house in the name of the President of the Privy Council. I would have so ruled in view of the fact that our committees have now taken on a new significance. Under the rules of the house and in the reports of the Standing Committee on Procedure we have given a new role to our committees. Since the hon. member's motion refers to the report of a committee of the House of Commons, I would have recognized that the hon. member's motion had precedence over the motion of the President of the Privy Council and, if moved, would have blocked the minister's motion.

However, the minister's motion is now before the house. Certainly the rules allow the minister to make a motion at the present time. The motion having been moved, I suggest to hon. members that it has to be considered.

Many other issues were brought before the house for the consideration of the Chair, though I am not sure they were entirely relevant. Hon. members want me to substitute my judgment and my ruling for that of the House of Commons. If a majority of the members of the house think that this motion

should not be adopted, that it should be voted down and we should proceed later on with another motion, then it is up to them to take this course. Hon. members should not ask the Speaker to do this on their behalf. My duty and my responsibility is to rule according to the rules that hon. members adopt and pass, and which they expect the Speaker to respect on their behalf. I think it might be a dictatorial act on the part of the Chair to assume the responsibility that hon. members are suggesting be placed on its shoulders, and I am not prepared to do so. As the servant of the house I must respect the rules. Therefore, I suggest to hon. members that the motion is properly before the house at this time and must be considered.

Whether I approve of the procedure, whether I think it is in accord with the new and exalted role that we would like to assign to our committees, is another matter. I am not sure whether I am entitled to have an opinion about this; certainly if I do have one I cannot tell the house what it is. I will humbly and with good grace accept the role which hon. members accord to their Speaker and be the servant of the house, rule according to the rules which they themselves have adopted, and say that this motion is properly before the house at this time.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on another point of order. I now wish to place before Your Honour the second of the three points of order I wish to raise with regard to this particular issue. Your Honour has decided on one and we have no recourse except to consider what action the house may take with respect to an hon. member who, as chairman of a committee, has not carried out instructions the house gave to him. My second point relates to an entirely different point of order. The house is asked to consider and adopt the recommendation of the standing committee of this house. It is also asked to adopt a motion of the President of the Privy Council. I submit to Your Honour that the motion is out of order in as much as it proposes that this house shall adopt a Standing Order already rejected by this house in this session as a substantive part of proposed standing order 16A which was negatived on December 20, 1968. Many hon. members in this house, and many outside the house have noticed a striking similarity between the government's present proposed order and the order which was negatived. On December 20, 1968, the order was read for resuming debate on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) the order being that the fourth report of the special committee on procedure of the house, presented to the house on Friday, December 4, 1968, be concurred in.

With the unanimous consent of this house the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) moved, and I quote:

> That the motion be amended by inserting . . . after the words "Procedure of the House," the words "except the proposal with respect to the proposed Standing Order 16A".

I repeat the last words, "except the proposal with respect to the proposed Standing Order 16A". It is now well known that the motion of the President of the Privy Council was agreed to. The main motion as amended was agreed to. That motion, as amended, then read:

> That the Fourth Report of the Special Committee on Procedure of the House, except the proposal with respect to the Standing Order 16A, presented to the House on Friday, December 6, 1968, be concurred in.

The report, as so amended, was then concurred in. The standing orders proposed in that report are now in effect, except standing order 16A. The house made its will known last year. Obviously, the main motion as amended put a positive question and a negative question, and to these questions the house answered that it did not concur in the committee's recommendation to adopt rule 16A but that it did concur in the remainder of the committee's recommendation. If it had been intended that no decision be taken on rule 16A, the procedure exists under which this matter could have been deleted or withdrawn.

The rule of the United Kingdom House of Commons which was adopted on April 2, 1604, is as follows:

> That a question being once made, and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again, but must stand as a judgment of the House.

That rule has been accepted in this house over and over again. In the face of the judgment of this house made last December that rule 16A should be negatived, the house is now being asked to adopt rules 75A, 75B and 75C. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that essentially the two proposed standing orders are the same. Each provides a procedure under which a minister of the Crown may, subject to agreement or consultation with a designated committee or group, bring in or move a time allocation order. In the case of rule 16A,

he could do that with respect to all the business of the house, including public bills, and in the case of rules 75A, 75B and 75C he may do that with respect to public bills.

I submit that qualitatively, former proposed rule 16A and the present rules 75A, 75B and 75C, are identical. Quantitatively there is a slight difference. Nevertheless, they are the same in concept fundamentally. There is no question about that at all. The point at issue is, however, that the house, in rejecting the quantitatively larger rule 16A, has also rejected proposed rules 75A, 75B and 75C.

We are not without guidance on this subject, Mr. Speaker. The most recent precedent was the salutory and wise decision rendered by Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1967. It is reported in House of Commons *Journals* for March 11, 1968, at page 753. I shall refer to this precedent later. It may be remembered on that occasion this house had rejected a tax bill and, in violation of the long established principles and precedents of centuries, parliament was ruthlessly violated by the government. Having stripped parliament of its cloak of decency, the government brought in a tax bill similar in many respects, although differing in quantum, to a previous tax bill. At that time the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) raised the question of the right of the government to so proceed. On March 11, 1968, Your Honour rendered a decision. I will not read it all; the lateness of the hour prevents my so doing. In part, Your Honour said this:

> It then becomes a matter of interpretation or judgment whether, in the words of the rule,—

That is the rule I have already quoted. Your Honour of course had that in mind. I continue:

> —the motion offered—

That was the motion to accept the new tax bill.

> —is substantially the same as one on which the decision of the House has been expressed. The only way to interpret the two measures in relation to the rule is to compare the proposals offered in each case: that is, in the previous Bill and in the new Bill now before the House.

Your Honour continued at pages 755 and 756. I think your decision is well known. It was that the bill was not to be proceeded with but was to be withdrawn. I submit that the two cases, the case of the previous bill and the case of the rules, are identical and on all fours. The second tax bill contained the principles of the first, although the quantum of tax was different. Here, we have two measures which touch on the procedure of the house. Each provides for a time allocation order at the instigation of a minister after certain preliminary procedures have been followed. I submit to Your Honour, therefore, that since this house in December of last year, by accepting the motion of the President of the Privy Council and concurring in the rules then brought in, negatived the right of the government to bring in rule 16A. At this time, therefore, the motion the President of the Privy Council seeks to bring before the house should not be allowed.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, may I deal with three of the points raised by the hon. member. In the first place, may I draw Your Honour's attention to page 579 of *Votes and Proceedings* of December 20, 1968, where this house, as hon. members have already mentioned, instructed the committee to consider the allocation of time proposals. Those proposals referred to allocation of time orders which could be brought by ministers of the Crown after they had been in consultation with the committee.

Mr. Stanfield: We are not dealing with a committee report.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is quite right. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will give me an opportunity to put my argument to the house.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister has lots of time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I point out that at that time the house recognized it would consider later in this session the question of an allocation of time procedure. It specifically instructed the committee to consider, for the purpose of having that matter further considered in this house, an allocation of time procedure along the lines of the proposal put forward by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. This invited full consideration of the British practice which, as hon. members know, provides for the right of the minister to make a motion for the purpose of allocating time for debates. In fact, the house at that time gave every indication in the proceedings which occurred that day that it wished this question of allocation to be brought to a final decision in this session. It did not clearly at that time disentitle the house from further considering allocation of time proposals along the lines of that which I propose in my motion.

The second matter is with regard to the terms of 16A. If I have an opportunity of debating the substantive proposals, I will go into at some length the manner in which the proposed 75(A), (B) and (C) differ from 16A. I suggest they differ very substantially in the form of procedure provided. There appeared to be concurrence on the other side of the house at the time they were under consideration.

Going back to my previous point, I think the real consideration to be looked at is how the committee could be seized with the question at all if, as the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said, it was out of order. If so, how can we give further consideration in the course of this session, to the question of allocation of time at the instance of the minister?

The final point that has to be made is that in effect the proceedings which occurred on December 20, as hon. members know, were, as a whole, the subject matter of agreement among all parties in the house. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) withdrew his amendment; I withdrew my proposal with regard to 16A and we arrived at a certain proposal with regard to dealing with the subject matter further. In other words, I submit that the various proceedings on that afternoon of December 20 should be regarded as a whole. They are not to be regarded as a negativing by this house of the principle of time allocation, including the possibility that time be allocated in accordance with an order to be introduced by a minister. For that reason, the motion I put this evening is not out of order.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thank the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) for getting to the floor ahead of me in the course of this debate because the argument he has put forward is so easy to demolish. I had hoped he would advance it, and he has done so.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has already read citations which lay down the basic rules of parliament in the matter of dealing again in the same session with something which has already been dealt with earlier in the session. To have this basic law as part of my remarks, I wish to read a couple of citations from Beauchesne. I draw attention first to citation 194(1):

(1) A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the house.

Citation 200(1) states this again. I read it for emphasis:

(1) An old rule of parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the house." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the house might be used in the discussion of motions of the same nature and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session.

That rule is quoted again in citation 203(7). The wording there is the same, so I need not read it. May I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that this rule has been used as the basis for some important decisions from the Chair in recent years. I refer in particular to the effort of Mr. Pickersgill, the former minister of transport, who back in January of 1967 tried to get a reversal of a decision that had been made on matters having to do with Crowsnest Pass rates. The Chair ruled very clearly on that occasion that a decision had been taken by the house in committee of the whole and it could not be reversed in that session, even though the attempt to reverse it was spelled out in language that was slightly different from the motion which had earlier been defeated.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has also drawn attention to the 5 per cent surtax measure that was defeated on third reading in the last parliament, following which the former minister of finance tried to bring in another measure which was so similar to the first one that the Chair had to rule it out of order. The rule is there. The practice of the house is clear and so are the rulings of the Chair.

The President of the Privy Council now stands and says, oh, but just a minute, a motion was passed by this house on December 20, 1968, which covers the matter. What did that motion say, Mr. Speaker? The motion said that this matter was to be referred to a committee, the committee was to discuss and consider this matter and it was given authority to bring back a report. I suggest that if the President of the Privy Council had not brought in his motion, but had let the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) move concurrence in the report of the committee, it would be in order. It would be in keeping with the instruction that was given to that committee by the house.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the house on December 20, 1968, that gave the committee the authority to deal with this matter and bring in a report and their recommendation was in keeping with the rule, provided it was done that way. When the President of the Privy Council seeks to bring in a government notice of motion, a proposition that changes the decision that was taken on December 20, he is just as far out of line as was Mr. Pickersgill and the former minister of finance.

This is the kind of thing that happens, Mr. Speaker, when you start trying to dictate to parliament, instead of achieving these things by a process of consultation and getting along together, arriving at some kind of consensus. That is the tragedy of this debate we are now going to have. We must get along. We got along for four or five months on the basis of arriving at one consensus after another. Now, it has been decided that we are going to deal at arm's length and so the minister resorts to these various devices. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this point of order would not be one that could be raised if we were dealing with the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). He would have had the authority of the motion passed last December 20. But no, he sits in his seat, not saying a word, and apparently the other six Liberal members of that committee have concurred in this process. So, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) brings in a motion which is in defiance of the basic rule of parliament, an old rule that has been brought up to date by yourself, sir, which says that a decision having been taken the matter cannot be raised again in the same session.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The President of the Privy Council says that there are some differences between 75c and 16A. Oh, yes, there are some differences but the basic proposition in 75c is the same as the basic proposition in 16A, namely, that if the government house leader cannot get the concurrence of the house leaders of the other parties for a time allocation order, he can bring in such an order himself.

There is a slight difference. Last December we talked about meetings of the Business Committee that would be held in the shower of the President of the Privy Council. Well, we do not have that kind of arrangement now. We do not have a formal meeting of the committee under 75c but we have the same fundamental proposition that the government house leader can by himself, unilaterally, dictatorially, tell this house what time allocation he is going to make. In principle, in essence 16A and 75c are exactly the same.

The President of the Privy Council also has the nerve to stand up and say that no decision was taken last December 20. Mr. Speaker, what nonsense are we supposed to take in this place? We had a long debate last December on the whole question of the rules that were brought in. As hon. members will recall, practically all of us were in support of most of the rules that were in that package. In fact if I recall correctly I was in favour of all of them but 16A, as were most hon. members.

As I say, we had a long debate and the debate zeroed in on 16A. As a result of that debate the house, by means of compromise, by withdrawal of one motion and amendment of another, reached a decision and, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is just as much a decision as if the house were to vote tonight on the straight motion the government is trying to move.

What was that decision? The decision was that 16A, in the form in which it was before us, was not acceptable to the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, that proposition that 16A was not acceptable was agreed to on December 20, 1968, unanimously. It was a decision concurred in by every member of the House of Commons. Granted, so far as the government was concerned, there was a condition. The condition was that the matter was being referred back to the committee, or to a new standing committee that was being set up. That is quite true, but nevertheless even though there was that condition in the mind of the government the fact of the matter is that the decision was made and 16A was out. We have been operating ever since under the new package of rules that did not include 16A. It was every bit as much a decision of the House of Commons that 16A was rejected as it was a decision that we accepted all the other rules in the package.

I come back to the condition upon which the government accepted the decision of last December. That condition was that the matter be referred to a committee. At that time we were dealing with the report of a special committee on the procedure of the House of Commons, but under the new rules we provided that there would be a Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Procedure and Organization. It was set up under the new rules and later the same day, December 20, a special motion was passed referring this matter to that standing committee.

The President of the Privy Council says that this thing has to be taken in its entirety as a package—the whole content of what was done last December. He is perfectly right, and the whole content is perfectly clear. The house took a decision against 16A but the House of Commons, by unanimous decision, made a special arrangement for the subject of time allocation to be referred to the standing committee with the authority for that committee to bring back a report recommending that something be done about it.

As I said before, and I repeat it now, if this were being done that way then the rule against dealing with something that has been dealt with in the same session would be covered by that proposition. But it is not so covered. What we have got before us is a government motion that seeks to reverse a decision made by the House of Commons unanimously last December, and it is a government notice of motion which does not have the consent of the entire House of Commons.

I have done a little homework on this as a possible point of order, but I was doing most of my research on the question as the hon. member for Peace River was speaking and I ran across certain citations which, unfortunately, I did not note, but I know they are there. They make the point that in a situation like this something like this can be done only by unanimous consent. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only possibility by which the government, as distinct from the committee of the silent member for Grenville-Carleton, can introduce a motion to reverse the decision taken last December is by unanimous consent. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot quarrel with that proposition.

This is the straitjacket the government has got itself into through the means by which it is proposing to operate. I submit that this is a clear violation of one of the oldest rules of parliament, that the government has no right to put this motion before us and, as a matter of fact, that Your Honour cannot possibly see this as a simple proposition.

I see that Your Honour is looking at the clock, as I am. My hon. friends are encouraging me to keep going. The only difficulty is that there are three late shows coming on at ten o'clock. I have the first of them and I have not had much chance to prepare for it. But it does seem to me that this is a point to which Your Honour should give consideration. I would like to look up the precise citations I was referring to a moment ago and therefore, Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SOCIAL SECURITY—INCREASED PENSIONS TO MEET COST OF LIVING

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 29 as recorded in *Hansard* at page 9214, I asked this question:

> Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the ever-widening gap between the level of the consumer price index and the 2 per cent increases which are permitted annually to those on old age security pensions, is the government considering amending the act to permit these increases to reflect the full extent of the increases in the cost of living?
>
> Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker.
>
> Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I want to come back in a moment to as strong a comment as I can make about that monosyllabic answer of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). Before I do so let me indicate what we are talking about when we refer to the ever-widening gap between the level of the consumer price index and the amount of the pensions our old age penisoners are receiving.

The present $75 level was fixed in 1963, some six years ago. In 1965 a bill was passed which brought in the Canada Pension Plan and amended the old age security act in various respects. It provided for a cost of living increase in the old age security pension, but provided that it was to be limited to 2 per cent in any one year.

I mention these two dates, 1963 and 1965, because I think in considering the position of our pensioners, one must start from one of those two years. One must start, either from 1963 when the pension was fixed at $75, or

from 1965 when it was decided by law that there was to be this increase due to the cost of living. What has happened?

In 1963 the consumer price index on the old basis of 1949 equalling 100 stood at 133.0. In 1965 it stood at 138.7, and now in 1969 it stands at 161.4. That is the consumer price index on the old 1949 basis, not on the new basis which has been established recently, but in order to make comparisons I have to use like quantities.

This means that since 1963 when the pension was fixed at $75 the cost of living has gone up by 28.4 percentage points, or by 21 per cent over the cost of living in 1963. By the same manner of arithmetic the cost of living has gone up since 1965 by 22.7 percentage points, or 16 per cent over the cost of living as it stood in 1965. Members can take a choice. If they work from 1965, the year the law was passed to provide an increase, that increase is now of the order of 16 per cent. If they work from 1963 when the pension was set at $75, the increase is now in the order of 21 per cent.

In others words, the $75 pension should now be $87 per month, if you work it from the year 1965, or $90.75 a month if you work it from 1963. Yet, as hon. members know, all that has happened is that two 2 per cent increases have been added, a total of only 4 per cent, so that the pension now stands at $78. For the purposes of the argument I will settle for the lower figure. It should be at $87 right now to keep faith with the decision of this parliament in 1965, that we were going to raise the pension in accordance with the rise in the cost of living. In any event it is only $78. This is just the same as though we were taking $9 out of the pockets of every person in Canada who is drawing an old age security pension.

It is not good enough to go on telling us week after week, month after month, that all these matters are under review. This involves a principle and an obligation. As a matter of justice we ought to insist that the time has come to amend the Old Age Security Act and increase that ceiling in order that the increase in pension will reflect not just 2 per cent but whatever the actual increase in the cost of living happens to be.

A friend has reminded me, and he does not need to because this has been my song all along, that we have to go further than this. We have to give our elderly people a share of the increase in productivity. Surely, the least we can do is give them the full measure of the increase in the cost of living.

I see you are moving to the edge of your chair, Mr. Speaker, so in conclusion let me say what bothers me most about the answer given to me by the minister on May 29. That is the ease with which he just said "No". That is the answer we get all the time from this government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): He has had a lot of practice.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The answer is "No" to these old age pensioners, to war veterans, to retired civil servants, to railway pensioners—to anyone in this pension field.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Nyet.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Nyet, that is the language they speak over there. This is one of the most serious questions facing this country. We must make sure that our retired people have a share of the increased productivty of this society. It is not good enough to go on answering "No". The time for action has come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we often say in French that you know a good cook by her recipes. Well, I dare say that you know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre by his questions which are always in the same area.

I agree with the hon. member who says that the old age pension, the guaranteed income, in short, all the different kinds of pensions are not high enough. On the other hand, I may comfort him by quoting some statistics to show him what the Canadian government spends on these different kinds of pensions.

Were I to tell the hon. member that the government is in the process of revising all the social welfare legislation, he would reply: This is nothing new, the minister has said that before. He was shocked when the minister said no last May 29. And if the minister had said something else, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would have objected in some other way.

Tonight, he choses to object in this way because the minister has simply told him no. If the minister had answered: We are in the process of considering the legislation as a

whole, he would have said: It is too little, too late, or something like that. One way or the other, I understand his position as a member of the opposition party, and I hope he will understand mine as a government member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may well admit—

Mr. Davis Lewis (York South): He could answer yes.

Mr. Loiselle: No, he cannot say "yes" when it is not "yes".

Mr. Lewis: The minister could answer "yes".

Mr. Loiselle: Yes, and what argument would the member then bring up?

Mr. Speaker, the member will surely remember that it was the Liberal party that decided to lower from 70 to 65 the age of eligibility for the old age pension.

And so, next year, from the 1st of January, that is in five months, every Canadian citizen of 65 or more will be eligible to the old age pension; that will cost the government an additional $600 million a year.

The old age security pension now costs, according to the budget for 1969-70, $1,500 million. In 1970-71, it will cost $1,620 million.

With regard to the guaranteed income supplement, according to the budget for 1969-70, it will cost the federal government $269 million more, and in 1970-71, $286 million.

However, the 2 per cent increase, for 1969-70, which is taken into account in the figures quoted a while ago—

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE—QUEBEC—NET INCOME OF INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to point out to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) the general displeasure of the manufactured milk producers whose income is decreasing as a result of the government dairy policy for the year 1969-70.

There is a tendency at times to blame the farmers for many things. Still, in 1966, the government itself was concerned about the decrease in dairy production. Indeed, the then Minister of Agriculture stated, on March 23, 1966, and I quote:

> Unless the producer's confidence in his ability to make a decent living from dairy farming is restored, we face the prospect of shortages.

And so, a policy was adopted to encourage the farmers to increase their production, to enlarge their farms with a view to making their operations more profitable, and to provide the dairy production that is necessary for Canadian consumption.

The same day the former Minister of Agriculture said that the main cause which induced the government to act was the great number of dairy producers who were abandoning this industry in order to raise pigs and cattle. He said also that he was concerned with the fact that a great number of dairy producers had given up agriculture so that Canada was facing the possibility of a great shortage of dairy products necessary for national consumption.

He also said that we needed productive and adequate lands and that measures had been taken to this end through the Farm Credit Corporation and through ARDA. The present minister said this: I do not see how we will help the farmers by giving them more credit, by helping them to get into debt, unless we get more involved in marketing and particularly by giving more protection to our producers.

Now, on March 31, 1969, the Minister of Agriculture announced a new dairy policy. According to this policy there was a reduction of the quota price. I am not prepared to blame the whole policy but I am opposed to the established price and to the export tax.

Let us remember that in 1967 a march on Ottawa was organized by the farmers. At that time the Minister of Agriculture came to meet them in front of the parliament buildings. I was among them and the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) told us that we were right to make claims, that we should have organized our march on Ottawa ten years before and that we had been very patient.

Therefore, once again we had hoped that the government would establish a long term dairy policy, that prices would get stabilized and that with an effort, we would finally succeed in solving the problem.

In 1968, which was an election year, the government which was then a minority government decided to raise the subsidy to $1.31.

That served our purpose. We were happy about it. The farmers too were happy. The year 1968 was a rather good year as far as agriculture was concerned, and especially the dairy industry.

However, in 1969 we had a majority government. The price of milk was reduced, the dairy policy was disrupted and today the dairy producers' plight is desperate. Those who tried to answer the call or our governments in order to get better organized, to modernize their equipment and improve the quality of their milk so as to receive a sufficient income in order to survive, had to get into debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in the agricultural field that salaries went down in 1969 in Canada. The farm worker is the only one to be penalized. In spite of the labour surplus on the labour market, it was recognized that a man who works is entitled to a reasonable salary and salaries as a whole, were not reduced. Thank God, we must be happy about such a policy.

The same thing should be done, I think, in the dairy industry. Those who organized themselves in order to be able to provide the necessary efforts and production in the dairy field should not be penalized.

Now the April Commission, appointed by the Quebec government, presented its report last year. According to that Commission, the farm worker is not hard to please and gets only 83 cents per hour for his work, while keeping a heard of 30 milk cows producing an average of 9,000 lbs. of milk.

In 1949, Mr. Speaker, butter was selling at 63 cents a pound and the hourly wage of skilled workers was averaging $1.25. For each of his working hours, a man could get two pounds of butter.

Now in 1969, the price of butter is 71 cents a pound and the average hourly wage in Canada as a whole, is $2.93. For every working hour, the worker can get four pounds of butter.

Mr. Speaker, a number of farmers will be severely penalized this year and will have to sell part of their production at $3.13 per cwt., after having paid the export tax. I am using the word "tax" because the former Minister of Agriculture had stated, in answer to a question, which was asked on March 23, 1966, and I quote:

> The levy on exports is not in the form of government payments; it is a levy from the producers.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

That is the reason why I am using the word "tax", because of the expression used by the minister himself.

The present minister is very well aware of the situation, as he stated in the house that the essential problem in agriculture was that of the very low prices and that certain steps had to be taken to bring them up.

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question, as reported in *Hansard* on June 23, asks the minister's opinion as to whether or not the lower price obtained by the farmer for his manufactured milk, taking account of the export tax, would contribute to an increase in income in 1969 as compared with 1968.

It would be possible to quote a lot of statistics to show that in 1968 there was an increase in gross receipts, farm cash receipts in Quebec, compared with 1967, and so on. I certainly do not wish to try to make that case here tonight, because it is not my intention to assert that the farmer is getting enough, or too much, for the sale of his products. The question in connection with the change in the hold back—what the hon. member refers to as the export tax—from the subsidy, is far simpler than that.

From the time this subsidy program was introduced, farmers accepted the fact that there would be a hold back on the subsidy in any year sufficient to pay for the losses or shortfall with respect to the support program, taking into account what was obtained on the international market for those milk products, particularly cheese and skim milk powder which it was necessary to sell some on the international market.

The hon. member knows this very well. He knows it very well because I have explained to him in the agriculture committee and in many other places that the change we made this year in increasing the holdback was necessary because there was production over and above the quota which was supported at 20 cents a pound and 65 cents for butterfat. With respect to any of these products which have to be sold on the international market, losses are incurred by the Canadian Dairy Commission which must be paid for out of the holdback. The change was made in anticipation of the probable cost for the current dairy year, 1969-70. In addition, we increased substantially—in fact, we doubled—the holdback on the amount of production which was over the quota. It is a well known fact that

unless we are able to keep this production within our total domestic requirements, we will be losing more and more money on the international market simply because prices in that market are very depressed at the present time. That is all that has been done, and it is in complete compliance with the policy announced by the government when it entered into the dairy support program in the first instance.

• (10:20 p.m.)

HEALTH AND WELFARE—CALL FOR SERVICES OF MEDICAL DOCTORS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, on June 26 I asked the minister a question concerning the very unfavourable situation regarding medical care in Canada. In an address to the International Association of Nurses in Montreal he had estimated that out of every 1,000 people who need medical attention, only 275 see a doctor, that only 10 out of the 275 went to hospital. The minister went on to add that not all of the remaining 990 people needed hospital care.

I would like to ask the minister if he could state or estimate what number, over and above the ten, were left without hospital care because of the shortage of hospital beds. I would have to remind the minister that it was probably unwise to take away the grant of $2,000 per bed for new hospital construction, and to cut the health resources fund, which would mean cutting some beds out of the proposed university teaching complexes.

Getting back to the 72 per cent of the people who do not see a doctor for one reason or another, is not the crux of the argument that people who need medical care are not getting it? This is because there are not enough general practitioners to go around. It is estimated by experienced physicians in this field that the work load is just about 25 per cent too great. We have today about one general practitioner for every 2,000 people. For the work to be done reasonably well, we need at least one general practitioner for every 1,500 people.

This is the point I have made to the minister over and over again. I have asked that medical schools be operated during the summer. This could step up the graduation of doctors by 25 per cent and help overcome the shortage of doctors. The answer was always a promise to confer with the provinces and the universities. To date, this is as far as the matter has gone.

The minister states that something must be done. Let us do it. I congratulated him on his wisdom and celerity in handling the cigarette smoking issue. Let us enable the general practitioners to do the diagnosing and treating. Unless this is done there is no point sending out public health nurses to find those who need treatment, because there will be no beds, and no doctors to provide the treatment.

If the government want to help ease the work load of the doctors a little, let them cut out the paper work that is inundating their desks and menacing their hospital work, taking time that is better spent with the patient. If this bureaucracy keeps increasing, the doctor will become a glorified referral secretary; he simply will not have the time to see his patient and diagnose his illness.

In many cases general practitioners are so harassed by this work load that their image and their communications have suffered. They are forced to admit patients to hospital without a proper clinical workup; they then write orders for a vast number of investigations in the hope that one of them will help in the diagnosis. This is very unfair to the doctors of this country as well as very costly to the government. Medical costs are increasing, I am told, at the rate of about $1 per person per month in Ontario.

We must not forget that the general practitioner is the only one who can give comprehensive care. He treats the baby, the child, the mother, the whole family, and in 95 illnesses out of 100 he is equipped to do so. It therefore follows that no medicare plan can work without a sufficient supply of general practitioners. The federal government has made medicare compulsory. It is up to the government to co-operate in supplying the doctors required in order to make the plan work successfully.

In conclusion, I look forward to hearing what are the minister's plans. It is his responsibility to make sure that the Canadian people receive adequate medical treatment.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer the hon. member on behalf of the minister. May I ask for your indulgence in case I am unable to complete my reply in three minutes. The federal government is making every possible effort to increase medical care to the people of Canada. This is why we adopted the national medicare program—to

see that there was universal accessibility to physician care for everyone. In addition, the federal government in combination with the provinces will be promoting a consolidation of health care facilities on the municipal, regional and provincial levels to see that they are employed to their greatest potentials.

The two levels of government are also hopeful of seeing reforms in medical education as well as inter-mural and extra-mural reforms through all the various health professions in the crucial matters of destruction of services, types of personnel most suited to the health problems involved and patterns of medical practice. As one example, we hope and trust there will be a widespread growth of such commodities as interdisciplinary family-care practice teams and community-level health centres.

To aid in the search for the best possible answers the federal-provincial conference of health ministers last year commissioned a set of task forces to look into the question of health services.

Four of these are looking specifically at the fields of beds and facilities, utilization, operational efficiency, and salaries and wages. Others are looking at the prices and the delivery of medical care and also at the cost of public health services.

The task forces will provide us with a set of new, unique and dynamic recommendations which will go a long way in improving health care facilities for all Canadians. On the basis of these recommendations the federal-provincial conference of health ministers will be moving in for action this coming autumn.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 8, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING TIME ALLOTMENT—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a suggestion with respect to today's business in the house which I hope might find general acceptance. As you know, government order No. 99 standing in my name is a motion to add proposed standing orders 75A, 75B and 75C. As I indicated last night, the advantage of this motion over the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) is that my motion would enable the house to amend directly the proposed standing orders, if that be desired, rather than refer them back to the standing committee for amendment. Although the former motion would obviously be the simpler procedure, I think it was apparent from last evening's discussion that that motion would be resisted by some hon. members and indeed that there would be protracted objections by way of points of order and perhaps questions of privilege before the merits of the proposals could be discussed.

It seems to me therefore that the quickest way to get down to the merits of the proposed standing orders would be to enable my colleague, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, to put his motion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me that this is what hon. members were seeking last night.

Mr. Woolliams: Did the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talk to you?

An hon. Member: You must be overworked.

Mr. Trudeau: Do you want flexibility or not?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would be quite prepared to yield on my motion, in case there is any risk that as a result of the Chair's ruling last night my motion would have precedence, and if necessary, with the unanimous consent of the house, will be glad to withdraw it so the hon. member can move his motion.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Whether or not the minister wishes to withdraw his motion is a matter for him. The position we have taken regarding the point on which Your Honour has partly ruled is that certain vestigial rights are possessed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. If he chooses to exercise his rights, or, rather, to carry out the duty imposed on him by the committee, we shall, of course, contribute to the debate which will follow in accordance with our responsibilities. But we shall do this without compromising the position we have taken, namely that the President of the Privy Council had no right to bring on the motion he did in the circumstances which existed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As the house is well aware, Mr. Speaker, the only reason we are still in session is to deal with this question of procedure. It is not our desire to stay and deal with it at all. But the government has reached a certain decision, and so we are here. We feel that if we must deal with this question we should deal with it according to the rules and we are glad, therefore, that the President of the Privy Council has seen fit to let the house proceed in accordance with the standing orders.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, first I want to say how happy I am. The attitude of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) proves that the House of Commons is not wasting its time, that the perhaps virulent debate of last night has borne fruit and that the President of the Privy Council having slept on it has, so to speak, seen the light.

Mr. Speaker, we are happy that the President of the Privy Council has realized that we

were right concerning our express demand that the Standing Orders and the work of the committees be respected. On behalf of my colleagues, I wish to congratulate him for it and to encourage him, throughout the whole debate on the procedure, to stay as positive and as open to the suggestions of the opposition.

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Having participated extensively in the debate on points of order in connection with the motion of the President of the Privy Council I would say that the points which have arisen in connection therewith, and the ruling which Your Honour has made, become an academic exercise: many of the arguments were not answered and it cannot serve as a precedent.

Mr. Speaker: Whether the hon. member for Edmonton West likes it or not, the very learned ruling which the Chair has given is inscribed in the annals of the House of Commons and will guide generations of parliamentarians to come.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the house be prepared to give consideration to following the procedure adopted in the debate some years ago, when we were discussing the question of the flag? It was agreed that the debate which then took place would be postponed day by day in accordance with the normal routine of our proceedings so that hon. members who had important and urgent questions to ask might have an opportunity to put them before the house.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Baldwin: I know the Prime Minister has been away for some time and I am sure he will have all kinds of answers ready.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I should put the motion, because at this point the question is academic. The point of order can be raised later.

Mr. Baldwin: May I be permitted to advise Your Honour that if the hon. member wishes to speak we intend to pursue the same point of order as the one I raised yesterday; it applies with equal validity to the motion which is about to be put.

Mr. Speaker: I will put the motion and the hon. member can then raise his point of order.

[Mr. Fortin.]

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton) moved:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Peace River has a point of order.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour will probably recall from the interesting session that we had last night that I had occasion to rise on a point of order in respect of the motion that the President of the Privy Council was struggling to make. That point of order was a very simple one, and though tempted as I am I do not intend to traverse the ground that I then covered. For the purposes of my point of order I hope that the house will take into consideration the fact that the things I said last night apply equally to the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

My basic point last night was that this house decided last December that this particular question was then negatived by the proceedings of the house, and consequently cannot be brought forward for discussion now. I raise the same point of order at this time. I ask the house to take into account what I then said and apply them to this context. At the time of the adjournment yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was half way through a very interesting and persuasive argument that I assume he is going to seek permission to resume at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would be pleased to hear from hon. members, but let me assure them that a lot of arguing will be needed to convince the Chair that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is not properly before the house. There might have been some doubt in connection with the other motion but the situation has now changed. However, I would be prepared to hear argument and make a decision on the point. The hon. member for Peace River submitted an argument yesterday which I listened to with great attention and which I have studied since that time. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has participated in the debate, and if he feels that he should complete the argument that he was making last night I will of course be pleased to hear him

further, following which I shall be in a position to reach a decision.

Apparently the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre does not wish to pursue the argument he was making last night.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the reason for my not rising is that the argument that I was putting forward last night had to do with the motion moved by the President of the Privy Council. I contended that whatever authority the house might have given to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to bring back a proposal, it did not give such authority to the President of the Privy Council. That was the argument I was making last night.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre obviously is correct and he is confirming what I was suggesting a moment ago. Whatever validity his argument might have had yesterday, it loses much of its strength in view of the fact that what the house is now doing is considering a motion by the chairman of the committee on the instructions of the house itself. I think this would have to be my ruling on the point of order that was raised last evening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I have a moment to thank you for saying that I was correct in my argument last night. It is good to have that on the record.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, may I speak very briefly to the point of order that has arisen and ask the President of the Privy Council whether it is his intention or the intention of any member of the ministry to bring in an amendment to the report that is going to be presented to us?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has the floor.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Skeena on a point of order.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I raise a matter that I think deserves some consideration by the house. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has been active in a safari to certain parts of western Canada. There exists in Canada at the moment a very strong, growing discontent among the native Indian people about the policy of this government. I wonder if, in order that we can get on—

• (2:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Hon. members can yell, "Order" all they like, but the native Indian people of this country don't give a damn what those hon. members think. They are concerned about realities. I will put the matter in the form of a request. I wonder if the Prime Minister would consider allowing us to have an oral question period, in order that some of these very important matters may be raised. If they are not to be raised, Mr. Speaker, we may have some tribal wars in this nation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Our people are not playing games, as hon. members will find out for themselves.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, although Your Honour has ruled on the second point of order that was raised, because of changed circumstances arising from the fact that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) now wishes to proceed with the report of the committee, may I put before Your Honour another point of order which I ask Your Honour to consider and, hopefully, which all hon. members of the house including hon. members on the other side may also consider. My point involves, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the validity of the government's right to proceed as it has been, in an attempt to change or add to the rules of this house. Before Your Honour considers the substantial magnitude of our objection I seek to place before Your Honour some arguments arising out of constitutional implications which Your Honour may take under cognizance.

In the first place, I submit that proposed rule 75A as reported by the committee is invalid. The invalidity taints the remainder of proposed standing order 75. May I draw Your Honour's attention to sections 48 and 49 of the British North America Act which read as follows:

> 48. The presence of at least twenty members of the House of Commons shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the house for the Exercise of its powers; and for that purpose the Speaker shall be reckoned as a member.

49. Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices other than that of the Speaker, and when the voices are equal, but not otherwise, the Speaker shall have a vote.

What does proposed standing order 75A do, Mr. Speaker? As I recall its wording, it proposes to put into the hands of the representatives of the parties the right to come to a decision which, automatically and with no further debate or discussion, shall become an order of this house. There are not 20 members who will make that decision. The standing order does not say that Your Honour must be present and so constitute the legal entity which the law requires in order to give effect to that decision.

May I also point out this further, collateral defect. Who are these representatives that are mentioned? Is there any certainty that they must be members of this house? Hon. members may say that I am quibbling only and that this is a technical irregularity. I suggest that when the government or a committee seeks to come to this house in order to suggest or impose changes or additions to the rules under which we operate, the government or the committee must be prepared to come here with a perfect case legally documented and based on our jurisprudence.

I suggest that the proposal would impose upon this house a standing order which would have the effect of placing in the hands of undefined and unnamed representatives the power to make an order as to allotment or limitation of time on any specific debate which shall automatically become an order of this house. I suggest this contravenes all the specific requirements of the British North America Act.

This is only the minor part of the point of order I propose to raise. Later on I will get into the particular aspect in a broader manner. It must be understood once and for all that, for all that has been said about this being a sovereign parliament and a sovereign house, this is not a technical expression of the facts. Unlike the mother of parliaments in the United Kingdom, this parliament derives powers. The rights and powers which this house has stem from statutes, the British North America Act and, I am ashamed to have to say, the Colonial Laws Validity Act.

I say in a collateral sense that while the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been playing silly games with the constitution, hiding experts in dark corners and having conferences which have been ineffective, the main issue that faces this parliament, our right to be a sovereign parliament and to make our own laws and rules, remains in jeopardy. Consequently I anticipate the rebuttal which may well be made, that this house has the right to do anything it wants. It has not, Mr. Speaker. It should have, but it has not. It is bound by the provisions of some of the statutes. I intend to quote some of these statutes to Your Honour as I develop what I consider to be one of the major aspects of this particular argument.

If one examines the constitutions of most of the countries which have received their independence from the United Kingdom, it will be seen in the enabling legislation in the constitutional statutes,—and I can quote two, dealing with the provinces of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland,—that in each instance there was set out in the statute providing for independence power in the hands of the legislature to make its rules, provide for its procedure and protect its privileges.

I suggest if one searches through the British North America Act from beginning to end, it will be found that, apart from clauses 48, 49 and one or two others dealing with money bills and the signification of bills for His Excellency's signature, there is nothing investing this house with the right to make rules of order and rules of procedure.

Hon. members should bear in mind that we are a legislature with a derived authority, not an authority such as obtains in the United Kingdom parliament, one which is derived from the strength, early beginnings, traditions, practices, precedents and the moods of the British parliamentary practice. Under these circumstances we are then driven back to the only statute which in any way purports to provide for the consideration of the establishment of rules, practice and procedure.

As I promised, I will refer the house to the Nova Scotia Act, passed in 1884, to illustrate my point. Section 20 provides the house and the legislature of that province with authority to establish rules of practice and also rules for the protection of its privileges.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The Newfoundland Act, which established the province of Newfoundland some years ago, provided precisely the same thing in sections 4 and 8. Jamaica and all the other dependencies in the West Indies have specific provisions in their statutes.

Now all we have left to rely on, Mr. Speaker, is the Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865, which in section 5(a) provides that a legislature, a representative legislature which is

defined in the act, has the right to pass laws—I emphasize those words, "to pass laws"—providing for the constitution, for changes in the constitution, and for matters dealing with procedure and privileges relative to that legislature. The words used are "to pass laws in the manner and form provided."

The only law relating to Canada is, of course, the imperial statute of 1867, the British North America Act, which is largely silent on this issue except for the sections I have mentioned. I therefore suggest to Your Honour and this house that we are in a very grave position. As my research has developed, as I have examined these records and read some of the cases which went to the Privy Council, I have come to the conclusion that this parliament and previous parliaments have been most neglectful in failing to cover this very serious and grave omission.

The Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865 defines "colonial legislature"—I am sure the Prime Minister will be delighted to hear that word colonial—and "representative legislature." The two are not mutually exclusive; rather, a representative legislature is included within a colonial legislature, and in order to have any right at all even to pass laws we have to come within that definition, shameful though it may be.

An hon. Member: What year is this?

Mr. Baldwin: This year is 1969. I am glad some member of the government has awakened to know what day it is.

The power given a representative legislature only to make laws respecting procedure applies in the first instance at least to action by both chambers and the Governor General in the form of a bill, passed by both houses and given Royal Assent. I have already referred to this in the British North America Act.

The proviso contained in section 5 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act has operated in three ways. The first is by an imperial act of parliament, that is, the B.N.A. Act and amendments which entrench the quorum and majority rule in each chamber; the provision that a money bill cannot originate in the Senate, and in the Commons must be accompanied by the recommendation of the Governor General. Those are three aspects in which the British North America Act deals with procedure and privilege in respect of the legislature.

The second way in which it has operated has been by the royal instructions to the Governor General accompanying his Letters Patent, and the third way is by procedural laws of the Parliament of Canada, which are very rare.

It is also my recollection that there are some provisions in the Interpretation Act which do invest parliament with certain procedural rights. In this connection there is also the War Measures Act. Hon. members who have been in this house for some time will recall the debates which surrounded it. Finally there is the House of Commons Act, which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) discussed the other day, and which provides for the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy and so on.

But, Mr. Speaker, even the passing of the Statute of Westminster and even the 1949 amendment to the constitution do not change this limitation on the capacity of this house to deal with matters of procedure. The 1949 amendment to the B.N.A. Act and the Statute of Westminster did allow an extension of powers so far as matters of the constitution are concerned, but they left strictly alone this question of dealing with matters of procedure. Not to this date, Mr. Speaker, save with the exceptions I have mentioned, has the Parliament of Canada passed a law to establish rules, regulations or standing orders for the Senate and the Commons or, alternatively, passed a law to empower each chamber to adopt its own rules or standing orders. No statute, no law has been passed within the meaning of the Colonial Laws Validity Act, and once more I repeat you search in vain in the B.N.A. Act to find such a right.

The House of Commons when it first sat on November 7, 1867, adopted of its own motion the rules, regulations and standing orders of the legislative assembly of the late Province of Canada, according to the *Commons Journals* of 1867-68. On November 15, 1867—I do not know whether I hear dissent or approval, Mr. Speaker. With this noise I find it rather difficult to place these matters before the house, matters which I think are of exceeding importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: On November 15, 1867, the House of Commons appointed a special committee to assist Mr. Speaker in forming rules, regulations and standing orders for the government of the house. On December 20, 1867,

the House of Commons concurred in the committee's report and adopted the standing orders recommended by the committee. The same unilateral method of adopting or amending our standing orders has been followed to this day, and a similar procedure has obtained in the Senate. The only lawful method, as set out in section 5 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, has never been followed.

I have already pointed out that the Statute of Westminster, which did extend certain rights of the Parliament of Canada and of other dominion legislatures in respect of the constitution, did not touch this question of passing orders of practice and procedure, and the same applies to the 1949 amendment. Therefore I submit that it follows that the motion to concur in the committee's report as one respecting the procedures of this house is out of order, and does not comply with the authority given parliament in compliance with section 5 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act, which states that such a matter must be introduced as a bill, pass both houses, and receive Royal Assent. But even in the event it returns in that form it is questionable at the present time—and I raise this so that the government might give it some thought—that the house has a lawful procedure with which to deal with it.

I know, Mr. Speaker that you have expressed, as have your predecessors, certain limitations with respect to the decisions you make, but I think this matter goes so much to the root of our practice that it involves a careful inquiry as to how far Your Honour as the receiver of the rights, customs and traditions of this house, and as our protector, must take into account the argument I am making.

There was one very interesting case which I will cite to Your Honour, and then sit down. The State of New South Wales some years ago amended its constitution by providing that no amendment to the constitution to abolish the upper body should be accepted until there had been a popular referendum following which, if a majority was received in the referendum, the matter then could be brought back to the government and have Royal Assent by the representative of the Crown. A subsequent government desiring to short-circuit this proposal proposed two amendments to the constitution, one of which would strike out and repeal the section in question, and the other one had the effect of directly, by act of the legislature, abolishing the upper house. These two proposals passed the house and then there was an attempt to let them receive Royal Assent.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Before this was done two members of the legislature appealed. I point this out, not in terms of a threat but in terms of probability. This is an opportunity which is available to any citizen of Canada or any member of the house, if I am correct in my argument. Two members of the legislature can appeal to the court for a writ of prohibition to deny the right of the Crown to give royal assent, on the ground that the constitution and statutes of that country attached a certain condition that the condition had not been met, and that because of the section of the Colonial Laws Validity Act which I quoted it was impossible and illegal for this to be made the law of the country.

This went to the Privy Council, which included some of the most distinguished counsel who ever practised before that court. Stafford Cripp, D. M. Britt and others appeared. A judgment was delivered by Lord Sanky which I shall not quote, although I have it here. The judgment said very simply that despite the length of time which had elapsed the legislature, as all other legislatures, was bound by section 5 of the Colonial Laws Validity Act and under the circumstances the Privy Council declared that the sections were invalid because they had not followed the procedure which had been prescribed.

Yesterday we spent a great deal of time debating the procedural aspects of the matter with which we are now dealing and I know the house is quite anxious to get on with our business and reject the motion which may be placed by the hon. member. Therefore I shall not develop the argument at as great length as I could. Briefly, this is it: We are a legislature with a derived authority; the only way in which we can pass proper standing orders governing our practices, procedures and privileges is by an act of parliament, and the proposal of the hon. member does not fall within this category. Under the circumstances Your Honour this house must reject it.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's arguments really relate to a chain of statutory title. I should like to bring to Your Honour's attention a number of provisions. First of all I would refer to the British North America Act and the Senate and House of

Commons Act. Section 18 of the British North America Act provides that—

—the privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that any act of the Parliament of Canada defining such privileges, immunities, and powers shall not confer any privileges, immunities, or powers exceeding those at the passing of such act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

Pursuant to that authority the Senate and House of Commons Act was enacted. Section 4 of Chapter 249 of the Revised Statutes of Canada provides:

The Senate and the House of Commons respectively, and the members thereof respectively, shall hold, enjoy and exercise,

(a) such and the like privileges, immunities and powers as, at the time of the passing of the British North America Act 1867, were held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and by the members thereof, so far as the same are consistent with and not repugnant to the said act; and

(b) such privileges, immunities and powers as are from time to time defined by act of the Parliament of Canada, not exceeding those at the time of the passing of such act held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom and by the members thereof respectively.

In other words the chain runs from the B.N.A. Act—the original constitutional document—to the Senate and House of Commons Act, which gives the House of Commons certain powers, including the power to make its own rules of procedure by way of standing orders, and pursuant to the provisions stipulated in chapter 12 of May's 17th edition. I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a direct chain of title from the constitutional authority, that is to say the legislature of the United Kingdom, and that that authority has been exercised by the Senate and House of Commons Act so that the powers are held by the house to make changes in its own standing orders from time to time, pursuant to that power in the statute. Therefore the hon. member's argument falls to one side.

Mr. Speaker: If there are no further contributions on this very interesting point raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I would presume to make a ruling at this time. As I am sure the hon. member for Peace River suspects, the Chair would have to rule that the point of order he has made at the present time is not so much a point of order as a point of debate which would perhaps be valid in the course of the discussion. I would assume the hon. member would raise the point when we reach the moment in our proceedings when the substance of the hon. member's motion is before us.

I have had occasion in the past to indicate that it is not the responsibility of the Chair to rule on questions of law or on constitutional questions. This ruling has been made in many instances by previous Speakers. I should like, if hon. members would allow me to do so, to quote at this time a ruling made by the Deputy Speaker on Friday October 25, 1963. It reviews some of the authorities on this point:

I have listened with much interest to the argument made by the honourable and learned member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald). I gather the essence of the argument he submits now is that the bill should not be considered, that it is out of order because it is *ultra vires* the Parliament of Canada. My submission at this time is that it should not be the responsibility of the Chair to rule whether a particular bill or particular piece of legislation submitted to parliament is or is not within the competence of this house. Firstly, I should like to refer honourable members to Standing Order 12(1) which limits and defines the duties and responsibilities of the Speaker: "Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate—"

In other words, this limits the powers and responsibilities of the Speaker to deciding on questions of order, not questions of law. This is further confirmed in citation 69(3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, at page 59: "Standing Order 12 being restrictive should be given the strictest literal interpretation—"

There is another citation referred to in the same ruling. I am still quoting from the same ruling of Friday October 25, 1963:

—I should like to refer at this time to citation 71(5) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, at page 61: "The Speaker will not give a decision upon a constitutional question nor decide a question of law, though the same may be raised on a point of order or privilege," which is what the honourable member did at the moment he raised it as a question of order. But it shall not be the responsibility of the Chair or the Speaker to make a decision.

Lastly, I should like to refer to a more recent ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lemieux, reported in *Hansard* for June 4, 1925, page 3875:

I apologize to the hon. member for Peace River for going back almost as far as he has in his argument.

"The Parliament of Canada is supreme, and if it should pass any act which is *ultra vires*, the courts would decide the validity of such act. It is not for the Speaker to declare—although he presides over the highest court in the land—as to whether any proposed legislation is *ultra vires*—"

Of course at this point we are not dealing with legislation but rather amendments to the rules of the house. But if I follow the hon. member's argument, it still is based on a constitutional point. I would think this is an argument which might be advanced by the hon. member or by other hon. members in the course of the debate, if they oppose the motion proposed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). In the circumstances I do not think the point of order raised by the hon. member should be sustained.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I feel there has been some advance billing in the presentation of this motion for concurrence. I wish to thank all hon. members who have expressed concern about the presentation of this motion, and those hon. members who have made the necessary procedural changes possible today so that it could be presented.

I believe that before I begin to describe the rules of procedure which are proposed I might be permitted to say a word about the work of the procedure committee. This is an extraordinary committee because it seems—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Blair: —that its various reports made from time to time to the house have occasioned great controversy. This might suggest to hon. members, and indeed to the public, that the proceedings in the committee have carried on in a violent partisan and controversial fashion.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Blair: I think that in fairness to my colleagues in the committee I should here state publicly that the proceedings of the committee have been marked at all times with cordiality and a sincere desire on the part of all hon. members of the committee to get ahead with its work. I am particularly grateful to the members of the committee for the consideration they have shown at all times to their chairman. I suggest that as we embark on this debate we should be under no misapprehension about the nature of the proceedings within the committee, and where we have perforce agreed to disagree we must also take into account that on many grave and important matters we have made recommendations to the house based upon agreement within the committee. I begin by referring to the order of reference which was passed on December 20, 1968. This order reads:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be instructed, and hereby is instructed, to consider and to propose ways to allocate time to the legislative business of the house and to include in its report or reports a draft of a proposed standing order drawn to give effect, if adopted by the house, to the proposal of the committee; and for greater certainty but not to restrict the generality of the foregoing, the committee is instructed to consider the British rules and practice for the allocation of time, the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition on December 10, 1968, the suggestions made by the Minister of Agriculture on December 13, 1968, and other proposals and suggestions made in the debate on the motion for concurrence in the fourth report of the Special Committee on Procedure.

Pursuant to the direction given to the committee by the house, it devoted seven of its meetings during this term to the question of allocation of time. It considered a special report on allocation of time procedures in the British House of Commons, and at all times the committee had the benefit of the knowledge of several very experienced parliamentarians who were members of the committee.

As hon. members know, the committee's report to the house consists of three proposed standing orders. If it would help hon. members in following the remarks I am going to make on these proposed standing orders, they are set forth in full in *Votes and Proceedings* for June 20 of this year.

The first standing order proposed is 75A. This standing order contemplates a position where the leaders of all the parties in the house are in agreement as to the programming of legislation and the allocation of time to legislation at all stages. Where this result is obtained, a minister of the crown has the right to notify the house of the agreement which has been reached by unanimity, and thereupon the motion is put. In my submission, this is the answer to the argument raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), because the final and ultimate decision as to an allocation of time is not made in any sense by private agreement by members of this house, but rather by a motion properly put and properly adopted in accordance with our usual rules.

The second rule is known as 75B. This contemplates a position where a majority of the party leaders agree on a proposal for the allocation of time. This means, for all practical purposes in this house, that three out of the four parties would agree on the proposal. Again, pursuant to such an agreement the motion is put by a minister of the Crown, but

there is one significant difference between the type of allocation of time which is possible under proposed order 75B and the allocation which is possible under proposed order 75A. A motion under 75B can cover only one stage of a bill at one time. For practical purposes, the stages contemplated in the proposed order are second reading, the committee stage, report and third reading. The order provides that only report and third reading can be combined in one allocation of time order. Where such a motion is put pursuant to this order by a minister of the Crown, it will be decided after a maximum of two hours of debate. In the course of this debate no hon. member would be permitted to speak for more than ten minutes.

It appears that there may be some ambiguity in the wording of proposed order 75B as it is presented in the report of the committee. The question which appears to have arisen is whether at all times the government party must be one of the parties forming a majority for the purpose of activating the order. I must express my personal view that there is no doubt in my mind that the committee intended that the government party must be part of the majority, for the simple reason that the motion pursuant to the order can only be presented by a minister of the Crown.

However, if there is an ambiguity, it is the kind of thing which undoubtedly will be exposed in debate and the consequences of that ambiguity will be explored. I have confidence that this house itself is capable in an orderly manner of resolving any ambiguity which might arise from this proposed standing order in our committee's report.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The third standing order proposed is 75C, and this standing order, I need hardly say for the benefit of hon. members, is the one which gave occasion to a partisan dispute. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) properly stated last evening that recorded votes were taken at the end of the sittings of the committee. The committee unanimously adopted standing order 75A. It adopted proposed standing order 75B, with one dissenting vote, and standing order 75C was adopted by a vote which placed the members of the government in opposition to the members of the other parties.

I would like to say first of all with reference to standing order 75C that it cannot be invoked unilaterally by the government. This order is premised upon prior consultation between the government and the other parties, and indeed in its opening words it is made clear that the order can only be invoked if the provisions of standing order 75A and 75B could not be made effective.

The order is plain, but I think it is important to comment on some of its detailed provisions. First of all, any order made under standing order 75C can only apply to one stage of one bill at one time, and again, as is specified in the order and is made plain elsewhere, the stages referred to are second reading, committee stage, report and third reading. As is the case with standing order 75B, an allocation of time order can be made with respect to the report stage and third reading at one time, subject however to the provisions of standing order 75 (13) which specifies that third reading cannot occur on the same day as the report stage unless it has the unanimous consent of the members of the house.

The second important point to note about the proposed standing order 75C is that it cannot be invoked, as it were, in advance by the government. It can only be activated after the specific proceedings have begun. That is to say, if we choose an example of the second reading of any bill, it would not be possible under this order for the government to propose an allocation of time order for the second reading stage in advance of the commencement of the debate on second reading, and any proposal for allocation of time could only occur after that second reading debate had commenced.

The order provides that in the course of any proceedings on a bill a minister of the Crown may give notice of his intention to propose an allocation of time order, and this of course means that notice is dealt with in the ordinary way and any debate on such an allocation order would occur on a following day. The order is similar to standing order 75B in proposing that any debate on an allocation of time order would be limited to two hours and the speeches of hon. members would be limited to ten minutes. It is also provided in standing order 75C that any allocation of time order made pursuant to this standing order must provide for at least one full day of debate, not less than one sitting day.

I imagine that some of the hon. members have a recollection of a proposed standing order which was known as Standing Order 16A, and I would like to suggest to the house that the proposed standing order 75C is quite

unlike the proposed Standing Order 16A. That standing order contemplated that orders for the allocation of time for legislation could be made in advance of any proceedings on the legislation, that they could cover any number of bills and any number of stages in debate on the bills. Under standing order 75c it is clearly provided that it can apply only to one bill and one stage at a time, and this, in my submission, should meet an objection made to standing order 16A that the country could not under that order be guaranteed of being advised of important issues coming forward in debate in this chamber. In a nutshell—

Mr. Stanfield: That is where it was.

Mr. Blair: —having explained the mechanics of standing order 75c, one can say that at the very minimum it contemplates three days at second reading, three days in committee and four days to cover report and third reading stages, and in the very unlikely event that these times were cut to a minimum, no bill can go through this chamber unless it is the subject of at least ten days of debate.

Some hon. Members: That is not true.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the hon. member permit a question? I have a lot of respect for the hon. member. We came from the same university and I believe he is very able, but I should like to put this question to him. As a person of integrity can he stand up in his place and say that there would be no debate on any bill which would be of shorter duration than ten days under this rule?

Mr. Blair: In answer to my hon. friend, who was my junior at law school, may I say that I fail to see how under this bill less than ten days of elapsed time could be occupied in the discussion of these procedures.

An hon. Member: Not elapsed time, but time in debate.

Mr. Blair: Anybody who disagrees with that should rise in his place and say so.

An hon. Member: Do you want a republic?

Mr. Blair: I would not wish the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) to bring his tribal warfare into the chamber.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understood the hon. member, he gave the impression that, taking in all stages of the bill, the debate on it could not be shorter than ten days. If that is not what he said, let him declare it now so we can follow the debate. If that is his position, let him come out clearly and say so. Unless he clarifies the situation he is misleading this house, the public and the press.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Blair: I think that what I have said is clearly on record. There are ten days of elapsed time at least which will be taken up in the discussion of any measure, and procedural matters in relation thereto. If hon. members have comments to make, as they appear to have, they can make them at an appropriate time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask a question, so that we shall be clear about the point the hon. member is making? Unless I misunderstood him, his first statement was that there would be ten days of debate. Now he is talking about ten days of elapsed time, and every hon. member knows there is a great deal of difference between the two. Would he clarify what he meant to say? Does he wish to retract his statement about ten days of debate and say there would be ten days of elapsed time?

Mr. Blair: I do not think there is any compulsion on me to retract anything. The rule is clear and I have stated its effect to the best of my ability. Hon. members may have some comments to make on it at a later stage.

I suggest that although they do present some controversial aspects, these rules represent the best recommendations which the committee found it possible to make to enable the house to cope with the vast and increasing volume of business before it. Concern—and I think it is legitimate concern—has been expressed that if there are provisions in our rules which permit the allocation of time to be instituted by motions on behalf of the government, this might have the effect of destroying the good feeling and co-operation which is the basis upon which most of the business of the house is carried on. With respect to this contention it might be of some assistance if I were to mention a few figures presented to us in a report on the practice in the United Kingdom.

It is estimated that 50 per cent of the business of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom proceeds in accordance with an agreed timetable; that 25 per cent is so uncontentious that it requires the application of no timetable, and that of the balance of 25 per cent deemed to be contentious, the majority,

or a substantial part, is dealt with through the ordinary process of negotiation, with the result that orders allocating time are not the procedures which are usually or habitually employed at Westminster.

The committee on procedure has made a number of recommendations to this house since last fall, and it is my submission that their effect has been to improve our procedure and in many ways to make it easier for ordinary private members in particular to participate in its affairs. It must be borne in mind that the creation of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization means that the continual review and study of the procedures of the house is now one of our regular concerns. None of the rules which we have adopted or which may be proposed can reasonably be likened to the edicts of Justinian, that is, intended to last for all time and regulate the affairs of all future generations.

It is in this spirit that I commend the report of the standing committee. I trust it will be adopted. It does not violate the ancient traditions and procedures of this house. It has been framed with a proper regard for the prerogatives of members, and its full intent and purpose is to enable the House of Commons in this year 1969 to meet the intense pressures placed on a modern parliament.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we have listened with great interest to the speech made by the hon. member. Let me say right now that it is our intention to move an amendment to the motion for concurrence which he has made; it will be within the terms approved by the practice and precedents of the house.

I am sorry the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not here. The Prime Minister is an expert on traps. When he came back and saw the trap in which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) had placed himself and his party, it is quite obvious that the hon. gentleman was repudiated. The cork was pulled out of the bottle and out popped the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), who had been waiting patiently, letting his motion stand day after day, wondering what it was all about.

To an extent, I am glad this happened. It is an indication of the way in which, when there is a good and righteous cause, and it is presented strongly enough by the opposition with the support of the public media, the government can be made to see, at least in part, the light of reason.

Thus, while I do not like some of the proposals contained in standing order 75A, B and C, I am glad we are at least proceeding now in the proper manner and that the government has been made to understand even in a limited way that it does have responsibilities, and that it must accept its position as being subordinate to, not superior to, this house.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Before I deal with the substance of the proposal I think it would be helpful to retrace the progress made by this parliament since last September. At that time we were locked in another struggle comparable to this one. We had indicated our willingness to remain here, if necessary, throughout what would normally have been the Christmas recess to make our point. Faced with this overwhelming pressure of public opinion and parliamentary opposition, opposition not only on this side of the house, I am sure, but substantial opposition on the other side as well, the government took the abhorrent and repugnant 16A out of the order that was then before the house for approval.

It was then that the Prime Minister made the statement that the opposition had fallen into a trap, that all he had ever wanted were the rules changes contained within the proposed order, with the exception of 16A. That is the sort of statement that I suggest no responsible man in public life would ever make. In saying this I am bearing in mind that the right hon. gentleman is back again attempting to get approval of, if not rule 16A, a substantial part of the principle therein involved. He is back again trying to peddle the same bad hardware.

What was the course of events after December, Mr. Speaker? The house made good progress. There was co-operation on all sides, as well as understanding. Meetings, both official and unofficial, were held. Meetings in this house were held of the kind that never take place in the United Kingdom parliament. I think the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) will agree with me that we were amazed to learn of the sort of running discussions held by the house leaders and others involved. Sensing the mood of the house, the needs of the day and the requirements of government in coming to day-to-day decisions, are conditions precedent to the proper operation of a legislative body. Such procedures are not followed in the United Kingdom. I am not going to go into the details of their alternative, which is something

that I do not think this house or this country would ever tolerate.

These procedures to which I have referred have, I think, been shown at their best since last December. There were numerous occasions when the government was faced with the task of asking for unanimous consent to revert to certain matters for disposition, or when the government required certain matters to be expedited for policy reasons or in the interest of the national good. On such occasions the government approached the representatives of the other parties and agreements were made. This happened over and over again.

I also call to mind the situation that developed as a result of the opposition parties agreeing to sacrifice certain days that should have been dedicated to debating problems which members of the opposition, and members on the government side for that matter, thought should be ventilated and dealt with. At these times private members said to the government, in effect: "We know there are difficulties, that time is now of the essence. We will waive two of the six days on which we are entitled to debate the budget." Those days then became days on which government business was conducted. It was not as if those days were added, as they could have been under existing orders, to the number of opposition days.

As I say, private members have been prepared to accede to certain courses of action in order to meet what they thought were the needs of the government. As long as this is done without damage to the welfare of the country and as long as it still permits us to discharge our responsibilities, not only as private members but as members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we are prepared to take this course of action again.

Then again, on other occasions the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), myself, other members of this party and members of the other parties suggested granting additional sitting hours in order that the government might complete certain business and send it to the other place to be dealt with.

I am not going to recite all of these occasions; they are well known to members of this house and to Your Honour. Under the new standing orders members of the opposition have days that belong to the opposition and on which they can move motions touching upon many of the problems that afflict us, problems with which the government has neither the knowledge nor the wit to deal.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

The course of action we took in this regard was during the time when we believed we were approaching the pursuit of a new direction of thought which would make the House of Commons different from what it was in the past. We understood we were going to begin our deliberations at a certain time and were going to end them at a certain time. In the belief that this was what was meant and that certain measures would be dealt with within that period, during the course of some two or three weeks we agreed to extension of the hours. We sat late, and we sat late quite frequently, so that government business could be expedited; and in fact it was.

I am not attempting to deny that there was one occasion, the debate on the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code, when we took what was, in my opinion, perhaps a somewhat longer time than was required. But this place is a forum for the reflection of the views of a substantial portion of the people of Canada, and the hon. members of the Creditistes party, genuinely believing that they had a mandate to oppose certain of the provisions contained in the amendments to the Criminal Code, conceived it to be their duty to debate them rather extensively. I do not fault them for that, though, as I say, I personally did not think the debate required the time it took.

We must remember that we are 264 representatives assembled here to reflect the views of the people of Canada. We are the people of Canada with all their warts and defects. We are no better and no worse. We reflect their thinking. If one group in this house genuinely and sincerely believes it has the duty to attempt to prevent a government measure from being passed—although in this case I did not agree—then I think that group has that right. The question of what is reasonable is another issue, of course. Apart from that one occasion I think the work of this house has proceeded harmoniously and reasonably.

What does the government think will be the spirit that will prevail next session? Let me say at once that I am not making any threats; I merely recognize the hard facts of human nature. Let me contemplate what is going to be the situation next year. If the government persists in this ill advised and improper attempt to obtain the full package contained in proposed standing order 75 I am afraid that, knowing human nature for what it is, we shall not see prevailing here the same measure of harmony, understanding and co-operation that has existed in the past. And

these conditions must be present within any legislative body if it is to do its job properly.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the rules are, and no matter what changes to the rules are introduced, if hon. members of this house become convinced that the government is attempting to operate improperly, without due regard for those matters which must be undertaken, we shall not have a good parliament. When harmony, reason and co-operation fly out the window, the result will not be happy for this house or this country. I am offering no threat; I am speaking simply from my knowledge of human beings in public life. I know what the results of the government's action will be. I say that the government's insistence in pressing on with this dogmatic, ruthless authoritarianism does not bode well for this house and this country.

When I practised law in my younger years I enjoyed nothing so much as a good fight. I enjoyed fighting in the courts.

An hon. Member: You are now junior to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Mr. Baldwin: Only in the sense that I follow him as a speaker in this debate, Mr. Speaker. As I say, I enjoyed nothing so much as a good fight in court. With the passage of years, when I became more mellow—and I recommend to my hon. friends opposite that they, too, should become mellow—I became a great believer in the cardinal principle that a case settled is a case won. When you settle a case both sides gain something and neither side loses. I based my practice on the precepts of arbitration, agreement, understanding and reason, precepts which also make parliament work. If these precepts are not followed I fear what the result may be when we come back next year.

At this time I shall confine my present argument mainly to proposed standing order 76B. In his remarks the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton tried to tell us that proposed standing order 76C is to be invoked only where agreement cannot be reached under 75A or 75B. When speaking on 75B the hon. member indicated that included among the parties which are to reach agreement under that standing order must be the government. I am having difficulties with my eyes at this time, Mr. Speaker, but even so I fail to find any language in proposed standing order 75B which supports the hon. member's contention. Nor can the President of the Privy Council point to any such wording. I think it is clear that if that wording were included in the proposed standing order, it would never have seen the light of day. The omission may have been unintentional, and may have resulted from a spirit of magnanimity on the part of the government party—which I very much doubt—but the fact is that there is nothing within the four corners of proposed standing order 75B which suggests that "a majority" must include the government. It need not necessarily include the government merely because a minister is delegated as being a person who must make the application for allocation of time in the house.

I ask the President of the Privy Council, what will be the situation if representatives of parties meet, discuss allocation of time and then hear the government's representative say that the government is prepared to allot one day, two hours, or whatever the time may be, for this stage of the debate. The representatives of the other three parties may say, "Oh, no; we have certain amendments to propose; in the interest of our constituents we feel that certain aspects of the bill must be resisted, and in order to make our case properly, submit amendments and subamendments, we feel that six days is essential." Let us say that, ultimately, the representatives of opposition parties, who are always reasonable people, reduce their demand from six days to four days.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Is that six days for each stage, or in total?

Mr. Baldwin: It could be for each stage or for one stage. I am speaking of a hypothetical case, Mr. Speaker. Let us say that the minister then says, "No, you will have one day only." What will happen? It is clear that the representatives in question, whoever they may be, constitute a committee emanating from this house with decision making powers. Having exercised their decision making powers the majority of those representatives may say, "We need four days." It could easily happen that the minister may say, "Phooey on your four days. I will not stand up in the house and move the motion." That situation could easily develop, and it is therefore clear that proposed rule 75B is completely useless. Of course the President of the Privy Council and his colleagues may say that a different interpretation is to be placed on the proposed standing order.

We have had experience in this house of how this government operates, Mr. Speaker. Only a little while ago we had a situation in

which it might have been said that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton refused to obey instructions of his committee and move a motion. We may well arrive at a situation in which the government representative on that group duly appointed under the standing order may say, "We care nothing at all for the decision of the majority of the committee," and the minister or government house leader may refuse to move the motion. What will happen then, Mr. Speaker. The minister can say immediately, "There is no agreement," even though the majority of that committee may have agreed. The result may be that the minister may say, "There being no agreement under 75B, I am proceeding under 75C to move a motion to impose limitation of time on terms acceptable to the government only." That is an inevitable result of putting together proposed standing orders 75B and 75C. I therefore say that you may as well toss 75B out the window.

Mr. Stanfield: You might as well toss the government out.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is where the hon. gentleman's party failed last year. His party is quite liable to toss him out.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that inflation has not got the government up high enough. It would not hurt enough at this time. The effect of this is very simple. Because of the government's insistence in proceeding as it has, I am afraid the opportunities for reaching a consensus, particularly having in mind the character of this government and the way it operates, are going to be extremely limited.

What we obviously have is a proposed new standing order, of which the government proposes to use only 75C. This is the whole purpose of the exercise. The rest is simply chocolate covering over the pill. I have no doubt it will be the intention of the government to move on 75C without regard to the duty cast on the minister to follow the majority decision under 75B. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton suggested that there would be ten days. I am not going to get into the controversy which has arisen from the repartee passing back and forth across the floor. I think hon. members on this side made it quite plain what he said.

If there is an issue, a crisis or a new and novel proposal advocated by the government and brought into this house, I suggest that the ten days between the time the debate is initiated and the time the last question is put is not adequate. We have many duties in this house. One of them is that hon. members, if they are in fact performing their duties, must maintain the closest liaison between the people of their constituencies in particular and the people of Canada in general. In the exercise of that responsibility they must from time to time keep their fingers on the pulse of public thinking. What do people want? What will be the impact of government proposals being made. For this reason, if by exercising their responsibility in a responsible way they become convinced that what the government is proposing is wrong and must not be passed, they have a duty, using this house as a forum and using the public media to report our deliberations, to make a case so that the public may be aroused. They must gather together public opinion to such an extent that the government will be compelled to yield. If it does not yield, it must face the consequences of a general election.

I submit that ten days is inadequate for that purpose. I am not talking about the question of the number of days of debate, I say it is inadequate. Having in mind the size and the vastness of the diverse economic and social configurations of Canada there must be a reasonable opportunity for the opposition to make their case for the people of Canada. This cannot be done in ten days. The house should not allow the government by the passage of this measure to proceed in that way.

Last December I might have been tempted to go along with 75C, not in its present form but with some possible variations. But I had some suspicions about the conduct of the government and what it was likely to do. I had some opportunity to see some of their members in action. They had not yet manifested the full strength of their contempt, their disregard for parliament, their authoritarianism, and the casual and callous contempt which the Prime Minister shows in his treatment of this House of Commons. That had not yet manifested itself in full. Today, six or seven months later, we have seen this. Any doubts I might have had in December have now been resolved against the government and against the passage of a rule of this kind. I would consider myself derelict in my duty if I did not say as strongly as I could that this government has not shown that it has earned the right to secure the passage of a measure of this kind.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed standing order 75c.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not having other copies. I was not expecting the withdrawal of the motion by the government. I had other motions ready in case we were proceeding with the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) on being given the green light to proceed with his motion today. He may feel we have been hard on him during the last few days. He does not know what we had planned to say today, but may I assure him we have felt great sympathy for him in having to sit there without moving the motion he had been instructed to present to the house.

Mr. Blair: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fairweather: Have you got permission to speak?

Mr. Blair: That remark is unworthy of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear to the house that there had been an orderly disposition of the proceedings disclosed by the President of the Privy Council some time ago, that encompassed the idea that the public business would be transacted before the procedural matters with which we are now dealing. When that public business was concluded last night, I think prematurely, I was unable to proceed. I resist the idea of any suggestion that I have been derelict in my duty.

Mr. Hees: You don't have to explain; we know.

Mr. Ricard: You are only making it worse.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We will let the record speak for itself, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton when he says that in our Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, at least to a certain point, we had very satisfactory sittings. We dealt with a great deal of work, and produced a number of reports which I think will bear fruit in the future in terms of improving the work of parliament. I would express the hope, too, that when tempers cool over this matter more study will be given to some of the other recommendations we have made. As a matter of fact our deliberations were quite friendly, quite productive and very enjoyable, except for the last two sessions before the third report was presented to the house on June 20.

• (3:50 p.m.)

What was wrong with those last two sessions? I say to my hon. friend from Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) that I take issue with a statement he made toward the end of his speech, and in taking issue with it I indicate what was wrong with those last two sessions. In his concluding paragraph he said he hoped that what parliament was now going to do would not violate the ancient traditions and procedures of this house. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening. The ancient traditions and procedures of this house with respect to its rules are being violated. The tradition that the rules belong to all members of the house, that they belong to parliament, is being violated by a proposal that the rules be written the way the government wants them written.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what was wrong with the last two sittings of our committee before the third report was presented to the house. All the harmony and amity we had went out the window, as we were told what the government was insisting on putting through and, as has already been made clear, the decision to put 75c before the house was on a vote of six to three, the six being Liberal members of the committee and the three being representatives of the opposition parties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is much that one could say, but there are only 40 minutes in which to say it, so I had better not waste too much time congratulating people, especially if that produces points of order. But I must say to you, sir, who found it rather strange that I resisted your invitation to continue the debate on the point of order we were making last night, that I found it rather strange myself; but the answer is that I was quite satisfied that the point we made last night got home, namely that it was proper for the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton to move concurrence in the third report of the committee but it was not proper for the government to move the motion that was in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). Whether the President of the Privy Council agrees with that or not, he has decided not to,

proceed with his motion and so we are dealing with this matter in what in my view is the proper way.

I am completely opposed to this committee report. I will do everything I can to see that it is not adopted, and certainly to see, at least, that 75c is deleted. I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), and my colleagues and I will vote for it, but I repeat that I am glad we are dealing with the report properly under the rules of the house.

Hon. members, are aware of what has brought us to this point. They know that last summer there were discussions as to the possibility of some time allocation rule. We could not reach agreement at the beginning of the session, and so the matter was referred to a Special Committee on Procedure of the House of Commons. That committee brought in its famous report of last December which resulted in a package of new rules being adopted, but not 16A.

Hon. members will recall that that subject was referred to the incoming Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, and that it is the report of that committee, supported only by the majority on the committee, that we have before us at the present time. So the issue through all of this is whether or not we have the wit to find some way to allocate the time of the house on the basis of consultation, on the basis of consensus, or whether the allocation of the time of the house is to be done at the dictation of the government. That was the issue all last fall; that was the issue in December over 16A; that is the issue now.

I still take my stand in favour of planning the use of our time, in favour of allocating the time of the House of Commons, but I take my stand firmly with that being done on the basis of consultation, with that being done on the basis of participatory democracy, on the basis of all parties in this house being involved, and not on the basis of unilateral dictation from the government side. But, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we have in 75c, a proposal under which the allocating of the time of the house to debate is completely in the hands of the government house leader, supported by his government majority.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton devoted a few paragraphs in his speech to a description of proposed rules, 75A, 75B and 75c, and in the first part of that description he said things with which I do not quarrel.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

But as he went along he did say things to which I take very strong exception.

I believe we have already straightened out the mistake he made when he said—and I trust *Hansard* will bear out what he said—that under 75c there would have to be a minimum of ten days of debate on any individual bill. Later he corrected that to say there had to be a lapse of time of not less than ten days. That is correct, Mr. Speaker; but as far as debate is concerned the fact of the matter is that under 75c a bill—any bill—can be put through the House of Commons with only four days of debate—one day on second reading, one day in committee whether it is committee of the whole or a standing committee, one day on the report stage, no matter how many amendments there might be on the order paper, and one day on the third reading.

If one takes into account that under our new rules most of our bills go to a standing committee and there are only three stages on the floor of the House of Commons, this means that under 75c every bill brought before parliament, except those very few bills dealt with in committee of the whole, could be put through parliament with only three days of debate on the floor of the house.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no point in talking about an elapsed time of ten days. As the hon. member for Peace River has already pointed out, there is need in our kind of political democracy for public reaction, for people to know what is going on, for time for them to respond, and I suggest this needs more than ten days from the introduction of an important measure until it is finally passed.

But even though the ten days are there, and even though that is not enough time for public reaction, the harm of this rule is that it makes it possible for debate on bills that have only three stages on the floor of the house to be limited to three days of debate in the Canadian House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough; and I suggest we on this side of the house are doing a service to democracy, to parliament and to the people of Canada in resisting this with all the power that we have, in the hope that, just as on previous occasions majority governments have seen the light, so in this case the government will come to its senses and permit 75c to be taken out of this proposed new set of rules.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton says that 75c does not come into play until

75A and 75B have been used. He said there has to be prior consultation. The government house leader has to be able to stand up and say that he tried to get agreement under 75A or 75B. Therefore we are supposed to have some kind of protection. Does he not realize that what will happen will be along these lines: There will be a meeting of the government house leader with the house leaders of the opposition parties, and there will be a suggestion that we agree under 75A to a certain limited period of time. Then, if we cannot all agree he will try to get three of us to agree under 75B. We won't like the small amount of time that will be offered, and we will start to argue for a little more time. And after that is done we will be told, "If you are not prepared to operate under 75A or 75B I will use 75C." Even if he does not say this, 75C is there like the sword of Damocles—although not quite, because the sword of Damocles did not come down. The rule is there like a real sword over our heads, which means that 75A and 75B are practically nullified by the power which 75C puts into the hands of the government house leader.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The government house leader and others who will take part in this debate may say that 75A and 75B represent suggestions I made before the committee. That is correct. The minutes of the committee will show that I proposed them almost in the wording in which they can be found now. But I proposed 75A and 75B as a total package. If you remove 75C I will still buy 75A and 75B and be proud to have had something to do with suggesting them, but I cannot buy 75A and 75B in a package with 75C which completely nullifies any possibility of the kind of bargaining that should be possible under 75A or 75B. It is like collective bargaining with compulsory arbitration hanging over people's heads or the threat of government action. Bargaining between the house leaders under 75A and 75B will not be free and meaningful as long as 75C is part of the set-up.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes.

Mr. Francis: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member in respect of 75B whether he agrees with the submission of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the representatives of the opposition parties could constitute a majority, not including the representative of the government party?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think that is a nice little point on which one could spend time and not have time to deal with other matters.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Let the little men howl.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If I could have the time to deal with it I would be quite happy to do so. I do not think the amendment the President of the Privy Council wanted to put into 75B was necessary at all. I think that the wording in 75B which says that the government house leader "may move a motion under 75B does not require him to move it and therefore 75B does not operate unless one of the majority is the government representative. Concerning what would happen to 75C if it was argued that 75B had not been fully brought into play, that is one of the fine procedural arguments we could have if 75C comes into play. I suggest this is highly hypothetical because surely debate in this parliament is still effective, surely we are still concerned about the procedural rules of parliament, and before this is all over we will not have a 75C.

I congratulate the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton—please do not raise a point of order until you hear what I am about to say—for not making a mistake when he talked about the point at which 75C could be brought into play. He said it could be applied only after there had been debate. I was listening carefully for him to make the mistake of saying how much debate, but he did not make that mistake because he knows that as that rule reads there could be debate for two minutes or indeed for one minute. Let no one stand in the house and tell me I am dreaming something. I was here in 1956. Not many of those who were here then are still here. But C. D. Howe is still here.

In 1956 there was a rule, Standing Order 33, which provided that closure could not be applied until all aspects of the measure had been under debate. We thought that when we got into committee on the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation bill we would have a debate on the separate clauses of the bill. But when the chairman called clause 1 Mr. C. D. Howe got up over there, picked up the bill and read the marginal note, taking 40 or 50 seconds, and then said, "I move that we proceed to clause 2." He did the same thing

on clauses 2 and 3 and the following clauses. I think there were five or six in all. There were protests and points of order, but in a short space of time Mr. Howe and Walter Harris, who was leading the house, said that we had had a debate on those five or six clauses and that the closure rule would be applied. Mr. King, by the way, in the mid-1930's attacked Mr. Bennett very strongly for having done something like that and quoted Mr. Meighen as having said that the closure rule could not be applied until there has been reasonable debate. But Mr. Bennett applied closure in that way in 1932 or 1933 and Mr. Howe applied it that way in 1956.

Under the closure rule the debate could be concluded in 40 or 50 seconds. Similarly, under 75c a minister could utter one or two sentences and then move the adjournment of the debate. The house leader could then get up and say, "By the way, I have not been able to obtain agreement so I move under 75c that the debate be limited to one day."

An hon. Member: It could be a Wednesday.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, it could be a Wednesday, which is a short day. That is what could happen in respect of the second reading stage. Look also at what could happen at the report stage. While it is not stated in the report and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has not yet taken part in this debate, he has read what I have said and I have read what he said as reported in the newspapers. I understand the reason he feels Standing Order 33 is not adequate is that we now have the report stage and there was no report stage when Standing Order 33 was adopted.

At the report stage we could have 5, 10 or 20 amendments just as we did in respect of the omnibus Criminal Code bill. A motion could be brought in to terminate the debate at the report stage after one day. So if there were 10 or 20 amendments on the order paper for the report stage, a one day debate would allow discussion on one or two of them and no debate on the others. This kind of process of using the closure rule to cut off debate even before there is an opportunity to debate and vote on amendments was described by King in 1933, I believe, as the most oppressive abuse of parliamentary procedure he had ever heard of. This is what we are up against. This kind of rule would permit at the report stage what Bennett and Howe did. The report stage would be out the window.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

In the very good package of rules we brought in last December there were several extremely valuable things. I think we did well in getting many items off the floor of the house into committee such as the estimates and the committee stage of bills. I think parliament operates better because of this. But I also believe that one of the rule changes which has proven to be very worth while is the report stage. This means that a bill which has been dealt with in detail in a standing committee can be dealt with on the floor of the house by members zeroing in on contentious issues. But if all of a sudden the government house leader can bring in a proposal that the whole report stage, no matter how many amendments there are, be limited to one day, then the value of this tremendous innovation, I suggest, is out the window.

So despite the explanation of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton that the rule is very good and is an advance by parliament in meeting the problems of our time and all the rest of it, I submit it is a form of closure even more forceful than the one in Standing Order 33. If time permitted I would have liked to go back and read some of the things that were said about closure in 1913 by a great Canadian statesman. I refer to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Even I was not here then, but from reading *Hansard* it would appear that he must have been an orator par excellence. But I say, as a result of reading his speeches, it was evident that he was at his best when he was denouncing the government of that day for limiting the right of free speech in parliament. I remind members opposite that he stood in this chamber—not this chamber but the one that was burned down—and said he would rather be here and out of office than to have remained in power by the power of the gag, that true Liberalism believes in freedom of speech and would not use its majority to impose that kind of limitation on parliament.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I urge very strongly that we settle in, accept the fact that we are going to have a few days of debate, and hope that within those few days we can settle this matter in the proper way. Last night's debate was not in vain; we got rid of a motion that was out of order and we are now dealing with this matter on a proper basis. Last December's debate was not in vain, despite the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said just afterwards that we had fallen into a trap. We got a good package of rules and left 16A out. I hope the result of this debate will be that

the government will again decide that this vicious rule 75c will be dropped.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton suggested that proposed rule 75c is greatly different from 16A. I did a bit of study on the subject this morning in preparation for what I thought would be another point of order, which was obviated when the President of the Privy Council changed the plans for us today. I would have liked to quote Mr. Speaker Lamoureux and give examples of things that seemed different but which were really alike. I suggest that the effects of 16A and proposed 75c are the same. They give the ultimate, dictatorial power to the government house leader to act even when the entire opposition disagrees with what the government is trying to do to the rules of parliament.

I see the time is moving, Mr. Speaker, and I must move on. What I think really has to be said, and to which there is no answer, is that 75c is not needed; there is no call for it whatsoever. We have been getting along well since Christmas in parliament up until a couple of weeks ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We had a couple of delays. The only piece of legislation with regard to which we had any significant delay was the omnibus Criminal Code bill. I was in favour of it, but I submit that there was a case for hon. members to have the opportunity to debate that bill because of the strong feelings they held about it. Even that bill could have been dealt with under 75B. With regard to the languages bill, if you want to say it was debated at length, it could have been dealt with under 75B. Perhaps it could have been dealt with under 75A. There has not been a single instance since Christmas when 75c was needed—not one.

Why, then, spoil the relationships we have had in this house in the past five months? We have had our disagreements and arguments, but we have agreed scores of times. The President of the Privy Council has risen in the house on many occasions and said: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is general agreement about this. What do we do? We get up over here and say: Yes, that is agreed, Mr. Speaker. It is as simple as that. We have settled scores of things. We have given up a lot of days. We have made switches of various kinds. We have had, in my view, one of the best sessions we have ever had procedurally in regard to getting things through the house.

We have dealt with these questions on the basis of consultation. We have reached a consensus most of the time. There have been a few slips. Sometimes my friend the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) has said no, and we have sometimes had to agree that he was right. Once in a while a Conservative has said no. It does not do any harm to have a little difference once in a while and take a little time to debate a subject upon which even one hon. member feels strongly. But in the main parliament has operated on the basis of consultation. It has gone well. One of my colleagues, if he gets the floor today, will list the number of items we have put through the house. It has been a good session. Now the government wants to spoil it all by putting us at arm's length, which it has done in the past two or three weeks. We are at arm's length over this issue, and this is a good way to stall parliament.

I submit that the government, having come to its senses last night over one point, should now come to its senses over this proposed rule and drop it. When we talk to people outside, or to the press boys at the coffee table, the one thing everybody seems to agree upon is that this rule is not needed. They ask: Why has the government brought it in? It is not really necessary at all.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to deal with what is perhaps a fundamental, almost philosophical question in relation to this whole business. If someone stands, as I do, and says he believes in allocating time and planning the work of the year, as I do, the question comes back: If you agree to that, if you are in favour of planning, don't you have to do something to limit debate? I agree it is necessary to limit debate. This parliament has done it. We have limited the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is eight days now, it was ten days a few years ago, and at times took 30 days when I first came here. There was no limit, but it went on for as many as 28 or 30 days. We have limited the debate on the budget. We have limited the debate on the estimates. We have made life easy for this government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My friends over there are laughing. They just have not been around here long enough.

Mr. Dinsdale: That is right; they are too green.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And they will not be around here long enough to learn much, either.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: They are neophytes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): For example, it used to be possible for the opposition, by withholding supply on the main estimates or interim supply, to keep the government at bay three, four or five times a year and obtain commitments and answers from the government on important issues. But now the government receives interim supply for three months on a certain date in March just as automatically as the coming of spring. It receives its main estimates for the full year on a certain day at the end of June just as automatically as the coming of summer. We have the right to vote against the main estimates, but who is going to vote against estimates which include money for agriculture, labour, pensions, or what have you, in the general package? The government does not know what struggles governments in the past have had to obtain this money. We have simplified the rules; we have made it easy for the government. I mentioned Mackenzie King a few minutes ago. I recall him very well. If he came back—

An hon. Member: He is back.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —he would not recognize the rules of this place. Debate has to be limited, and we have accepted that principle. The time limit on all speeches used to be 40 minutes; now it is sometimes 30 minutes, 20 minutes, 10 minutes, 5 minutes, and we even have a 3 minute rule. We have all kinds of limitations. The point about limiting debate is that it is proper for us to do it, but we must do it by agreement and we must all share in the decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My right to speak in this House of Commons is not given to me by the government, it is not given to me by the Prime Minister, it is given to me by the people of Winnipeg North Centre who sent me here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Burton: You boys had better remember it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The right of the Prime Minister to speak in this house, his freedom of speech, is given to him not by the opposition or the government but by the people of Mount Royal who sent him here.

Some hon. Members: By Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, Canada did not send the Prime Minister here.

An hon. Member: Yes, it did.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The people of Mount Royal sent him here. I say to you as strongly as I can, Mr. Speaker, that we come here as equals, every one of us, with the right to speak on behalf of our people in the parliament of Canada. It may be said to me: If we all exercised that right and there were no limit on debate, there would be no time for anything. My answer is that this is the reason we get together and by consent and with common sense do what will be fair to everyone. We reach agreement as to limitations we will impose upon ourselves. But these are limitations imposed by agreement amongst all of us. No majority, merely because it has a majority in this House of Commons, has the right to take away from members of this house freedom of speech which they do not want to surrender. That is what this government is trying to do by allocating time by a majority vote.

• (4:20 p.m.)

There is nothing wrong with parliament as a whole deciding to limit speech, provided we do it with the consent of all, perhaps not unanimously to the extent of every last member but certainly by general consent. That is what we have done across the years. Every change there has been in the amount of time members can take has been made under the tradition or procedures of this house which are being violated by the proposal today, despite the fine statement made by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. I submit that the whole question of the right of individual members to speak is a basic right given to them not by the government, not by the government house leader, no matter how much of a dictator he may be, not by a majority on the government side but the people who sent us here, and we are entitled to retain that right except in so far as we agree to surrender it on the basis of common sense.

I still argue that we should work our heads off to arrive at arrangements for allocating the time of the house, but let us do this by agreement. I thought that is what we were working toward in the committee until the last two meetings.

An hon. Member: You were fooled.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, I was fooled. I thought we were going in that general direction. There was good will, good humour and a camaraderie was built up as we get together, ate together, and so on. All this went down the drain when we were suddenly told, "No, it is not going to be done that way. The government is doing to decide when free speech is to be limited."

That is why I feel that standing order 75c simply must be reconsidered. I do not know how long this debate will go on. Last night it took only two hours to win a certain point; I hope it will not take two or three weeks to win this one. We are all going to make the best speeches we can. We are going to argue our cases as strongly as we can, but not just for the fun of hearing ourselves speak or of getting our names on the record. We want parliament to win this issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What happened in December was not that we or they won but that parliament won when the decision was made to adopt the rules to which everyone agreed and not to adopt the one to which there was violent objection.

I submit that a victory will be won by parliament if out of this discussion we can reach the decision to continue to wrestle with the problem of time allocation. I am not asking the government to drop the idea of time allocation and of planning the year. I am proud of the start we made and of the calendarization that we put into our rules. Let us keep wrestling with the problem until we arrive at a scheme for programming the year, a scheme for allocating time to which we all agree, not one that is imposed upon us. What we have is a rule that is before the house today because it was supported by the government majority in a committee, but only by that government majority. If it goes through, it will go through only on the votes of the government majority, and I suspect that some of them have their doubts about it. If it is put through and is brought into play, the farcical votes that will take place after two hours debate will be votes in which a decision to cut off debate will be made on the basis of a government majority. The government wins a decision three times as to what the rules of the house should be. It wins on the basis of its majority three times and parliament is out.

My friends over there will say to me in private and in public, "Don't we operate on the basis of a majority?" Yes, we do when we pass laws, when we legislate. But when we make the rules of the game it is not the strongest side that makes the rules but everybody who is involved. One wins this battle not by muscle but by merit, not by brawn but by brain, and I think we have the wit to do it.

I appeal as strongly as I can to the house to support the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the report be referred back to the committee. Perhaps we can do the same thing that we did last December. Instead of having to take the time to send the report back to the committee and let it report again, we can do what was done on December 20. The minister can get up and suggest that the third report of the standing committee be adopted minus rule 75c. That was what was done on December 20 and it can be done now. It would save much time and we could get out of here. All we are here for is to try to straighten out this rule situation. I hope it will be done that way.

If I still have time I should like to read something that was said by the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada for a number of years. These words impressed me greatly at the time.

An hon. Member: He was a real Liberal.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This statement was made in the year 1946 before he became Prime Minister. We were debating the subject of redistribution, which at that time was dealt with by a committee, and also the means of seeking an amendment to the constitution from Westminster. In the course of a debate on how far the government could go in amending the B.N.A. Act by a simple resolution to Westminster, Mr. St. Laurent was asked by Mr. Arthur Smith of Calgary, the late father of one whom some of you know, whether it would be possible for the government to change the language provision of the B.N.A. Act by the simple device of a resolution to the parliament at Westminster. The debate came back to my mind because of the discussion we have had lately.

Mr. St. Laurent made what I thought was a most courageous reply. Obviously he had given some thought to the matter and had prepared himself to reply. He said that this could be done legally, that under the constitution parliament could pass a resolution, send it to the King, who was the monarch in those days, and ask for it to be laid before the British parliament, and that in this way the B.N.A. Act could be amended to take away the use of the French language. To quote his exact words as recorded at page 2621 of *Hansard* of June 18, 1946, he said:

> Legally I say it can. The situation appears to me to be this. There are persons and nations who reach a high estate in the affairs of men, and the high estate they reach imposes upon them high obligations. There was no obligation on the Tribune Festus to say to King Agrippa that he could not deliver Paul to the Jews when they requested that he be put to death. It occurs to one, however, that they also had reached a high estate, which imposes a corresponding obligation.

And then Mr. St. Laurent said:

> I copied out of the Bible on the table of this house, from the Acts, the quite natural statement of Festus:
>
> "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."

Then in two or three paragraphs on pages 2621 and 2622 of *Hansard* for that day—and I invite hon. members to read those paragraphs—Mr. St. Laurent went on to indicate some of the things that his ancestors of French speaking origin had gone through. He spoke about some of the things that had been done, but he declared that certain wrongs would not be committed because, like the Romans, we had reached a higher estate. Finally, he ended with these words:

> If it is fair, if it is just, if it is proper according to the standards of human decency, it will be done; if it is unfair, if it is unjust, if it is improper, all members of this house will say, "It is not our manner to do such things."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. St. Laurent said of the Romans that there were certain things they would not do even though they had the legal right to do them. Mr. St. Laurent said of the government majority of that day—and he spoke of the government majority in any parliament—that though there were certain things they might have the legal right to do, it was not their manner to do them.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I say to the government opposite that they have the majority and they can put this sort of thing through, wrong though it is. They can throttle parliament in the process and they can interfere with the right of free speech. But I thought that as Liberals it was not their manner to do such things.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the eloquent speeches made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles); I was truly impressed, in view of the fact that they have much more experience in this house than myself, as this is my first session here.

For several reasons, I do not intend to go back as far as 1946, but I would rather consider the present situation of a Canadian member of Parliament, in 1969, in an attempt to see how much standing orders 75A, 75B and 75C are really in the interest of Canadian parliamentary life.

Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian member of Parliament asks himself certain questions, after having done much research. On many occasions, this parliament has attempted to improve its procedure, its operations, to act more effectively, to give a better performance, in order to bring about a better recognition of each hon. member's right. Every improvement has been done in the interest of the Canadian parliament.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that my words will not be misinterpreted. The amendments proposed by the government party represent for the most part a definite improvement as regards what exists presently in the Standing Orders. I refer more particularly to Standing Orders 75A and 75B, about which the members of my party are in agreement. In this sense, my party wishes to congratulate the government on his contribution.

However, we are not going any further, we do not support the government any longer, we are opposing and we shall continue to oppose, with all our strength, the adoption of Standing Order 75C for reasons that are not due so much to the past as to the present and that I should like to enumerate briefly in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up the whole thing, I believe that any majority government, be it made up of Progressive Conservatives, Liberals, New Democrats or Créditistes, will

always be very strongly tempted to control everything.

A majority government has control over its members. A very complex system has been established to control not only the attendance of hon. members in the house but also what they must say and do. The government should not be blamed for that, Mr. Speaker, since it is trying to ensure its survival. I do not say that not because the Liberals are on the other side; I would say the same thing if it were the Progressive Conservatives, the New Democrats or the Créditistes because it is so strong a temptation that one is inclined to yield to it.

Therefore, the control of hon. members, of what they say and of the introduction of proposed legislation is possible. In fact, any government, whatever its political colour, controls also the contents of the legislation, and the standing orders that have been adopted say it clearly: No member of the opposition can introduce a measure that entails the spending of money.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposition cannot introduce money bills liable to help the Canadian people. If they did, they would be called to order pursuant to the standing orders and the tradition of this house.

So, any government controls not only its own members but also its own ministers. It may happen that one of them goes astray but he is always called back to order, and many precedents prove it. The government controls not only its members but also the legislation. It controls the spending of money and sets up the legislative program.

In fact, one can never blame the opposition for the fact that during a given session, no significant legislation has been passed. Why? Because all legislative action comes and will continue to come—and this is in accordance with the Standing Orders—from the majority government. The same holds true in the case of a minority government.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, because of the majority it holds, a government controls parliament in a certain way. What displeases me most in the house is to realize that a government is able to control this supreme institution called parliament.

Since September, Mr. Speaker, we have noted a certain change in the way that committees carry on their work. We have seen that, more and more, the government is giving in to the temptation of controlling everything, and in particular the work of the committees.

Again last night, in this house, several hon. members were raising such questions. I was one of them, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the work done in committee is important. That work must be carried on independently from the ministers' will, because the hon. members' work is not subordinated to the political parties. Such must be the situation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, besides controlling parliament and the hon. members on the government side, in committee as well as in the house, the government, by means of rule 75c could—if it was ever passed, and that would be unfortunate—also have control over the opposition members. It could shelve the third parties and, on that score, Mr. Speaker, I need not say that we shall never give in.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said so eloquently, we have all been elected on an equal footing. We have all received a mandate from our electors and once elected, we represent our constituents, and also the whole Canadian population.

• (4:40 p.m.)

As such, we are all equal in the house and should be treated accordingly.

This morning I had the pleasure of taking part in the C.B.C. program *"Présent"*, with the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Forest) who recognized that closure was archaic, harsh and unpopular with the population.

Though he did not say it in so many words, it meant that the government was looking for another way to control debates, to stop them when it saw fit and even to impose a time limit.

But what distresses me even more, Mr. Speaker—and I would be remiss in my duties if I did not say it, though it might hurt some people—are the statements made about the opposition. Some seem to believe in this house that the Créditistes are mainly responsible for the extension of our proceedings, and so on, and so forth. The government has often attempted to put the blame on the Créditistes.

When I attended one of the meetings of the committee on procedure and organization—I was then one of its members—I saw many sniggers and noted many hints and allegations, some of which were downright scornful. This was meant to imply that because of the unfortunate behaviour of the Ralliement

créditiste when the Criminal Code was under consideration, it was now necessary to force upon us, willy-nilly, a provision on closure which is as hateful as the present one and which although it is more concealed, more modern, would also be a weapon, a guillotine to put an end to the squawks of the members of the Ralliement créditiste.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with that allegation and if it were only for this reason, the government has not heard the last of us, because they are not being honest in making such insinuations.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable to be criticized by some government members who never rise to speak in the house, who sit here doing nothing, who get their allowance but remain idle in parliament. In accusing members of the Ralliement créditiste, of the New Democratic Party or the Progressive Conservative party of talking too much when they are making every effort to fulfil the mandate they have received from their constituents, I believe those government members are going too far.

That shows you in what spirit the present government introduces Standing Order 75c. That is why I wish to congratulate the member for Peace River and his colleagues, as well as the member for Winnipeg North Centre and his colleagues, for not letting go, and showing the government that even though it has managed to muzzle its men, it will never manage to muzzle the members of the opposition, at least certainly not the members of the Ralliement créditiste, and I would like that to be clear. Past experience has proved that those two parties teach lessons to the two old parties. Indeed, all the members of the Ralliement créditiste, like the N.D.P. members, make it a point of honour, a duty to participate in the drawing up of legislation, and not in delaying it, to reject the government proposals, to amend or study them. To my mind, those members certainly deserve congratulations, and certainly not censure or the imposition of Standing Order 75c.

Mr. Speaker, I say that Standing Order 75c is unfair to those members who are in earnest about their role as members, and who want to fulfil their electoral mandate adequately.

The government will soon rise in defence of efficiency. The partisans of efficiency, of production, of profitability are having their fling today, under the boot of the Prime Minister. Nothing is left to chance. It is a question of anticipating everything, of regulating everything, of prescribing, if necessary, always on the ground of efficiency and of output. The content or the quality of the bills matters little. What is important is the number of laws that we shall adopt to impress the Canadian people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we maintain that it is the quality that matters rather than the quantity. This should not make you conclude, Mr. Speaker, that we are agreed to filibuster or to delay the proceedings of the house. That is not the question. We are ready to co-operate and we have proved it.

It will also be necessary, Mr. Speaker, to examine the content of the bills. One is right to oppose a bill when it does not contain anything or when it contains controversial measures. The government can certainly not blame us then because we perform our duty.

Under to the Canadian parliamentary system, the contents of legislation has to be controlled, imposed by the government and more precisely by the government members. In fact, no member, not even a government member, can move a piece of legislation that would involve expenditures. That is important in my opinion and that is why I come back to it.

So members of the opposition are fully restricted as to the presentation of bills. There is only one possibility left to them, which is nevertheless tremendous: To consider government proposals, government projects and then give them unreserved support, criticize them in part, move amendments or reject them completely. Such is our lot. In short, opposition members cannot avail or pride themselves of any serious move, because they cannot make any proposal involving the expenditure of public funds.

The opposition as it is now designed must necessarily wait for government initiatives before initiating constructive criticism on behalf of the Canadian people. The purpose of Standing Order 75c is to take away from the opposition the right of free speech with regard to government proposals. This is the way things are now.

Therefore, the sole asset, the only working tool of the opposition, is the time factor. For the opposition this factor is essential and basic. It makes it possible for it to study bills which generally are introduced at the last minute by the government for fear that they might be considered, that certain controversial questions might be let out in the open such as, for instance, the omnibus bill. The government is afraid that these subjects might be considered and scrutinized and that one or

more amendments may be moved or that the whole bill may be thrown out, which remains the basic privilege of democracy. In fact, it is even its corner-stone.

Under Standing Order 75c, opposition members will not only be unable to take any financial or government initiative but the time allotted for the thorough consideration of such measures could also be limited by any minister, at any time, on any subject.

This is sheer nonsense.

Opposition members are blamed for taking too much time but we can indeed blame the government members for never making good use of the time of the house, for never participating in any debate. We even wonder what they are doing here. Why have they been elected? Why are they paid for?

I think that the present debate will, at least, serve the best interests of parliament because members will ask themselves questions about their duties in parliament.

It is easy to blame the members who speak in the house but let us also blame those who never participate in any debate.

Those are the people who would prevent opposition members from doing their job, from doing their part in considering legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is sheer nonsense.

We agree that the rules should be changed in order to avoid, as far as possible any waste of time. We wholeheartedly agree on the wording of orders 75A and 75B, but not on that of 75c.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We must think over the role of the government member as well as that of the opposition member. We must equip ourselves with modern and efficient tools.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a few days ago, government members met for a famous symposium that will probably go on record, to think over their function. They all asked themselves the following question: What are we doing in Ottawa? What are we doing in parliament? Why did they hold this meeting? Precisely because most of them realized they could not take part in debate. Their role is restricted to being mere numbers in the voting machine.

Mr. Speaker, government members envy opposition members who can be active in debate, and that is why they ought to be congratulated for having asked themselves questions. However, I am at a loss to understand that those same hon. members, who now demand from their Prime Minister the power, the privilege—which indeed they have and do not exercise—to take part in discussions, would like the opposition members to remain seated and say: You are absolutely right. All bills are good; we remain in our seats. Keep on governing, and in four years, we will have an election.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is preposterous. We cannot tolerate that.

Now back to rules 75A, B and C. Under rule 75A, as one knows, unanimity is required among members of all parties. That means, Mr. Speaker, that whenever the government introduces a bill of national interest or a bill which they believe important and which they want passed as quickly as possible, for all kinds of reason, good in themselves, they seek the advice of the house leader of each opposition party and try to come to what they call a gentlemen's agreement, a friendly agreement between the parties. And if the government does not get that unanimous consent, they could resort to rule 75B, that is a decision between the representatives of the various parties could be reached on a majority basis.

It is clearly mentioned in the amendment, and I quote:

—including that of the government,—

That is more or less what has been happening since the beginning of this session, and it seems that the principle has worked out quite well. Indeed, all parties have been very co-operative, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could vouch for it were he in the house at this time.

When the omnibus bill was debated, the Minister of Justice decided at one point to ask for our co-operation. Right away we replied: "We are ready to co-operate." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, an hour and thirty minutes later we were asking ourselves that the question be put. They cannot therefore blame us for uselessly extending the proceedings. We are ready to co-operate. We are showing our good will, but we would like hon. members opposite to do likewise.

However, Standing Order 75c is unacceptable for many reasons. It states that if an agreement cannot be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A, a minister from his seat, in connection with any question, at any time, can propose a motion aimed at limiting the debate.

This, Mr. Speaker, is strangely similar to the present Standing Order 33 which reads as follows:

Immediately before the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in committee of the whole—

That becomes interesting. And note that is nearly word for word.

—any Minister of the Crown who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting—

This, Mr. Speaker, is exactly how Standing Order 75c reads.

—of his intention so to do may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned, or that the further consideration shall be the first business of the committee—

This is rule 33, at page 28 of the Standing Orders adopted in January 1969.

Mr. Speaker, there is a strange similarity between Standing Orders 75c and 33. We can find it also between Standing Orders 16A and 75c.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that is all one.

Standing order 16A 3(b) read as follows, and I quote:

The Chairman—

In other words, the President of the Privy Council—

—from his place in the house can give verbal notice of the meetings arranged for the said committee—

Or for the sittings of the house—

—in any case, written notice of such a meeting, etc.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to take the time of the house to read rule 16A, which was rejected, besides, and rightly so. If any hon. member put side by side on his desk rule 75c, standing order 33 and rule 16A, he would find, on reading them that they are almost identical. He would see that the object is the same in the three cases: to limit debate and to put a stop to it.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we do not accept. The opposition has no wish to be controlled or muzzled.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to take up too much of the time allotted to hon. members nor to impose upon my hon. colleagues' kindness, but I still have some important comments to make at this time.

Many before me have spoken with emphasis and have expressed the hope of greater co-operation between the party in power and the opposition.

[Mr. Fortin.]

The President of the Privy Council has complained in the house about the lack of co-operation between the parties. However, the opposition calls the hon. members on the government side high-handed people, who want to establish a totalitarian system.

Mr. Speaker, this is what gave birth, I think, to Standing Order 75c. As a matter of fact, while yielding to the temptation to control everything, the majority government said to itself: By controlling the business of the house, we will avoid quibbling, discussions and loss of time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not make any sense for the following reason. In the same way that the government is asking the opposition every day to compromise, to make concessions and to co-operate, it should also compromise and co-operate.

I suggest this is the stumbling-block of this discussion which is altogether too often forgotten.

Members of the house rise at any time to blame their colleagues of their lack of co-operation, of abuse of power, of the rules, of anything you wish, but everyone seems to forget that if we were willing to co-operate, nothing would be easier as far as setting up time limits is concerned.

Here is the proof. The whole opposition seems to agree on rules 75A and 75B. Most government members say that the standing orders of the House of Commons are archaic. That is true, Mr. Speaker. They say that the House of Commons is held up to ridicule, in many respects, by Canadian people. That also is true, Mr. Speaker. But blocking the business, imposing closure, muzzling hon. members from all sides of the house, that is not a step forward, it is a step backward.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if there is to be real co-operation, there must not be on any side drastic measures or filibustering, except if we are deliberately provoked, as the government did during the debate on the omnibus bill.

And even there, we were right, because we were faithful to the mandate conferred on us by our electors, for is that not the purpose of our presence here? Were we not commissioned to act in conformity with the will of our electors and to see that it is respected?

However, it goes without saying that in certain circumstances, during consideration of this or that bill, where public opinion is aroused against its adoption, where the consequences of its adoption could be very detrimental to a large part of the population, hon.

members, whatever their party, should have the privilege of making themselves heard on a controversial bill. I think it is a privilege that no party, no man will ever be able to take away from the house, without destroying Canadian parliamentarianism.

Mr. Speaker, what strikes me even more is this: If we replace the Liberals by the Conservatives and if the Conservatives brought forward this same standing order 75c we would see the best speakers of the Liberal party—such as the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) for instance—make telling speeches and say to the Conservative government that it is authoritarian, totalitarian and dictatorial, and that it is keeping Parliament under its heel. Then we would hear great speeches, by Liberal members, including the President of the Privy Council himself, and I think that he is fair enough to admit it. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) who is smiling, would be the first one to stand up and blame the government for being authoritarian, autocratic and anything you want.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Today, these people are in power and they would like to do so. One wonders whether they are really serving the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people or whether they are as always serving the interests of only one man, the Prime Minister, who wants to rule everything. One can ask the question but I do not know what is the answer. However, they know it. Their conscience dictates it to them.

Mr. Speaker, one must not lose sight, of the fact during this debate which questions and jeopardizes the ability for each member, in particular for opposition members, to speak freely, that we are the spokesmen of the Canadian people, and that on that basis the quantity of the bills must necessarily give place to quality.

Let us come back to the main argument advanced by the President of the Privy Council who clearly stated, during consideration of standing order 16A and who said it again on many instances during the meetings of the committee on procedure and organization and again yesterday, during the consideration of the motion which he introduced, that the business of the house is lagging behind which results into a great loss of time. That is a fact, and everyone admits it. There is no argument about that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President of the Privy Council on that score; but that does not mean that we should hurl ourselves at the other extreme to the extent of limiting the debate to one day for instance as standing order 75c stipulates.

Mr. Speaker, let us work it out: after the movers of the motion have spoken, as well as those who reply officially on behalf of each party, I can assure you that there is not much time left for those members who are known as the back-benchers. In other words, a very small minority, not even 1 per cent of the members, would be able to speak on standing order 75c. The other members would sit here to allow the government to either be overthrown or stay in power. We are not voting machines; we are here to participate.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind you that the Canadian parliament, in my humble opinion, is an instrument put at the disposal of the representatives of the Canadian people to legislate; it gives every member the power to participate in the drawing up of legislation. I feel it would be an error on our part if we were to take away that right from the members.

Mr. Speaker, just one more thing before bringing my remarks to a close: any debate on any topic, always gives us the opportunity to throw light on every aspect of a question, and enables us to put it before the public. It also gives us the opportunity of expressing the public opinion in the House of Commons. It affords the public, as well as the members of every party, the opportunity to protest, to judge, to criticize, or to accept a proposal, as the case may be. It also gives the opportunity of delving more deeply into a subject, and to do some research. A debate can compel the members to think, to work and to prepare speeches. Lastly, it enables us to better understand the implications of a piece of legislation and maybe, if it is in the best interests of the Canadian people, to amend it.

If we limit debate according to the state of health or good will of a minister, whoever he may be, Mr. Speaker, then the sovereignty of parliament does not make any sense.

Several government members here are bringing up again the notorious matter of the omnibus bill. I would like then not to consider that matter as a refusal on our part to participate or to co-operate. It would be unfair of them, because they are aware, as well as president of the Privy Council that we did co-operate. In fact, many times he has sought the co-operation of the Ralliement Créditiste members, and we had never turned

him down, we have always accepted to co-operate. On the other hand, every time he has tried to impose his own views on us without seeking our advice, we have always refused our co-operation, because as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Center said, we refuse, under the pretext of modernizing the rules of the House of Commons, to be pushed around. We readily accept modernization but we want to truly and fully participate in it.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Ralliement Créditiste will not allow those members who never take part in the business of the house to blame us for extending our debates unnecessarily. This is nonsense and it should cause the President of the Privy Council and his colleagues to ponder and urge the opposition members to be a little more brief in order not to delay our proceedings too much. But at the same time, he should see to it that his own people participate more in our discussions so that parliament would not only for the opposition but also for government members who do not speak too often.

This is why we believe, Mr. Speaker, that there would be an advantage at this moment, even if we support section 75A and 75B, in withdrawing section 75C and in referring the whole thing to the committee for a deeper and more serious study. The very definition of the Canadian parliament, of the meaning of a debate, of the role of a member, whether of the government or of the opposition, is at stake, and I think the question should be of interest to all hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleagues for their patience and to ask those who are most experienced to express their views in order to preserve the rights of this parliament. I would also ask them to set an example to the younger members in order to prove to them that this parliament still mean something in 1969, because even if it is modernized, one must still respect the right of every member to speak.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as a number of hon. members have already suggested, the committee which has considered and produced the recommended rules spent a fair amount of its time since Christmas trying to arrive at some kind of compromise between the position taken by hon. members on the other side and the position taken by the government. I think it is fitting that this difference in point of view is expressed in the amendment put forward. That is the real controversy that has been before the committee and in fact before the house for most of this session, namely, the point of view taken by the opposition that the majority of the members should not in the long run have the opportunity of determining how the time of the house is to be utilized.

As hon. members have already mentioned, principally in seven sittings of the committee the question of time allocation was discussed. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), in one of his lyrical moments, suggested that everything was going swimmingly and there was no hint of difficulty or controversy until we got down to the last two meetings. I think the hon. member will agree he was being lyrical. At all times it was made perfectly clear on behalf of the majority of members of the house, and my colleagues on the committee made it perfectly clear they considered that this and all other questions in the house were to be decided by the majority of voices, including the decision of programming.

The committee devoted itself to arriving at some kind of compromise to find means whereby the rights of the minority to express their viewpoint in opposition to a particular bill could be made available and at the same time so that ultimately a decision could be taken on all of the measures put before parliament. This is the basic question, and apparently this basic question still remains to be decided in the house and between the various parties in the house.

I will not spend any time describing in detail 75A and 75B. The proposed rule 75A really makes formal what has been an informal practice of the house, that is to say, by general agreement of the representatives of the parties a decision is made as to how time is to be allocated. The advantage that 75A offers which has not hitherto been available under our rules is that it will make it possible for the representatives of the parties to agree on an appropriate order. We will not be in the situation we have sometimes found ourselves in where one or two members can prevent the vast majority of members of the house from arriving at a decision as to how the time is to be allocated at the various stages of a bill.

As has already been indicated, under rule 75B there is a different procedure, recognizing the fact that there is a dissent. One of the opposition parties may well dissent to the proposal put forward. One stage of the bill is

to be dealt with at a time. Of course, the report stage and third reading are to be dealt with together. There is to be a two hour debate with opportunities of ten minutes each for hon. members to express their reasons why the order should or should not be made, and in the house, by a majority decision of the house, the majority of voices decides whether or not the order should pass.

I think hon. members will recognize these are useful tools which will greatly facilitate the work of the house. I do not think we can lay down our pens on this particular task without also dealing with the pathological situation, the one that will occur from time to time where perhaps a united opposition, or in the case of 75B two of the opposition parties, perhaps the two minor opposition parties, will not be in agreement with the proposed order and thereby be able to bring the business of the house to a halt.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Rule 75c has a deadlock provision, Mr. Speaker. It is to apply in a situation where, as I have said, there is a united opposition against the government or where even two of the opposition parties, perhaps two of the minor opposition parties, are united in opposing the timetable which may be agreeable to the other two parties in the house.

I think it is only fair to point out the particular aspect of 75B which makes this safeguard proposal necessary, and that is that 75B really declares those things equal which in effect are not equal. For example, 75B declares that the 153 Liberals in the house are equal in weight and quantity to the 14 Creditistes. It declares that the 22 members of the N.D.P., are equivalent in size to the 72 members of the Progressive Conservative party. In other words, it equates groups that have large differences between them and thereby creates what is in effect an unreal equity between them.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said he assumes, and I take it he meant this seriously, that in most cases the government house leader will say, "This is it; either you agree to this order or I will make one of my own." I use his quotation from Mr. St. Laurent, and perhaps more in the vein in which Mr. St. Laurent intended it:

> While there are certain things which we have a legal right to do it is not our manner to do so.

I would suggest that during the course of this particular session that fact has been quite evident in the running of the house. But I equally put to you, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of two opposition parties using the leverage which 75B would give them to hold the house up to ransom, or even the possibility of one of the minor parties—where the other has indicated it was unalterably opposed to the legislation—trying to squeeze concessions in terms of time or of amendments to the legislation or other particular concessions which in the opinion of the majority might be neither wise nor just. It is because of this leverage that we feel there should be some safeguard against a provision which could so aptly be described as being undemocratic, which can certainly be described as being unparliamentary, and which equally can be described as contrary to the expressed written provisions of our constitution.

First, with respect to its undemocratic character, what it really indicates is that we would have minority rule, that a minority of members would rule how the house should carry on its business. That is not consistent with the basic tenets of democracy. In the long run the majority should be in a position to decide.

Second, I suggest it is an unparliamentary provision in the sense that there is no other assembly in the parliamentary system which in this way gives the whip hand to the small parties in the house, to a small minority of members. Equally I suggest it is contrary to the expressed written provisions of our constitution, about which we have heard reference already today. Section 49 of the British North America Act states:

> Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices—

In other words, I think that without more than is advocated in 75B, we have a rule that is undemocratic, contrary to the parliamentary tradition, and contrary to the expressed terms of our constitution. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was prepared to claim fatherhood for 75B, and I am prepared to accord him the responsibility or, if he prefers it, the credit for having produced this particular proposal. But I just point out that in trying to get minority control of this house under 75B, and 75B only, he is really reaching for that which the electors of Canada refused to him and his party, namely, control of the House of Commons.

Because of the extensive description already given of 75c I will not delay over it long, but I do wish to emphasize its principal aspects. The first is that the application under 75c is conducted only with respect to a single

bill, and with the exception of the combination of report stage and third reading it is applied only to a single stage of a single bill.

The way in which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) described it in his second formulation was correct, when he described it as requiring the lapse of at least ten days before the full rule could be worked in detail. In fact, under our procedures I would suggest that as a minimum much more than ten days would be required. This is because, as hon. members know, there is now a rule of the house that unless a special order is made the committee stage of public bills is automatically conducted in a standing committee, and the experience we have of our standing committees during the course of this session is that it is has taken them two to three weeks to deal with major bills. What is more, under our Standing Orders the report stage of a bill cannot be called until at least 48 hours have elapsed from the time the report is received from the standing committee. In fact, and in accordance with our experience in the house, many more than ten days will elapse before all the various stages of a bill are gone through.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Under this proposal how long will a bill be before a standing committee? That time can also be reduced to one day.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It can indeed, although I think what we have to talk about is the reality of life and, to repeat again what Mr. St. Laurent said, this is the way public bills have been dealt with. I would point out to the hon. member that up until now we have in fact been in the position in standing committees, merely by the use of a majority, to bring debate in committees to an end, but that has not happened. I would suggest that the practical way in which this proposed rule will be operated in the house is that there will certainly be at least one month's time before a bill goes through all its stages.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Do I take it from the minister's remarks that he would be prepared to take out of this proposed rule the one day application in reference to the committee stage?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Well, it is a worth-while suggestion and I would agree it follows naturally from my remarks, but perhaps at this point I could put forward the general principles which I think should apply to the writing of a time limit into a bill. I agree that four days on all stages of an important bill may be far too short, but writing in four days may be far too long for many less important bills, and one of the facts of life in this house is that when you have this kind of minimum time limit then, whether it is necessary or not, the debate expands to fill the time limit. So I think it is a reasonable safeguard to have one sitting day although in fact, under the procedures followed in the house, committee stage on occasion has taken many more days than one sitting day.

Mr. Bell: And hasn't it worked? I ask that as a serious question. Would the minister not admit that report stage and committee stage have worked this session?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No. I point out to the hon. member that it is the specific weakness in our procedures with regard to the report stage that makes it necessary that we have this provision now. The experience has been that under the arrangements we made for the rules at Christmas time we have put more reasonable time limits on second reading and third reading, but the experience has also been that where there is an uncontrolled stage the debate tends to shift over into it and grow there. Therefore we are trying to provide for that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the house last gave major consideration to this basic question of programming the time of the house and we were considering the proposed new rule 16A, the complaint was made that it would provide for an order with regard to more than one bill and more than one stage of a single bill. What the present proposed rule does is provide that on three different occasions the government will have to come into the house to seek an order of the house, after a two hour debate, on the manner in which time is to be allocated. In other words, there will have to be three separate applications for such an order, and to that extent the objections to 16A have been met. In addition, we have stipulated—and this was a matter of some considerable negotiation in the committee—a minimum of one day's debate at each of the three stages.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The second objection made to the previous proposal with regard to time allocation was that it would be possible to limit the debate on a bill at all stages even before the debate had started. Because of the one stage provision that, of course, is no longer possible and

in addition the debate will have to have started on the particular stage before the rule may be invoked.

An hon. Member: For how long?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, would the minister answer a question? I put the same question to him that I put to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton this afternoon, in reply to which he said that the debate under the rules would last ten days as a minimum. Does the minister go along with that or was the hon. member somewhat exaggerating?

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I checked what I said in reply to the hon. member's question and *Hansard* will show I said there will be an elapsed time.

Mr. Peters: Did you change the blues?

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) has made a completely and unworthy parliamentary suggestion. I made no alteration. I tell the house now I was not speaking from a prepared text and my first formulation, as the hon. member has said, was different from the second.

Mr. Woolliams: You made a correction.

Mr. Blair: In answer to the question, I make no correction because I gave the correct answer.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think I actually have the floor, Mr. Speaker, and should be allowed to continue.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister answer the question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Actually it may have been before the hon. member came back in the house, but I indicated what I was talking about was the lapsing of a period of time. I did not say there would be a minimum of ten days debate. I indicated that with the period of time customarily taken at the committee stage it may be closer to a month than a minimum of ten days.

Mr. Woolliams: What do you say is the minimum under the rule?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): My experience in dealing with major legislation in the house—

Mr. Woolliams: Just answer the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will answer it if the hon. member will be patient. The anticipated experience is about a month's elapsed time.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I say nicely to the minister that I hope he would not mislead either the house or the communications media. I have asked a point-blank question. Surely the minister can tell us the minimum number of days that would be involved if the rule were implemented. I do not mean his experience. I mean under the rule as it is drafted.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I must say I do not think I should have to repeat the remarks I made when the hon. member was not in the chamber.

Mr. Bell: He did not say anything.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In respect of bills which have been referred to the standing committee our experience has been that a period of two or three weeks has been involved and even the report from the committee stage has a minimum of a two day delay before it can be taken up again. It would be difficult to use the procedure in a shorter period than one month's elapsed time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, surely this is a deliberate attempt to mislead the house. The minister knows perfectly well that the time in which a matter may be before a committee can be limited to one day. We are not talking about anticipated time or past experience—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I want to point out to the hon. member that there is no point of order; this is debate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that an hon. member who apparently can be very indignant about the rights of others to speak should interfere with my right to speak. I point out to the hon. member for the third time that the proceedings of the committees of this house in respect of a major bill can take two to three weeks and that the report cannot be dealt with again for a period of 48 hours.

An hon. Member: It sounds like an auctioneer.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is right. What we are involved with here, after all, is a mathematical calculation involving the number of bills to be dealt with in the course

of a parliamentary year and the number of sitting days.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: Would the President of the Privy Council permit me a question at this time?

I would like to ask him this: In view of his statement concerning the allocation of time at different stages of the bill, would he tell us if he would be prepared to amend section 75c so as to insert a certain guarantee for the house, in particular a certain period of time for the study of a bill?

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I point out to the hon. member that I already indicated that if we put in a limit of greater amounts of time, then for smaller bills that may turn out to be too much and on larger bills it may turn out to be too little. What we want to arrive at is some kind of a median which will provide a basic minimum for any piece of legislation, recognizing, however, that in respect of important bills very much more time will be taken up.

In the last debate it was suggested that the change here is more severe than the procedure being used in the British parliament. The fact of the matter is that in the British parliament the procedure in respect of allocation of time for debate is far more drastic than that proposed here. In that procedure it is customary for the debate on second reading to take only one sitting day. This is generally respected by members and may be enforced by the Speaker if it appears that the time may be exceeded.

It is the general practice in the British parliament to have an order not unlike the one proposed under 16A except that it is confined to three stages of a single bill whereby the committee stage, report stage and third reading are all allocated under the same order. While the practice of the British house provides for a single day to debate whether or not an order has been made, the procedure provided here gives many more opportunities at different stages for the opposition to debate whether or not the order should go, and since the orders are confined to a single stage of a bill they are less encompassing than the British orders.

It has been said in the discussions which took place that you, Mr. Speaker, should be involved in the proceedings. Indeed, there was an article to this effect written by a former colleague of the members of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Douglas Fisher, in respect of the question as to why the Chair had not been involved in these proceedings. Without disclosing the committee discussions in that regard, I think it is fair to point out that there was, I believe, a general consensus that in what is essentially a partisan political matter that is the amount of time to be taken on a matter Mr. Speaker should not be caught in the middle of that particular debate. Reference can be made in that regard to the fact that the British in their allocation of time procedure equally have been very careful not to put Mr. Speaker in the position of having a conflict of interest in which he would have to choose between two contending sides on a political question.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Certainly.

Mr. Fairweather: What alternative did the British have to involving the Speaker in these delicate negotiations?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): They have an institution. It is interesting that the hon. member should mention it. I see the hon. member for Peace River is smiling. They have a very able gentleman known as "usual channels", a public servant who negotiates between the government and the official opposition. It is very interesting that "usual channels" in the United Kingdom does not consider the minor parties, for instance, in Canada the N.D.P., in that regard.

Mr. Woolliams: They are getting pretty important.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): They certainly think they are anyway. The question has been raised from time to time as to why Standing Order 33—

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the hon. member for Lotbinière rising in order to ask a question or to raise a point of order?

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I have only a limited time.

Mr. Baldwin: We will give you extra time.

Mr. Bell: We will give the President of the Privy Council extra time, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to direct a question to the minister?

Mr. Fortin: I wish to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Lotbinière rises on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: It seems to me that since standing order 75c has not yet been carried, it may still be dealt with in this house, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to ask the minister whether his intention is to eventually become more Canadian than British. We have heard enough of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The question has been raised on many occasions, why has not closure been used? For example, it was raised a great deal in connection with the omnibus Criminal Code bill and people asked why closure was not used at that time in order to shut off the debate. This was particularly so in connection with the very lengthy debate that occurred at the report stage of that bill. The shortest answer to that question is that in effect Standing Order 33 is not effective in dealing with our new procedures. In particular, it is not effective in dealing with the report stage when you can have, as we did in the debate on the Criminal Code bill, many different questions, each one of which would have to be the subject of a closure motion.

I believe I am right in saying that 44 amendments were filed in the omnibus Criminal Code debate, and by the ruling of the Chair that number was reduced to around 30. Given the fact that under Standing Order 33 closure requires two sitting days to run its full course, this would have meant that 60 days or a longer period would have been necessary to close off that stage alone. In other words, I think it is important that we have this new procedure.

When we adopted the new procedure last December we failed to provide for the eventuality, which subsequently was proven to be an actuality, that the debate would be prolonged at the report stage far beyond a reasonable discussion of the issues.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the President of the Privy Council permit a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will he deal with the point I tried to make, that that situation could have been dealt with under 75B? I recognize the report stage problem, but I wonder whether 75A or 75B would not be sufficient to deal with the situation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I have said, Mr. Speaker, if the two minor parties, that is, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and the party to his left, were not in agreement with the time allocation, we would be no farther ahead; we would have, in effect, a deadlock in the house brought about by the agreement of the two minor parties. Again may I point out that the difference with regard to Standing Order 33 is this: under proposed standing order 75c there is an obligation on the part of the minister to consult with the parties in accordance with the consultation process. This is prerequisite to his attempting the programming.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Oh, oh.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member may laugh, but the fact of the matter is that under 75c the procedure cannot be used unless there has been advance consultation. The final objection—this is really the basic objection—of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is that with regard to a small minority in this house, or even with respect to the minority in the house represented by the united opposition parties, the majority should not be able to compel a decision as to the amount of time to be taken on a bill. I would point out that there is also, in effect, minority closure; that is to say, there is the position that the house is put in when so much time is taken on one or two measures, such as was taken in this session by the Ralliement Créditiste on the Criminal Code bill, that as a result a dozen measures are left on the order paper and could not be dealt with.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, this confirms what I was saying a moment ago. I should like the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to withdraw his remarks and to say clearly that if we took a greater part than usual in the debate on the omnibus bill, it is because it was a controversial bill. It is exactly the principle we are advocating at this time—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, this is not a point of order, the hon. member is starting a debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I point out that what happens, in effect, when an excess of time is taken on one or two bills is, as has happened so often in this parliament recently and as is the case with the present order paper, that major matters of importance on the current order paper, for example, with regard to educational television, financial institutions and expropriation, cannot be dealt with in the time available. As I have already indicated, there are only so many sitting days in the year and the time has to be divided carefully among the number of sitting days so that we can assure that each measure will be dealt with.

Perhaps the best statement with regard to minority closure, that is, where a small number of members of the house take up so much time that all the measures on the order paper cannot be dealt with, was made in the debate of May 20, 1965, on the resolution regarding House of Commons procedures. The particular passage to which I refer will be found at page 1531 of *Hansard,* when the speaker said:

> Let us on the opposition side of the house realize that arrangements for the limitation of debate—

Mr. Woolliams: Who said this?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):

> —arrangements for the allocation of time, are not to be shouted down by calling them closure. Methods whereby debate is limited, whereby debate comes to an end at a certain time, are not nearly as serious a form of closure as is the situation we are faced with when, by endless talk on one or two subjects, the opportunity to get at other subjects is completely foreclosed. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the interests of those of us on the opposition side of the house that there be planning of our time so that we can get at all of the items that are before parliament—all of the matters of business that demand our attention.

[Mr. Fortin.]

That is what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said in 1965. I agree with him that minority closure involved in not allowing sufficient time to deal with major measures before the house is something which has to be dealt with in this parliament. The present set of rules suggested by this side of the house is, in our opinion, the best means of assuring this in any particular case.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps I might be allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker, because my time is limited.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We will give the President of the Privy Council all kinds of time. In addition to his agreeing with what I said, will he also agree with my contention that this should be arrived at by consent?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member, of course, says that this should be arrived at by consent. To say that agreement has to be arrived at by the consent of all four parties is to say that one of those parties is to have a veto. That is what the hon. member seeks; he seeks to have a veto over the conduct of the house. I do not blame him. I do not suggest it is immoral or that there is anything improper about it. It is an attempt to gain political power, and he is entitled to do that. Equally, we on our side are entitled to reject his attempt to get that power and control over parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: There is no doubt about it; Perrault is the toughest pounder in the west.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Fortin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Lotbinière on a question of privilege.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that in many instances since the beginning of this debate, the President of the Privy Council—perhaps he is not

to blame and the fault lies with the interpreters, I do not know has spoken of the "minor parties" when referring to the Ralliement créditiste and the New Democratic party.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that speaking in this manner of those two parties in the house is disparaging and a violation of our privileges.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. members has just made his opinion known and the question of privilege does not arise.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I had not completed my explanation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or on a question of privilege?

Mr. Fortin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to point out that I had not concluded my remarks.

When someone says that we belong to "minor parties", that implies, in a disparaging sense, that we do not represent the whole population across the country. The same remark would apply to the New Democratic party. I believe that we should be referred to as "minority parties".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the categorization of his party as a small party was not imposed on his party by me but rather was imposed upon them by the electors of Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You represent a minority of the electors.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This is a very interesting argument because if the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are really in favour of a system of proportionate representation they should be advocating that when they stand at the polls. Of course they have not advocated any such thing. I am sure that nobody is denying, for example, the former hon. member for Selkirk the right to form the government of Manitoba because he happens to represent such a minor fraction of the total vote cast in that province. So this applies both ways.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You are not showing your elegance.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am not indeed. It would be interesting to remark on the comments made in anticipation of the debate by a newspaper which is not unfriendly to the hon. gentleman opposite. Indeed, it was referred to favourably by both the hon. members for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) yesterday, although not on this subject. I am referring to the Toronto *Telegram* of Friday July 4, 1969, and its lead article entitled "The Battle Of The Rules". It commences in this way:

> Conservative and New Democratic M.P.s aren't likely to elicit much public sympathy if they continue to delay approval of new parliamentary rules that will empower the government to limit House of Commons debates—
>
> Despite the criticism of rule 75c, it seems to be reasonable. For, in effect, it has two main objectives that remove it from the category of closure. It would preserve the power of the opposition long enough to arouse public opinion. At the same time, it would enable the government to bring an issue to a decision within a reasonable period.
>
> To suggest, as some Opposition M.P.s have, that the passage of rule 75c would degrade parliament and make it a rubberstamp of the executive, is stretching matters.

I suggest that, given the usual inflation in debate which occurs, this is a pretty fair statement of the situation by a newspaper which, as I said, has not been known to be uncritical of this government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What does the Ottawa *Citizen* say?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): You have it, so you should know.

Mr. Fairweather: I have it and I will read it to you in a minute.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am glad that we will be entertained by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather).

While it is the essence of our parliamentary system that the opposition must have an opportunity to criticize government measures, it is also essential that after debate the house should be permitted to come to a decision. Unhappily, the Canadian House of Commons has acquired the habit in recent years of opposition by delay, and experience in recent years indicates that with this habit the increasingly heavy legislative work load which our house must face is met not by analysis and criticism but merely by delay.

Let the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) look at the order paper and be convinced in this regard. It is fair to point out that until now—and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed this out himself—time limits have already been provided for in other aspects of house business, such as in the throne speech and budget debates and in the supply procedure for scrutinizing government spending. What is needed is some flexible procedure for dividing the time needed for public bills in a way that will ensure that each one is debated and brought to decision in that particular session.

As time goes on—and this is already evident in the order papers of recent years—the carrying on of the public business requires an increasingly large number of bills. For example, on the program for October there will be 83 measures which, of course, may be added to or subtracted from as time goes on. The fact that these 83 measures must be divided into approximately 155 to 160 sitting days that we have in our parliamentary calendar, and allowing for approximately 45 to 50 days of generalized debate such as the throne speech and budget debates as well as opposition days, means that a very strict timetable will have to be worked out for planning the business of the house.

Mr. Aiken: Would the minister permit a question? On the basis of the mathematics he has just given, if it is going to take a month for any bill to be passed by the house, how many bills are we going to get through in a session?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps this gives the best demonstration. As the hon. member may not be aware, under our rules this would not mean a month of actual sitting time of the house. In view of the two or three weeks in committee stage, of course it will not be necessary for a bill to be under full consideration in the house itself for a month. It is a fact that we do have the committee stage in our legislation which now provides the elasticity that was not available previously when bills had to pass through committee of the whole stage in the house.

In conclusion I wish to say that efforts were made in the committee to arrive at some solution which we felt would be fair to both sides, that would be fair to the government in attempting to put its programs through parliament and would be fair to the opposition in giving them the opportunity to criticize legislation. What have been arrived at are medium time targets to be set which, in the case of important bills, are minimal. I think it is fair to point out that, as hon. members feel perhaps rightly, they should take every step possible to prevent these particular measures from being adopted by the house. That is their view in this debate and presumably they will also have the same conviction about measures which are not just related to procedures of the house, that is to say, major legislation such as with regard to taxation, Indian policy or other important questions.

But I should like to make clear to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that I do not think his party should be criticized for having felt on a matter of principle that they had to take a long time in debating the omnibus Criminal Code bill. What the house has to do is to make a provision that while hon. members may feel they have to take that time they can at least be relieved of that obligation by some kind of fair allocation of time order which will enable other measures to be dealt with.

I really do not expect hon. members to support this. On the other hand, I am sure they do not expect me to favour a system whereby a minority in this house controls the business of the house. However, I trust we will have a meaningful debate in this regard, and I hope that perhaps even at this late date we may reach a general agreement in the house as to some effective means of programming the business, bearing in mind that section 49 of the B.N.A. Act says that ultimately the decisions of the house are to be made by a majority of voices.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office Department—zoning of postal addresses in large centres; the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)—Agriculture—possibility of aid to western farmers following meeting between premier and Prime Minister; the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt)—National Revenue—Ingersoll, Ont.—steps to restore customs services.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): The Speaker, it is the arrogance of the government that sticks in my crop. In July the place to play the numbers game is at country fairs and not in the House of Commons. The minister who has just spoken knows perfectly well that the committee on which we served held meetings all through the spring, and it was not until he served his ultimatum in May that we realized that he and the government were determined to bring on a form of closure which had proved to be such an impossible plan last December.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I ask the hon. member a question? Is it not a fact that by general consent of the committee the question of the allocation of time was left over to be dealt with in the latter part of the session while other matters, such as the committee system, were dealt with? At all times hon. members knew that this was something which we felt the house would have to deal with in this session.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We thought you would be reasonable.

Mr. Fairweather: That is the point. We made a mistake, and that is the problem with this motion. Because some people in this parliament are reasonable we had expected that we would not be faced with such an arrogant proposal. We went on to discuss other issues upon which agreement could readily be reached.

• (5:50 p.m.)

If we are in the game of reading editorials I suppose it is only fair to give measure for measure. I shall not go through a long preamble as to which party the Ottawa *Citizen* usually supports but, by coincidence, on the same day the Toronto *Telegram* was giving the minister the benefit of its editorial excellence there appeared an editorial in the *Citizen* entitled "Rights Imperilled". Not a bad day, July 4, considering the significance of that date in the history of this continent. Criticizing the closure rule as being too drastic, the article reads:

> It is no accident that the government decided to wait until the dying hours of the present session to introduce its new closure rule—and that is what rule 75-C is.
>
> The apparent fatigue of all members might help the government slip it through. But the weapon will backfire if the opposition remains determined to fight.
>
> No parliamentarians can become as intractable, as unwilling to compromise, as those who are tired, who want to go home, but can't because they feel put upon and must stay to do battle. Much of the good work accomplished in gaining opposition co-operation to speed the work of parliament may be undone if the government keeps to its course.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) raised this important question in his contribution to the debate. The article continues:

> When a majority of the house leaders cannot agree on a time limit for debate on a bill, rule 75-C would permit the government to impose a limit of one day at each stage. The result could be a mockery of parliament's rights.

It is impossible for the President of the Privy Council to admit what the ultimate result of this change would be, because he finds it inconvenient to share this information. He talks about meaningful debate. Certainly we could have a meaningful debate if the facts were given frankly. I return to the editorial.

> The opposition should be given reasonable time—perhaps two or three weeks—to rally public opinion against legislation it considers iniquitous. If, after that, the public is still unmoved by opposition arguments, further debate becomes wilful obstruction. Closure can then be imposed without the taint of dictatorship.

That is a frank editorial and I read it in totality, which all too often is not the practice here. The minister speaks of the difficulty he would face in connection with the closure rule, rule 33. Surely it is within the capacity of the ministry and its programming department to put before parliament a reasonable amendment to that rule.

No matter what numbers game the minister plays the rules are not the property of the government of Canada. They are the property of individual members of this house. I presume we shall hear this from speaker after speaker. They are the property not only of members who belong to large parties but of those who belong to the smaller parties, even to those who may be independents. It is the rules of parliament that we are debating, and it is because these rules were not altogether acceptable to the members who make up this parliament that we are engaged in the present exercise of altering them.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), in the course of what I thought was a masterly speech, ended with a quotation from Louis St. Laurent. Since it is almost six o'clock I hope the minister will eat his dinner recalling a quotation from a speech by one of his colleagues, a minister who has been under fire lately. This comes from yesterday's Toronto *Star*; it is an editorial commenting on a speech made recently by the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans). The editorial speaks of the debt of gratitude the people owe him, and goes on to say:

> Their real debt of gratitude will be for the thinking he is doing to try to determine what is needed to restore a human dimension to the world; to restore to man his status of man; to give him mastery over himself once more; in short to protect man from the very efficiency the communications minister is expected to provide.
>
> In his second speech in recent weeks on the need for creating a new humanism, Mr. Kierans put the problem rather well when he said: "Mechanization, speed, technology, communications and computers; these are the key words which predominate today. These are the words which are driving men forward. But the one factor which is often forgotten in all this, I am afraid, is man himself—
>
> Recent generations have failed to create a new humanism, he said, because in a hectic century they have failed to take time out to ponder their own position in the scheme of things. As a consequence, man has become a stranger to himself, to his own personality.
>
> One way to overcome this, in Mr. Kierans' view, is for government to provide not only efficiency and leadership, but also sensitivity.

It is the absence of sensitivity on the part of the President of the Privy Council and his colleagues which has got us into the dilemma we face today. The editorial goes on:

> That won't be easy, because "government naturally is a self-perpetuating institution which justifies its existence on grounds that are often quite unclear."

I do not know what went on in the cabinet when the Minister of Communications was taking part in the discussion which led the government to change its course and permit the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) to introduce his motion. But I have the notion that the hon. gentleman did not think of the word "sensitivity". Nevertheless, because we are sensitive people, I suggest this is a good point at which to observe that it is six o'clock.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

[*English*]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, when I demonstrated my sensitivity at six o'clock by not asking for an extension of time I was reminding Your Honour and others of the warning given by the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) about the danger of a government that lacks the essential element of sensitivity.

I should like to move on to a thesis that should be obvious to all. I refer to the property of the rules of parliament. Generally speaking, if the rules of this parliament have broad acceptance in this chamber they are bound to work efficiently. If, on the other hand, they are rammed down our throats by an insensitive government, they are likely to frustrate the very purpose the government has in mind in introducing them. Other hon. members have said that the rules are not the property of parties; that in fact parties, in our parliamentary system, have no place in parliament.

I should like to make one or two suggestions that I think might result in a much better examination of government bills. My first suggestion, to which I think the government is agreeable, is in connection with the laxity displayed by governments up to this time in getting their bills to the first reading stage. I hope that early publication of the new stream of legislation we are about to be faced with will be the rule, and that the exception will be the introduction of a bill in the latter stages of a session. This would bring about much better public understanding of the issues involved.

If I recall, it was a committee of this parliament that prepared the public for such fundamental changes as were embodied in the Divorce Act, and this made it possible for parliament to consider those changes quickly and effectively without requiring allocation of time or any unilateral decision by the ministry.

We have also had two examples of this laxity during this session. Although the piece of legislation that the house completed yesterday, the official languages bill, was clearly acceptable in principle to the majority of the citizens of this country, owing to the lack of explanation of the provisions contained in the bill I think there is real danger of its being misunderstood. The second example was the Criminal Code amendments which went to the basic consciences of a good many people.

Again, had the issues involved in that legislation received wider public discussion, perhaps there would not have been quite as much resistance to those reforms as was the case.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) used the British experience and the British rules as an analogy. There are a couple of procedures used by the United Kingdom parliament that I think should be copied here. The first is the use of what is known as the "honest broker"—"the usual channels". The President of the Privy Council made reference to this officer and stated that in the United Kingdom parliament he did not pay attention to other parties in the house. We make our own jurisprudence in this house and no one suggests, that in the Canadian context, the senior public servant who acts as "honest broker" between the parties in parliament should not have due regard for the wishes of all parties represented in this parliament.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The second procedure, one which I think is fundamentally different from ours, is the use of the panel of committee chairmen. There is much less partisanship in the British parliamentary committee system than has unfortunately been evident in several cases in this parliament. The Order Paper for today displays evidence of an extraordinary manoeuvre that was used by the government in order to try to circumvent the wishes of the transport committee. An attempt was made by the minister, the last speaker, to frustrate the debate upon which we are now engaged. It is clear why hon. members are taking some time. We have an obligation to the country to spend some time examining this nefarious proposal embodied in proposed rule 75c. In the United Kingdom they have a panel made up of committee chairmen who are representatives of all parties in that house. Those chairmen are potential speakers. In many cases when an important government measure is being processed in parliament, the committee chairman may come from a party in opposition—a civilized way of doing things that we might emulate in this country. I have been informed that often when the United Kingdom government has a particularly ticklish bill that it wishes to put through the house, it is glad indeed to employ a committee chairman from some opposition party. The neutrality of the United Kingdom government in these instances is very obvious.

The minister spoke sadly but unconvincingly about the number of items to be processed on the order paper. If he will examine the order paper closely, and I might add that I did not spend my entire supper hour reviewing the order paper, I think he will find that from pages 8 to 17 inclusive are listed more than 100 proposals that this house has approved. There are 18 items on the order paper, but many of them are routine and are not ones about which we need be overly concerned. The minister spoke about the Expropriation Act amendments. He ought to know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is not disposed to move those amendments forward at this time. The matter has been referred quite properly to the lawyers of this country for comment, and undoubtedly this fall the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs will consider the implications of the new bill. Even if this house were to give its unanimous consent, the Minister of Justice could not move this bill forward at this time; and the President of the Privy Council knows that to be so. There are one or two items to do with the Senate that the government does not wish to put before parliament at the moment; neither does it wish to proceed with item 29, the bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. Educational television has been under consideraton for some time and no one in this house wishes in the least to hold up this measure. The minister knows that policy in this important area is in process of evolution and that the government is not ready to proceed with the bill until certain policy considerations have been thrashed out. I think the minister is being unjust to the most co-operative parliament, of which I have had the privilege of being a member when he says that we have hamstrung the government. If anything, we have been far too easy with the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bell: Especially when one considers how the government acts.

Mr. Fairweather: If we ignore the one example alluded to earlier in the debate, government spokesmen have advanced a specious argument in support of reasons for introducing a ruthless new rule such as the one proposed by the President of the Privy Council and the Liberal majority on the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

I have had the privilege since coming to parliament of serving on several committees on procedure; and always, and I say this with

the greatest respect to those government supporters who serve on the present Committee on Procedure and Organization, we have tried to get the widest agreement from hon. members who espouse the various political doctrines prevalent in this country. We have tried to accommodate all shades of opinion existing within our political spectrum. If this government had followed such a precept in this instance it would not be in the trouble in which it now finds itself.

I wish to refer to one or two other points that have come to my mind. It might not be amiss, when speaking of our obligations, to read remarks attributed to Edmund Burke in 1774. He said many important things on that occasion, and particularly apt is the following statement:

—government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination; and what sort of reason is that, in which the determination preceded the discussion;—

It is because the government intends to predetermine parliament's program in advance of that program being deliberated in this assembly that Burke's words uttered almost 200 years ago apply clearly to this debate. Is I see the issue, it is that we are a deliberative assembly and the government should not be surprised that members of parliament need time to examine matters coming before parliament and to muster the public opinion of Canada. Any legislation not supported by widespread and well informed public opinion is apt to become bad law from the standpoint of the public's acceptance of that law. That law may entail good draftmanship; that is, the law may be well drafted and the statute may be very neat and tidy. The law, nevertheless, will be bad.

Over the years many people have wondered what are the obligations of hon. members under the parliamentary system. I suppose one could say that we play a part as representatives. In a minor sense we are indeed representatives; but that is not our primary obligation. Our second obligation is to take up what one might term an educative role. We are here not only as representatives of our people in parliament; we are here also, for good or ill, as educators. If the departments of government wish members of the house to fulfil their obligations to their constituents in full, they will have to give members the opportunity to exercise the educative part of their duties. Only in the narrowest sense are we representatives. In a much broader sense we are agents of all the country, and we therefore are under the obligation when considering government measures to exercise whatever native judgment we have. I am very serious about this. These three rules are inherent in membership in parliament. This is why I deplore this illiberal and arrogant challenge to a 700 year old institution which many, many times has done things for the betterment of the citizens of the country. Far more times has it been a positive aspect of our lives than it has been a negative aspect.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The people from the party I have the honour to serve who were on that Procedure and Organization Committee felt we had an obligation, an obligation we were glad to try to exercise, to assist parliament to reform its procedures. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) have said, we have taken giant steps toward bringing up to date our system of government and our rules and procedures.

The minister should be more frank. The order paper has dozens of items to the credit of the government to some extent, but also to the credit of the total institution of which we are a part. Whether the minister likes to continue his game of numbers, the 12's, 15's, 22's and 72's, we too have been sent here to exercise a constitutional role. This role is recognized by the jurisprudence, the conventions and the rules that have been adopted. This is not a threat, but I hope that this debate that is trying to turn an illiberal aspect of the government's policy toward a more sensitive and co-operative understanding of the fundamental issue which is involved here will challenge this illiberality until the government comes to its senses.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I think we now have under debate the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), the Chairman of the Procedure and Organization Committee because of the government house leader's attempt this afternoon to make a virtue out of necessity. I feel that the clear presentation that was made here last night to Your Honour to the effect that the government was asking the house to reverse a decision which it had already taken may have influenced the decision the house leader has taken. At least he may have felt inclined to believe, as I did, that the argument was clear and lucid enough to make an impression on the mind of

Your Honour. Therefore, I feel the opportunity to debate this committee report was not brought about by any real change of heart on the part of the government house leader.

It is a real tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that the first serious attempt of the Canadian parliament to arrive at a procedure for the allocation of time for debate of government legislation should be marred by the poisonous atmosphere that is being created in this chamber. This atmosphere is being generated by the way in which the government has sought to impose upon this house the proposed rule 75c.

This proposal, and this particular rule which gives the government house leader the unilateral right to seek an allocation of time, should be considered in light of the fact that the house, by general agreement, has already arrived at some very drastic limitations of time as distinct from allocation of time for debate. This has been done by mutual consent of members from all parties in this house working through our various procedural committees. I could give examples, and a number have already been mentioned in the course of this debate.

Very drastic changes have been made in the whole manner of dealing with supply, and also in the procedure for dealing with bills in standing committees. To anyone who has been in this house for any length of time, Mr. Speaker, these time restrictions cannot help but appear to be very drastic. Only a few years ago these time restrictions would have been opposed most vigorously by many members in different parts of the house.

This proposal for time allocation under rule 75c should also be considered in light of the fact that these various restrictions on time began in a minor way quite a few years ago with the fixing of time limits for speeches in certain debates, such as the address and budget debates. In addition, there was a limitation on the actual number of days to be allotted to these debates. All of these things which have been agreed to at various times by members of the opposition have restricted in a very drastic way the rights of private members to challenge the government which, after all, is the Crown in our midst.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the original function of parliament, as an institution, was to protect the people from the tyranny of the Crown. Many changes are necessary in these fast changing times. We required to consider and alter the techniques under which parliament must operate. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we should never lose sight of the fact that the basic function of this institution is still to protect the people against tyranny.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that through careful consideration, and through arriving at a consensus on previous occasions concerning the manner in which our rules should be changed, we have kept pace with our times. We have arrived at techniques which make parliament a more effective institution. We have done the things which were necessary to restore the image of parliament in the minds of the Canadian people. We have done these things in a manner which, while it has placed some restrictions on private members, nevertheless has not altered our fundamental freedom to oppose tyranny as and when it may appear in our midst. I believe this should be the approach that hon. members should take when dealing with proposed changes to our rules.

• (8:30 p.m.)

The placing of the allocation of time into the category into which the government house leader has tried to put it is a result of a disregard for, and misunderstanding of the fundamental nature of parliament. I readily agree that it is not the fault of the government house leader that he was thrust into a position of power and responsibility in this house after serving only a relatively short period of time as a member of this institution. However, having been put in that position, he might have applied himself a little more to reaching an understanding of what parliament is all about, at least more than he has revealed so far in this debate and in some of the discussions antecedent to it.

In his speech this afternoon, the government house leader revealed the government's lack of understanding of what parliament is all about, and having allowed himself to accept responsibility for pushing this proposal forward he cannot absolve himself from blame for the situation in which we find ourselves. I submit that his argument this afternoon was specious on at least three counts, and I wish to deal briefly with each of them.

He made a lot about the number of items of government legislation that must be dealt with, and mentioned the fact that in a certain debate which took place not long ago one group in this house took up a fair amount of time discussing something about which they felt very strongly. The implication of his argument in this respect, seeking unilateral

authority to allocate time, completely ignored an equal responsibility resting on members of the Liberal party with respect to a legislative timetable. When I mention the Liberal party members may I say in parenthesis that they may have been liberal at some time or another in their history.

The minister ignored the very development of the party system which gave to the Crown, as it moved into the centre of parliament through the instrument of cabinet, a greater potential for tyranny than it ever exercised when it remained outside parliament. At that time your predecessors in office, Mr. Speaker, had to be bold and courageous men to present the messages of parliament to the king.

The minister also ignored the political history of recent years. He ignored the fact that the political manoeuverings of his party were certainly as much responsible for any backlog of public legislation as any action taken on this side of the house. Here, I am referring to the period that goes back to 1963. I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I will say it again, that I do not recall ever being more angry in my life than when I was sitting at home and heard the Prime Minister's predecessor in office announce that he was calling the 1965 general election. We had just left Ottawa for a recess with full arrangements made for a timetable of programmed legislation in the fall.

If I may mention one thing in which I happened to be involved, arrangements had been made for a program of visits by the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs to various Indian reservations across the country, so that members of the committee would come to know the needs and ideas of the Indian people. Had that tour taken place, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) might not be in quite so much hot water as he is with the Indian people. In the light of the performance of his own political friends, I submit that the government house leader should take a second look at his request for this authority on the basis of what he suggests was obstruction on the part of the opposition.

The minister also made much of the argument that the will of the majority must prevail in this house. I listened to him carefully on this point. Nobody would quarrel with the statement that the will of the majority prevails in making decisions in a democratic assembly. However, he failed to recognize the distinction between coming to a majority decision on a government proposal and the fact that the basic rules of parliament should not be altered by a majority vote without regard to the wishes of members of a particular group who, at a particular moment in the history of this institution, happen to be in a minority position.

He also failed to draw a distinction between arriving at decisions on time allocation and arriving at decisions on how and under what circumstances we should change the rules of the house. I would agree that in considering the allocation of time there is a point at which the decision of the majority of the house must prevail. But the minister's argument on this score was specious because he ignored another fact. It is that the rules of the house already provide for a means of terminating debate according to the wishes of the majority of the members of the house.

While that rule in its present form may not be perfect, nevertheless it was put into our standing orders after a great deal of wrestling and rather violent debate many years ago. Its existence in the Standing Orders has not been seriously challenged during the last several parliaments. In fact, I have heard no suggestion from any quarter of the house that the present closure rule be taken out of our rule book.

• (8:40 p.m.)

If the closure rule is not quite appropriate to deal with certain situations brought about by recent rule changes, then this is a matter which the house could very well ask the Procedures Committee to consider. I have not been one of the members of this house who has seriously attempted to become knowledgeable on some of the finer points of the rules of this house. I have had, however, a considerable exposure to argumentation on the subject over a period of years, and there have been a good many arguments about the rules in recent parliaments. Certainly, during my experience as a member of this house in six of the last seven parliaments, this is the second time a naked attempt has been made by the government to use its will to bend parliament as an institution. I do not like it now any more than I did when I witnessed it in this house in 1956. I have in my hand volumes 4 and 5 of *Hansard* for the sessions of 1956. I took them home a week ago last Sunday and read a certain debate, commonly referred to as the pipeline debate, more or less from cover to cover. I should like to commend these volumes of *Hansard* to members of this house, particularly those members who sit as supporters of the government. I

commend these volumes as required and interesting reading for the next few days or few weeks during which we may have this matter under consideration in this house.

If the government supporters want to understand what their government is attempting to do on this occasion I do not know of any better way they can find it out than by reading these debates. In the parliament of 1956, there were a great many members with a great many years of experience as parliamentarians. Those men, as a result of their own experience and a reading of the debates which have taken place in the past, have had distilled in them a great deal of the essence of what parliament is all about. That is why I feel, as a member of this house, that really in order to come to grips with what is being attempted here perhaps there should be some reference to some of the things which were said during that previous debate about the meaning of this institution. If I may I should like to trespass on the time of the house just to quote one or two excerpts from the debate. I shall quote from page 4512 of Hansard for May 31, 1956. I shall quote the right hon. member for Prince Albert, (Mr. Diefenbaker) but this was before he acquired that particular title. He also quotes another distinguished parliamentarian.

Mr. Diefenbaker was speaking after the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, had moved a motion that the consideration of clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, the title of the said bill, and any amendments proposed thereto shall be the first business of the committee and shall not be further postponed. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made a brief reference to this situation this afternoon when he mentioned that a few words had been read from the notes about clauses 1, 2 and 3 and that they were then considered to have been debated. There was some debate on clause 4 and clauses 5, 6 and 7 were never even called. The argument here is how you can have further consideration of something which has not been considered. Mr. Diefenbaker said:

> I am going to quote one who has a distinguished son as a member of this cabinet. In 1932 the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, the leader from the province of Quebec whose successor is the Prime Minister, had this to say as reported on page 1497 of *Hansard* for that year:
>
> "It means that parliament is being asked to abrogate its position as the predominant factor in legislation. It means that we are being asked to agree to be dragged at the wheels of the Prime Minister and to make parliament an appendage of the executive."

Mr. Harris: He was not talking about closure.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will read it all.

> "This attitude of the Prime Minister makes our duty to resist this legislation more imperative."

I am glad the minister suggested that because it is more applicable having regard to the Prime Minister's conduct in the last day or two.

> "The first duty of parliament is to remain a parliament, not to become a subservient and ornamental body. Parliament has a right which is certainly paramount to the convenience of the Prime Minister, the right to live."

May I interpolate, it is also superior to the frustration of a prime minister.

> "It has the duty to defend itself and not to allow anybody to invade its rights and privileges. It is the will of parliament, not that of the government that is the will of the nation. When the Prime Minister says that he speaks for the whole of the country, he is mistaking the echo of his words for the voice of the Canadian people. It is parliament which is and must remain the authorized exponent of public opinion and of the public will."

And then later on:

> "The sovereignty of the people is delegated to parliament, not to the executive, and when I say "parliament", it means the minority as well as the majority in parliament."

Later on, he quotes the following remarks made by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe:

> "What he would conceive as a parliament is that we should stand at attention and salute when the Prime Minister wants us to do so, a parliament that would be ready to goose-step at the behest of the Prime Minister. Sir, the methods of the czar have produced bolshevism, and we do not wish to introduce that in Canada. It is an evil work. I claim, on the part of those who are in this way undermining the authority of parliament—"

I submit that is precisely what the government house leader of this parliament is attempting to do by putting forward the proposal in this way. I suggest we already have in our rules a way to arrive at a majority decision so far as allocation of time is concerned or so far as termination of debate is concerned. I submit in this initial effort on the part of the Canadian parliament to put into its rules an arrangement for allocation of time of debate, the waters should not be muddied by bringing into the picture the unilateral authority of the government to make the decision in its name concerning when and how a debate will be terminated, unless it is prepared to use the rules we already have and unless it feels it can establish before the people of Canada that there has been a clear case of obstruction. Then, and only then, and under the proper circumstances do I believe that kind of motion should be made in this house. Then, the people of Canada would be

in a clear position to come to a decision concerning on which side of the argument their interests lie.

To attempt to take this proposed method of establishing the will of the majority in respect of the allocation of time for the ordinary processing of business in the interests of the people of this country, I submit is to invite disaster for this institution and to make virtually impossible the free exchange of ideas between the representatives of the various political groupings in this house. If I have time, I should like to quote one other extract from the debates to which I have referred. It has to do with the use of what is commonly referred to as closure.

• (8:50 p.m.)

The speech was made by a member who was at that time in the political group with which I sat in the house. He was considered, under the particular circumstances that prevailed and the atmosphere of the house at the time, to be rather heretical in making the speech. I refer to the former hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, Mr. MacInnis, who if I recall correctly came to this chamber against the advice of his doctor to make his speech. At the beginning of his remarks the hon. member said:

> This is the first word that I have uttered in this debate—

He went on to say:

> —and I would not have risen now if it had not been for what has happened since this house opened today. At the opening of the house the Prime Minister made a statement that after we had disposed of the motion before us, then we could proceed with debating the bill.

Later in his remarks, which are reported at page 4377 of *Hansard* for May 28, 1956, in connection with closure he said:

> What has happened, and this was the initial mistake that was made, was that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce introduced the resolution preceding this bill he also made a motion that closure would be applied. Closure would be applied, why? Because the debate had been obstructed? No, closure was to be applied because the government had set a time limit to the debate and because it was anticipated that there would be obstruction. We do not carry on business in this house on the basis of anticipation.

It seems to me we have heard recent references to this basic principle of parliamentary procedure. The then hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway went on to say:

> I have been here for over a quarter of a century and I have never yet seen a Speaker who would make a ruling on an anticipated situation.

[Mr. Barnett.]

> However, rulings and decisions have been made and the decisions made today will be the precedents for tomorrow. I suggest to my hon. friends on the Liberal side of the house that they read the speech which their former leader, the late W. L. Mackenzie King, made when he was leader of the opposition in connection with a motion for closure moved in 1932.

The hon. member said later:

> What has happened is that from now on any time the government introduces a resolution preceding a bill and there is some talk that the opposition is opposed to it—that is why the opposition is here; it is their duty to obstruct from time to time; that is their right. I have seen my friends over here put on a filibuster.

He was referring to the then Social Credit group from Alberta. The hon. member went into the whole question of the rights of the opposition in relation to debate in the light of what had been happening regarding the question of closure being moved on the basis of anticipation rather than on the basis of the fact. In another part of his remarks, the hon. member had this to say:

> I think the initial issue in this debate is the question of closure. May I tell hon. members, government members, official opposition members, C.C.F. members and Social Credit members, that I favour closure. The government has a perfect right—not only a right but a duty—to invoke closure at the right time; that is, when it has been demonstrated that the business of the house cannot be carried on in any other way but by closure. I said I am in favour of closure. I am in favour of closure, old style. I am not in favour of closure, new style. I do not believe that the members of this house, I do not believe that the members of the government understand, indeed I cannot believe that the Prime Minister understands what has happened.

I think those remarks are applicable to the present situation. It seems to me that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government house leader cannot understand what they are seeking to do in the context of the motion, and the proposal in the amendment moved earlier today which we are now considering. If it had not been for certain developments in the sequence of events, the proposal might very well be before us now as a direct motion of the government house leader.

I hope that private members on both sides of the house will give some thought to these issues. There are not very many members in the house who have personal knowledge of the previous attempt of the government to use its power nakedly to alter the basic facts of this institution. As I look across the way, the only hon. member I can see on that side of the house who was present at that time is the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen). I suggest that he should do

a great deal of whispering in the ears of his colleagues in the government as this debate progresses, and he may be able to help them understand what they are seeking to do to this institution, which I think all of us in our hearts cherish as a very important part of the fabric of Canadian life.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is not new that the major and serious problem in this house is its incapacity or rather its inability to set up its program and foresee its business or its proceedings on a more realistic, more practical and more efficient basis, and also more in keeping with the increased volume and the complexity of present legislation, more in line with new needs and the present times.

When last December this house approved the vast majority of the recommendations of the committee on procedure and organization, we made a greater step forward than ever before to modernize our procedures, recognized by all as obsolete. Moreover, this question was raised many times, particularly during the last election campaign, and I think we might say that we received a formal mandate from the people, to go ahead with reforms in respect of our procedures.

• (9:00 p.m.)

All are now aware, I believe, in spite of certain apprehensions expressed during the debate, that the prestige of parliament has grown, that bills are examined more adequately and that estimates receive a more serious and profound study. We must also point out that the opposition has better opportunities of changing the legislation when expressing its point of view, particularly through the amendments it can propose in committee as well as in the house.

Naturally, there are still improvements to be made, particularly as regards the operations of the committees. Certain committees are overloaded with work and need, for instance, experts, additional personnel, more appropriate and more numerous locals, etc. Besides, the committee on procedure and organization has studied this problem and has made certain recommendations.

But we still have to complete the work so well begun and bring ourselves to the same level as the modern legislatures of the democratic world, which have, most of them, if not all, adopted rules to limit the debates that drag on without reason.

It is yet impossible to establish or to provide a legislative timetable during a session. The present one will be adjourned while there is still on the order paper or in abeyance, here, or in the other place, a whole series of important bills that could have been considered and passed.

It is impossible to allocate time for the passage of a bill at any stage, either in the house or in the committee. This session that was to adjourn on June 27 is still going on and the end is not in sight.

It seems obvious to me that our parliament must have, in order to meet this country's needs and to work efficiently, and in an orderly and constructive manner, a procedure that will enable it to impose a limit when no agreement has been reached and that we are faced with systematic obstruction on the part of a minority that endlessly repeats the same arguments solely for the purpose of delaying a decision, to upset the government's legislative program or, perhaps for political or party purposes.

Last December, no decision was reached, contrary to what has lately been stated in that regard. The only decision was to refer once again this important question to the same committee so that it could re-examine it in the light of the views expressed during the debate in December and taking into consideration the rules and practices applied at Westminster which is always considered as the model of all parliaments, especially of our own.

During the first debate and again now, those who wish to strengthen their hold on the proceedings in parliament and also their right to veto the opinion of the majority which, constitutionally and normally, must make the final decision, have suggested that we should rely on common sense and on the judgment of all hon. members or party representatives.

Mr. Speaker, experience has shown that this is neither practical or realistic, and I am sure that if all opposition members are reasonable—let us not forget that there are three opposition parties, and that a party cannot speak on behalf of another to guarantee an order given or deemed to be given with regard to expediting the business of the house—there will never be any danger that Standing Order 75c shall be applied because the government which would certainly not want to be accused of dictatorship and so forth will do its utmost to reach an understanding with the other parties and provide

more than reasonable delays indeed regarding the various stages of a bill. Everyone will benefit from it and that Standing Order will only be there as the Sword of Damocles, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said.

We had such an instance not so long ago, when a minority party comprising 14 members kept the house back for 20 days on a bill which had had also 14 extended hearings before the committee on justice and legal affairs. Without entering into the aims and reasons the members of the Ralliement créditiste had in mind when making use of their rights and privileges under the present Standing Orders, I should point out that they could have made that verbal marathon last still much longer.

However, when a deadlock occurs, when the right of speech and discussion becomes a closure in reverse, an exercise which is a deliberate violation of the majority's right to come to a decision, it is absolutely necessary in such cases—possible, though scarce—that our procedure contain a machinery for closure, and that, quite often, will greatly relieve even the opposition.

I am satisfied that is what the great majority of the Canadian people want: that we discuss, of course, but that we finally take a decision after a sufficient and reasonable time.

That is what is proposed, Mr. Speaker, in the recommendation of the committee that considered the matter at length and which took into account most of the objections raised last December, and which proposed a procedure considerably different from that known as rule 16A.

Last December, several members of the opposition agreed that the government should assume its responsibilities and its powers, and put an end to an endless debate, by closure or otherwise. The closure rule has seldom been applied here, in fact, 16 times only since 1913, and since the latest amendment of the Standing Orders, it is now very difficult to apply. The experience of 1956 proved to what extent that procedure can be complicated in its implementation. It is in fact proposed to apply it only when the difficulty arises, when the debate becomes violent and when the minds become excited. It is not, Mr. Speaker, a proper cure for the problems which could come up in the house.

I would refer you particularly to what the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin)

[Mr. Forest.]

said in December, as reported on page 3867 of *Hansard,* and I quote:

[*English*]

Surely some reasonable provision can be found. The case of an impasse between government and opposition occurs, and I think should be dealt with. It is true that in a case where all of the opposition parties obstinately refuse to agree to any reasonable time allocation on an individual item, the process of closure would be open to the government. But it may be, however, that in respect of individual items and after a reasonable time for the opposition to state its objections in debate, and subject to some reasonable limitation, the majority supporting the government should be able to resolve the impasse. I am not pleading that there should be no rule dealing with situations where there is an impasse, but this is a far cry from the present proposed rule.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the hon. member for Greenwood was supported by many other members, and I refer to the debates which took place at that time.

This afternoon, I understood the Leader of the Opposition to say that in December he relied on the support of the press, and that he still had it. Yet, this afternoon, two editorials were read to us and I would like to quote to the house what the *Montreal Daily Star* particularly said on June 30 last. Here it is:

[*English*]

Opposition parties need not expect much public sympathy if they launch another filibuster to prevent the House of Commons from adopting the government's proposed new time-allocation rule. The experience of the past six months has provided sufficient proof of the need for machinery to ration the time spent on public business.

[*Translation*]

And it goes on to say:

[*English*]

Every day wasted by an opposition filibuster will provide more evidence of the need for rules to insure that parliament is a place not only to debate, but also to decide.

[*Translation*]

And on May 24 last, the *Financial Post* which is surely a very responsible newspaper stated in its editorial and I quote:

[*English*]

The government, whether this one or the next one, must have the power to carry out its prime responsibility which is to pass legislation. There is no justification in the name of democracy which allows a small group of MPs to frustrate that extremely important responsibility.

The opposition must now accept its true limitation and join with the government in approving some form of restraint on debate. The time for anything less has run out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in the *Financial Times*, on April 7 last as well as on July 7, 1969, the following could be read and I quote:

[*English*]

It is clear that what is still needed is an orderly flow of legislation through the system. The only way to ensure this is to set progressive deadlines for bills at each stage. These deadlines need not be inflexible, but they should be postponed only in special cases.

[*Translation*]

• (9:10 p.m.)

I go on quoting.

[*English*]

There will be cries, of course, that this is anti-democratic. In fact, the ability of the opposition to influence policy is greater, because of the increased use of committees, than it was before. The rules will not really be reformed until there is time allocation. And until then, Parliament will not be prepared to meet the demands on it in this fast moving and difficult age.

[*Translation*]

And on July 7 last, Mr. Speaker, one could read this:

[*English*]

The genius of parliamentary government should be to ensure that all legislation is open to criticism by any minority, that it is examined as fully as it can be and that it always carries the assent of the majority. But it is also to ensure that the important business of the nation is attended to.

The rights of adequate debate are very thoroughly safeguarded—in some respects too thoroughly—in the procedural proposals now before parliament. What is still lacking, but is partially provided in Rule 75c, is some means of providing (as we put it on April 7 this year) "an orderly flow of legislation through the system".

The basic problem of the House of Commons is no different from the problem which faces all of us—how best to use a limited amount of time. The new use of Committees and the increased number of opposition days have already given the opposition more chance than it ever had to influence legislation. What it is now claiming is the right to stage a sit-in or a teach-in whenever it likes. And that is the negation of orderly government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I shall not go on quoting but I want to draw your attention to the fact that the new proposal of the committee differs from that which was made in December, which provided only for the establishment of a business committee made up of the representatives of the various parties. At that time, even prior to debate and whether there was unanimous consent or not, a minister of the crown was allowed to propose a motion providing for a time allocation for one or several stages and for one or several bills at one time.

I do not intend to come back over details about standing orders 75A, 75B, and 75C which have been very clearly explained this afternoon, especially by the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). I would however, like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that standing order 75C will only be used in the last resort, when no agreement has been reached under orders 75A and 75B. My contention is that there will always be an agreement if the opposition is as sensible as it claims to be. It will not be possible to invoke it in advance but once the debate has begun, its use will be limited to one stage only and also to only one bill.

The use of this method will certainly take more time than the minimum period of 10 days and in contrast to what was said this afternoon, the opposition will have all the time and all the means to warn the public against any measure that it would deem harmful or dangerous.

I am convinced that most opposition members realize the necessity of this procedure but since we have not yet reached here the same degree of political maturity as in England, for instance, we will hear the same old stories to the effect that democracy is in danger, that parliament will disappear and so on, while we are not denying the right to discuss, the freedom of speech. We only want to put an end to the endless discussions and to the repetitions which rather discredit Parliament and which the Canadians of today do not accept any more.

It is obvious that the government, in its own interest will do all it can and will make all the reasonable concessions to proceed by agreement, before using rule 75C in the extreme cases which will probably be even scarcer because of this rule.

What must be avoided above all is that a small minority can prevent almost indefinitely a majority elected by the people to adopt the measures that are necessary for the welfare and the progress of that nation during the time which is still necessarily limited for the discussion of public business.

Mr. Speaker, among the democratic parliaments of free countries we are almost the only one that has not yet adopted any rule to restrict the length of debates. I would even say that democracy is not yet in danger, nor has it disappeared in the countries which

have adopted it, like Australia, New Zealand, India or England, for example.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the United Kingdom which is rightly considered as the model or the mother of all parliaments, they have realized long ago that there are only 365 days in a year and that in the course of any debate there comes a time when a decision must be taken and when the rules must be applied.

And in the British parliament, the closure rule is not the same as ours and is even more drastic. It is often applied without raising a general outcry.

In this case, the government will be able to plan a legislative program and at least expect it to be considered and adopted if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by quoting from a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in December of last year:

> We must not refuse to make the necessary adjustments and improvements in our institutions. For it is true that parliament and each of its component parts are, like living organisms, subject to the universal law of life: adapt or wither away. It is not sufficient for us merely to cherish this heritage as if it were a relic, of interest only to historians. We must reform it so that in our time it will serve us well. We must revitalize it so that our successors will receive from us, not an outdated, moribund survival from an earlier age, but a vital and responsive institution of democratic government.

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Speak up, we cannot hear you.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not got started yet, but I know you fellows have patience. Let me refer first of all to the remark made by the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) to the effect that he was a senior member of the university from which we both graduated. Well, we young fellows, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and myself, can appreciate that when we get to his age we see things through different eyes.

I believe the first question I should ask tonight is: what are we doing here? After all, the government said it would run parliament according to a timetable, and that we would adjourn on June 27. We are here, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend from Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) said, quoting from the *Citizen*, because the government thought it could put something over on the opposition parties by rushing these proposals through, anticipating that members of the opposition would want to go home for their holidays, like some on the opposite side whose empty seats we see here this evening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I hope those who are in their places tonight will realize that they have underestimated the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Let me say that we intend to stay here to oppose these proposals, and if we have to stay here all summer, we intend to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Our party intends to do so, and after listening to spokesmen of other opposition parties in the house I have the impression they intend to do the same. I might say here and now to all those who want to write articles about a fillibuster that if this place does not close until October 8, when it is supposed to open again, it will not cost the taxpayers one more dollar, since the cost of this institution is identical whether it is open or closed. We are really travelling on our own time for the sake of preserving for the people of Canada this living institution, namely, parliament.

In my introductory remarks I should like to say I was shocked that this proposed new rule, which is 16A in another form, should have been introduced into this particular parliament. I have sat in this institution since 1958. Many in this chamber have been here even longer than I have. But there is one thing on which I believe we can all agree: none of the parties ever had more responsible leadership, whether it be the Official Opposition or the N.D.P. or the Ralliement des Créditistes.

It would seem to me that having regard to this kind of leadership—and I refer, now, in particular, to the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), a reasonable man—this is the wrong time at which to come to parliament and try to ram down our throats a proposition of the kind now being advanced.

This country has called for responsible leadership for a long time. Whenever we got into prolonged debates in the past our actions have been called irresponsible. Now that we have responsible leadership throughout the whole house—and this is no criticism of any

leadership we have had in parliament on previous occasions—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Now that we have responsible leadership under a very reasonable man, a man who has always been ready to work for parliament, I would have expected a far different approach from the other side.

Let us consider for a few moments the record of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition. When the government put forward the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code we asked that it be split into three parts. This was refused. But our leader went along with the party opposite and the N.D.P.—the Ralliement took a somewhat different view with regard to certain clauses of the bill—because we believe in reform and we thought there was a great deal in the bill which was commendable. We voted for the bill and we helped its passage through parliament. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) were here tonight he would confirm that both in this chamber and in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs we were co-operative at every stage. We were co-operative during the report stage, on second reading and on third reading. There was no fillibuster or hold up on our part.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Let me give one more example before I move to the rules themselves, the official languages bill. No one could have taken a more nationalistic or realistic approach in the interests of this nation than the leader of my party. In this regard he was supported by the leaders of the other opposition parties. We have co-operated with the government and tried to assist them to plan a timetable for getting legislation and other matters through this house. In spite of this, we are today faced with what I call a guillotine rule. What has brought about this new approach by the Liberal party?

Mr. Nowlan: Not new, it is old.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, it has been given new leadership. I should like to quote from the 1967 debates. An examination of the index to the debates reveals that the former minister of justice, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada, was not a man who made many speeches. One can say that he was conspicuous by his absence in this institution. After all, he was a newcomer.

Procedure and Organization

On the occasion when the opposition parties defeated a former government on a tax measure, he was asked several questions, one of them put by the then hon. member for Calgary North. The former member for Calgary North at that time asked why the minister of justice called the defeat of the government a technicality, and why the government did not resign according to the constitution of the country. I feel sorry for the president of the privy council, but I feel far more sorry, Mr. Speaker, for this newcomer to parliament who represents the riding of Grenville-Carleton, because he has been used as a government yo-yo. First of all, he thought he could move his committee report. Then he was told he could not, and then that he could after all. He should really thank us, because if the opposition had not won the day yesterday he could not have made the speech he did today.

Mr. Blair: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is rising to a point of order.

Mr. Hees: Somebody must have pulled the strings.

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I mentioned my hon. friend had been to the same university as I. I should point out that he was not a graduate in history.

Some hon. Members: Yo-yo.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I will not deal with that point except to remind the members of the house that at university the hon. member led the Conservative party, but since then has become an opportunist and joined the Liberal party. I had the misfortune to sit under his leadership at university, and he was such an opportunist that that was the only time one could flush him out.

Let me go on and relate what the Prime Minister said. Replying to the then hon. member for Calgary North, the right hon. gentleman said: "We are masters in the house in the sense that we have to conduct the affairs of the government".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Does the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) wish to rise on a question of privilege?

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): It is not very serious, Mr. Speaker, but the interpreter does not hear the hon. member who is speaking. I do not know why, but the simultaneous translation system is not working. If it were possible to re-establish communications, we would be very grateful.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Before I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was going to quote what the present Prime Minister said in one of the first speeches he made on February 27, 1968, reported at page 7042 of *Hansard*. In answer to the then hon. member for Calgary North he said:

> We are masters of the house in the sense that we have to conduct the affairs of government.

When the right hon. gentleman took over the leadership of the Liberal party he said: "I am going to be master as soon as I get a majority in this country". It is he who is using members of parliament and the President of the Privy Council to pilot through this kind of measure.

Let me refer to another statement of the Prime Minister, one I have quoted on other occasions, made in February, 1963 before he was even a Liberal. Let us also remember that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton was not always a Liberal. At that time the right hon. gentleman was attacking the Liberal party for their opportunism and expediency, and he said their philosophy was:

> Say anything, think anything you like. But put us in power, because we are best fitted to govern.

As he said, the political philosophy of the Liberal party is simplicity itself. That is the attitude that is behind these proposed rules.

Mr. Peters: And they believe that.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, they do. I am not surprised, as a member of the opposition, that the right hon. gentleman stated "We are the masters of this house", because on a former occasion before he had joined the party he had criticized that same party's philosophy of:

> Say anything, think anything you like. But put us in power, because we are best fitted to govern.

When the Canadian people give the Liberal party a majority, the Liberals become drunk with power. This is the reason they are proposing these rules.

I turn now to some of the arguments that were made this afternoon. Proposed rule 75c states:

> A minister of the crown who from his place in the house at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration—

Stopping there, if no agreement is reached under 75A, and 75B, which is pretty ambiguous, is not put into operation, the government can move in with their guillotine rule 75c.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: The backbenchers in the Liberal party applaud. The adoption of this rule would mean that they would be even more silent in the next two or three years than they have been in the first year of parliament. This guillotine rule will operate just as effectively against them as against opposition members. They should be on our side, not on the side of this all-powerful cabinet.

The government is saying, in effect, that in the absence of agreement under 75A or 75B, the government will bring down the guillotine rule 75c. In other words, that remains as an ever present threat that hangs over the leaders of the major parties if they cannot reach agreement. The house leader of the Liberal party, this all-powerful baron in the House of Commons, is saying that unless agreement is reached under 75A or the formula of 75B is adopted, the government will bring into operation 75c. The government wants not only to use this rule but to abuse its implementation in the sense that it will use it to destroy any chance of real consultation. How can there be consultation, Mr. Speaker, when we are blackmailed into either agreeing or being guillotined? That would be the position if these rules were adopted.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton said this afternoon that there is nothing really bad at all about 75c. He said that if no agreement is reached under 75A or 75B, debate can continue for ten days. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton no doubt is a senior member of parliament.

• (9:30 p.m.)

An hon. Member: He is still wet behind the ears.

Mr. Woolliams: I continue quoting proposed rule 75c. The nub of it is contained in the part I am about to read:

> —in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a

specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill—

Really this proposal sets a minimum as well as a maximum time. It says that you can spend one day on second reading, one day in committee—and just imagine what would have happened if we had spent one day only in committee on the Criminal Code amendments—one day on the report stage when amendments have to be moved, and one day on the third reading stage. According to my mathematics it seems that we are to be allowed four days to debate a bill. Of course, the hon. member says, "But we can have a little hanky-panky; before the introduction of each stage we can have a two hour debate." What a waste of time that will be. None of us is here to waste time. I think I speak for all intelligent members of parliament when I say that we are interested in debating the substance and principle of a bill. We are not interested in wasting time at the second reading stage, the committee stage, the report stage and the third reading stage by indulging in a two hour procedural wrangle. At every stage we are to have a two hour debate. Well, those of us in opposition are interested in getting to the substance of the bill. We want to get at the principle of a bill and let our people in this country know what the import and purport of the legislation is.

A few minutes ago the minister read briefly from the Toronto *Telegram*. I, too, wish to read from the Toronto *Telegram* of July 8, 1969. In my copy the author of this article, Mr. Lubor J. Zink, writes as follows:

With rule 75c in operation, they say, the Government would be in a position to arbitrarily limit the debate of any controversial Bill to three days and thereby make it impossible for the opposition to alert the public to potentially detrimental measures.

It is this danger and not the principle of allocation of time for debate the opposition is determined to fight resolutely. For unless the opposition parties manage to hold on to the weapon of prolonged debate when they see danger to the nation in some specific legislation or policy proposal, the Government will be in a position to enforce its will before the public grasps the issues involved.

What is parliament all about, Mr. Speaker? I know my friends of the Liberal party will not be influenced by what I and others in the opposition have to say. The only time the government changes its position is when the opposition brings something to the attention of public opinion. Only when public opinion has been made fully aware of something does the government back off and amend legislation. That is what the opposition does and that, in part, is what parliament is about. I know that when hon. members opposite come out of caucus, they are brainwashed and trained seals; but they are nevertheless sensitive. Oh, yes, they are sensitive because they love power, as the Prime Minister so aptly said before he became a Liberal. They love power so much that they have been forced to respond to public opinion in western Canada. The Prime Minister is to make a trip out west to try to calm the fears of our farmers.

An hon. Member: He does not know when he is going.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right. He does not know when he is to go; but the very fact that he is going indicates that he is sensitive to public opinion. He is also sensitive to the pin pricks of his backbenchers who say to him in caucus, "You've got to do something, Pierre; we are going to be defeated next time round."

Mr. Perrault: That is arrant nonsense.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear the mountain of British Columbia rumbling. I always call the hon. member Rip Van Winkle because he rumbles like a mountain. You can always tell when he comes into the house. The Prime Minister should know who he is, this hon. member who comes from the mountains. I continue quoting from Mr. Zink's article:

This danger is acute despite the marvels of instant communications. For while three days of debate may be sufficient for raising most of the arguments the opposition wishes to make in the Commons, they are woefully inadequate for making an impression on the public mind.

He continues:

There is no objection to limitation of debating time by agreement as stipulated in the proposed rules 75A and 75B, but the opposition parties cannot swallow the arbitrariness of Rule 75c. It is their duty to block the dictatorial measure until the Government either rams it through by invoking the standing closure rule or removes the unacceptable part of the package as it did before Christmas.

Is it not a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that every time we are about to adjourn for a holiday the government brings in a proposal to change the rules. Just before Christmas they brought in the proposal for rule 16A and now, just before we are to rise for the summer, they bring in proposed Standing Order

75A, 75B and 75C. What does the government expect to gain by its tactics? What does the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton expect to gain?

Mr. Nowlan: He is the Santa Claus of summertime.

Mr. Woolliams: He certainly is. At Christmastime, when the government withdrew proposed rule 16A, I knew that we should have to face another discussion on the rules. At that time the Prime Minister said he had trapped the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of all other parties in this house. He suggested that he withdrew the motion with respect to 16A because he had rammed down our throats the other part of the package then before parliament. How can one negotiate with a Prime Minister who talks this way?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: How can you establish good will among members and good faith in this house in the light of such remarks?

An hon. Member: Where is the just society?

Mr. Woolliams: I would expect some hon. members who did not take part in the Liberal leadership race to display a much more intelligent attitude than has been displayed here. I am not referring to the acting prime minister, either.

An hon. Member: You are talking about the "Gold Dust twins".

Mr. Woolliams: I am talking about the "Gold Dust twins", that is right. This government does not want members of parliament to discharge their duties. This government supports the principle of dictatorship. It wants to dictate to committees and it wants to dictate to this house how debates shall be conducted. The government does not want information to be disseminated to our people; it only wants our people to know what it thinks the people ought to know. It only wants the kind of opposition it can stand comfortably—it only wants nice, quiet, gentlemanly opposition that will do nothing to disturb the all powerful Liberal party.

Mr. Stanfield: It would like to suppress committee reports.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right. This government thinks it can do without parliament. It imagines that parliament is here to serve the government. What the government really would like to do is ignore parliament entirely. That is what the government wants to do.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Woolliams: I know it is a shame. That is why I am talking tonight and that is why I intend to talk all summer so you will not get a holiday.

Mr. Perrault: You took your holiday in the winter.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear Rip Van Winkle again in the distance! We can just see what will happen as soon as this legislation is passed. As soon as the government can say we have four days to debate a major bill, they are going to ram through the legislation without the people being informed. Take the language bill, for example. I am one who supports the principle of the bill.

Mr. Perrault: Good for you.

An hon. Member: There's the nut again!

Mr. Woolliams: That Rip Van Winkle is an amazing man!

Even today Canadians do not understand what the language bill means, although there was a fairly intelligent debate. Because of the opposition, Canadians do know that there will be decisions made by this great commissioner who was not supposed to have any power.

Canadians know today that this so-called non-powerful commissioner can summon witnesses. They know he can have hearings in camera without even that great lawyer, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), being present. Even he will not be able to be present. They also know this commissioner can get documents, go into offices without search warrants and make decisions. All this can be done in the great image of an investigator, according to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). All of this can be done under this bill which was passed by this chamber, and which contained no right of appeal.

If a French Canadian member of a minority group in some area of Canada lost his job and was unable to educate his family because the commissioner, for some reason or other, was prejudiced, he would have no right of appeal. The Canadian people know this, not as a result of any explanation made by the government but because of the actions of the opposition.

What is the function of the opposition? Perhaps it is time a few words were said about this. The opposition is not a piece of furniture or a piece of ivory, nor does the opposition want to spend the summer here in order to debate something we know is inherently wrong as far as this institution and as far as Canadians are concerned. What is the major role of the opposition? The opposition has a continuing responsibility of vigilance. It must do the job of checking the government, opposing the government vigorously when necessary with all the tools and ability at its command. What the government is trying to do is take away those tools.

Checking the government is the most obvious task of the opposition. This applies to legislation such as the Criminal Code bill, medicare, and it should apply to measures to increase our taxation. The opposition must prod and push the government into action. Goodness only knows this government needs some pushing! They do not know how to sell wheat; they are losing the oil and industrial markets and they are prepared to lose $80 million to the automobile industry. I say they have to be pushed.

Mr. Stanfield: They have inflation under control!

Mr. Woolliams: As my leader has said, inflation—

An hon. Member: Which leader?

Mr. Woolliams: Governments everywhere must find a solution to inflation and the housing problem. Who would have thought during the election campaign that interest rates today in the city of Calgary and other major cities in this country would be as high as 10 per cent? Only Benson!

The opposition must be the type to advance policies. What do we mean by that? We recommended in our amendment that the language bill should contain a right of appeal in order to guarantee the civil rights of this nation. We are recommending positive policies, and that is our function. If the government implements this rule, in spite of what the hon. member says about ten days, the government will be able to ram a bill through in four days, so what chance will we have to make any serious recommendations? They do not want to hear the opposition. It just bothers them.

The opposition must advance policies that will persuade the electors that its members should be on the treasury benches, and therefore, form the government. These members could provide a better government, one that the Canadian people realize would bring about changes. The failure of the opposition to perform these functions will relegate them to the role of the opposition forever. Sir Charles Tupper said:

> The duty of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is to exercise its vast influence in restraining vicious legislation, and in giving a loyal support to proposals of the interests of the country; while initiating itself such measures for the commonwealth as are neglected by the administration.

We have heard many quotations, and perhaps some of them should be referred to again.

Mr. Gibson: Who are your research teams?

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe some Liberal backbenchers should have research teams because all they do is laugh and scoff. They are not interested. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) is just back from another holiday.

Mr. Gibson: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Perrault: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Extensive quotations are being delivered from a document and no source date or page reference has been given. I ask the hon. member to give us details of the document from which he is quoting.

Mr. Woolliams: If the hon. member really wants to know, this is a speech prepared by me this afternoon. I am quoting some political scientists to whom, no doubt, Rip Van Winkle has never exposed his intelligence.

Quentin Hogg said:

> Countries cannot be fully free until they have an organized opposition. It is not a long step from the absence of an organized opposition to a complete dictatorship.

Possibly I should quote Lord Acton again:

> All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And that fits the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault). A former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. L. B. Pearson quoted the late R. B. Bennett with approval as follows:

> Oppositions are essential and necessary in the development of a democratic state. They serve a great and useful purpose. To the extent that criticism is frank and thorough, to that extent they do a great service to the country.

Disraeli said:

No government can be long secure without a formidable opposition.

I think it was the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) who quoted Edmund Burke. Edmund Burke said:

He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper.

I might just end on this note. We have gone along with reform on the rules of parliament, and we have gone a long way. When that reform did away with committee of the whole procedure for bills and did away with committee of supply in relation to estimates, I said we should at least retain control of 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the estimates in the house, because the only control the opposition has over this kind of arrogance and dictatorship is the control of the purse strings of parliament. The government has gone a long way on the road towards dictatorship. The Liberal party said their government was going to be made up of young men with a new image and new vision. We were going to plan our work so that we would be able to leave here on June 27 and resume the session in October. Surely, the government did not think it could try to ram this rule change through parliament without the opposition being aware of its tactics? What the government is doing today is taking away the effective tools of all members of parliament, and particularly the effective tools of an opposition whose functions are as I have outlined them this evening.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I had hoped that the Prime Minister would have been in the chamber tonight. In his absence I would ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to have another look at this matter in the hope that the government would withdraw this motion, just as it did at Christmas, and let parliament remain a living institution where Canadians can speak through their elected representatives.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): I would like to express my opinion on rules 75A, 75B and 75C. We have every reason to say that every day, matters were presented in this house that led the minority to believe that it was its duty to object strongly.

If this government, blinded by its majority, would care to open its eyes, there would be no ground for discussions such as the one we are having today. What proves me right, Mr. Speaker, is that Bill C-202, even though it is far from perfect, was passed thanks to our support.

After all, what we want as Canadian members of parliament is to express the voice of the people who cannot be heard at a moment when we are threatened with a dictatorial regime. Once again, I say there are circumstances when the opposition, called the minority, must make its views known vigorously because public opinion must know the dictatorial rule which is imposed upon the house.

I am not setting forth a new doctrine, Mr. Speaker. It goes back to the time of Charles I. History books are full of such references. The house leader had, at that time, introduced what was called the great remonstrance which was debated during a whole night. On another occasion, in 1771, the majority of the house did not want to allow the debates of the house to be published. Edmund Burke fought against this and succeeded in wrecking the majority's plan. He himself declared: posterity will bless the penetrating insight we showed on that day.

Since the Prime Minister is now travelling across Canada stating that we must have one Canada, one nation, and since, together, we have celebrated the 102nd anniversary of Canada last week, allow me, Mr. Speaker and hon. colleagues, to point out how in 1867, when Parliament was organized, following Confederation, rules were established for this house.

A special committee was then appointed to draft such rules. The committee's report was tabled in the house for further study as is stated in *Hansard* of December 27, 1867.

Dictatorial measures were also applied in 1885, 1896, 1908 and 1911, in order to deprive the opposition of all freedom of action. All governments who took such a step regretted it bitterly.

That is the reason why, today, I hold out to the Liberal members who condemn the dictatorial manner in which they are led, the olive-branch to replace the golden chains offered them by the Prime Minister.

I say to my good friends the Liberal members: If you should accept such measures, if you should approve rules 75A, 75B and 75C, you will regret it bitterly, as did the Borden

government in 1913 and the St-Laurent government in 1956.

When I refer to the dictatorial manner in which parliament is led by a Prime Minister who, today, is asking the house leader the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) to pilot an indefensible bill, I base myself on a recent newspaper article which points out that such dictatorship is not only felt by Canadians but that it is also noticed by people beyond our borders.

And I have in hand a newspaper of last May which reproduced an article from the representative in Washington, Mr. John Rarick, who stated that the threat of a Canada governed by Mr. Trudeau is, and I quote:

> —but a segment of a world scale conspiracy against free men—

And he went on saying:

> The "Canadian Castro"
> While calling Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau a "Canadian Castro" Mr. John R. Rarick stated that Canada has "jeopardized its position" within the free world and—

He said also that there was no hope right now that freedom could continue to exist in this country.

Such a statement was made by someone who does not live in Canada and who is studying the Canadian situation.

If dictatorial rules are imposed on us, preventing the opposition to warn public opinion and tell the people that harmful bills are being prepared, we could then also read the statements of certain of our newspapermen.

I have in hand a statement of Mr. Claude Ryan published in a newspaper of October 30, 1968, four months after the coming into power of the Liberals. It indicates what was thought about the new government. This is what it said and I quote:

> Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau had the extraordinary chance of being elected leader of his party, then brought back to power without having to disclose to the Canadian people the true nature of his political ideas. He could utter for months the worse blunders in a climate of euphoria created by the appearance of the Messiah.

May I point out that it is ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In accordance with Standing Order 40, a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been made and seconded at this time. Therefore, the question is: "That this house do now adjourn."

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order No. 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—ZONING OF POSTAL ADDRESSES IN LARGE CENTRES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my inquiry of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) was made on May 29 shortly after it became apparent that yet another administrative fiasco was being chalked up in the Post Office Department, which of late has far out-distanced all other government departments in the number, range and variety of its bureaucratic snafus, and I do not exclude the Passport Office of the Department of External Affairs. Just when one begins to think that nothing more can go wrong in the Post Office Department and that the minister has finally come to the end of his semi-eternal process of creating task forces, another problem looms.

With costly fanfare, expensive publicity, and after many months of work by an expert team, the three digit zone system was to be unveiled for Metro Toronto on May 1. How expensive this great development was is seen in the answers to my order paper questions on July 2. One hundred and fifty thousand books were printed, and there was a reprint order of 200,000. The total cost of printing was $50,000, and the entire operation cost $130,681. How many small post offices could have been kept in operation for that amount of money? Advertising in all the media cost $72,785, and this was to be a job which when done was to stay done forever. In the green book which introduced this plan to the people in Toronto, and I may say there was a red book too, there was a foreword by the District Director of Postal Service which reads:

> I am sure that you will be interested in knowing that the numbers have been set up in such a way as to eliminate the necessity of any changes over the next 30 years.

But the permanence became somewhat undermined and the precise became somewhat uncertain. The green book, with its May date, did not have a very long run as an outstanding best seller. In the Toronto *Star* of May 29, the people of Toronto read this:

• (10:00 p.m.)

> The Post Office has put a freeze on its new three-digit postal zone policy.

The new policy was announced in a flurry of publicity in newspapers, on radio, billboards and handbills. It cost the Post Office $60,000 in Metro alone to tell you "Your Number is up."

The new system was supposed to have become effective May 1. But it isn't, and may never be. It seems somebody forgot to tell somebody else about a policy change.

And left holding the bag are hundreds of Metro firms who already have had new business forms printed to incorporate the change. All the Post Office can advise them to do is store the letterheads somewhere—maybe they'll be useful some day.

R. F. Horgan, acting director of information and public relations for the post office in Ottawa said yesterday that firms requiring new letterheads and stationery anyway should use the new three-digit forms. "But we certainly wouldn't advise them to destroy present stocks."

Then, in the Toronto *Telegram* of May 30 we read:

Local post office officials are telling confused callers they can use either of two sets of zone numbers, whichever they please. "Use the old one, it's easier," one official told the Telegram today.

As recorded at page 10742 of *Hansard* for July 2 I asked:

Is it possible that the 3 digit zone system now in force in these cities—

These are three large cities, including Toronto.

—will be dropped as a result of the review of zoning systems suggested by the Minister of Communications on May 29?

The answer was:

Yes, but not probable. It is expected that, if a national postal code is adopted—

And so on.

But, what do we do in the next two or three years? Are our numbers up or down, frozen or evaporated? Perhaps Vancouver is the scene of the most complete compounding of the confusion. The *Province* of May 23 provides some insight along these lines:

The post office department apparently is going to amend postal zone changes that were to become effective in the Lower Mainland on June 1.

The further change—possibly to a full, five-number zip code system—was hinted Thursday when local postal officials said the original change to three-number ones was being "deferred or postponed."

A telegraphed message from Ottawa suggested the change had been "deferred or postponed" and that "an explanation was on the way."

The explanation was expected to arrive today.

"We're in the dark on this," the Vancouver spokesman said.

The official went on to say:

The new system was described as one that would speed sorting and delivery of mail.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

All this from the man who was going to make the Post Office businesslike and efficient. If this is efficiency, Mr. Speaker, give me some good old fashioned sloppiness. Doubtless the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) will tell us that all is well; that the numbers game is good for us; that the unofficial intercity guessing contest will give us some of the kick of a national lottery. The minister is expert at giving assurances and reassurances. I recall how confident he was when he said that the new rates would not injure publications and how pleased the carriers were with the new arrangements following the institution of the five day delivery. I need not talk about the debunking of the pre-conclusions. It would be amusing, even ludicrous, it would be a modern Gilbert and Sullivan. But it is also serious. It cannot be doing much to speed the nation's mail if the largest post offices in the country are in such a state of confusion and so much time and energy is wasted in such feckless planning.

Is it any wonder that our post office is becoming a source of derision? We read this in the *Dominion Travellers Association* magazine under the caption "Who trusts the mail anymore?":

Uganda, or whatever they call the place now, has a better postal system than Canada has. Afghanistan has a better system. Even the United States—once the unhappy owner of the world's worst postal system—has a better one than Canada has now.

They do a better job in Bechuanaland, using runners with forked sticks, than they do in Winnipeg using a computer and hundreds of poorly paid civil servants. The Pony Express defied Indians to deliver mail faster between San Francisco and Houston—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications and Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am frequently fascinated by the flowery phrases of the Falstaff of the Conservative court, a court that I might remind hon. members of the house is now in exile. If the calibre of his criticism remains at the present level, the court is likely to remain in exile. While the hon. member's criticism of the Post Office may indeed merit the term "flowery", it is certainly not factual.

I do not think the hon. member or anyone else can prove the statement that the post office departments in the United States, Uganda or Afghanistan are better than that of Canada. The confusion that exists about the

decision that we made exists only in his own mind. We decided some years ago to start zoning Canadian cities according to two or three digits. Early this year, as part of an over-all review of the operations of the Post Office, we came to the decision that we should examine the possibility of a national coding system into which we could integrate all sections of the country.

The purpose of a national coding system is to enable the Post Office to take full advantage of mechanized and automated sorting machines—not the kind of manual process that was such a boon to the patronage of the Conservative government. Its advantage, also, is to examine the feasibility of the present three-character postal zoning systems being continued as part of a national coding system and to determine whether from a practical operating standpoint such a national coding system can identify sections or units within a city. It is a system which allows us to go directly to an automated system of letter carrier walks and recommend detailed plans for the implementation of such a system.

Perhaps we are looking one or two years into the future, but there comes a time when you make a decision to provide, if it is at all feasible, an ideal system; therefore, you halt temporarily city by city, ad hoc measures. This is exactly what we have done. Anyone can use the existing two-digit or three-digit system. No one has to store any letterheads or any mail, and business is quite aware of this. There is no loss to them in this system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired.

AGRICULTURE—POSSIBILITY OF AID TO WESTERN FARMERS FOLLOWING MEETING BETWEEN PREMIER AND PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, on June 4 I directed a supplementary question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asking him, because of his responsibility for establishing priorities in the government, whether in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) had announced a budgetary surplus of $250 million, the government would divert some of this surplus into an emergency program to alleviate the economic crisis confronting western agriculture. I asked this question, first because agriculture was barely mentioned in the budget brought down by the Minister of Finance, and second there was a $250 million projected surplus in the budget.

In view of a number of circumstances in agriculture in western Canada, I was suggesting in my question to the Prime Minister that we should divert some of this surplus into some sort of emergency plan. I realize there are many other areas into which some of this surplus could be diverted. However, the farmers of western Canada are frustrated by the attitude of the government. I came back from western Canada just yesterday, and a number of them were talking about the government giving subsidies and making concessions to many business corporations, automobile manufacturers, mining and *Time* magazine.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I should like to suggest that some kind of emergency plan in western Canada is of absolute necessity right now. I am sure the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) would agree with me on this since he also has been in the province quite recently. I think that right now the farmer has very little cash. He is met with escalating expenses and high interest rates, and this goes on and on. It is not only the farmer who is being hit in this way. This affects also the businessmen in larger and smaller communities in Western Canada. So I think that if nothing is done, there will be some real poverty in western Canada. There is already poverty in many of the farming areas there. I think it also makes economic sense to put some cash into the western economy. I know that the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and other organizations have suggested this to the government not once but many times.

There are many solutions. I am not saying that this is the only solution. We all know that many long range plans and activities have to be carried out in this area. I should like to suggest to the government that they spend $60 to $80 million on some emergency plan. In the past few months our party has been talking about something like this. I believe they have suggested a number of times that we pay farmers 20 cents a bushel as a deficiency payment on grain. If the government does not do something like this, there will not only be real poverty among the farming population of western Canada but many of these people will move into the cities and will join the ranks of the urban poor and unemployed. I think there will also be many more severe consequences. There will be much unrest which is already shaping up among the farmers. They are talking in terms

which have never been used before. I should like to appeal to the minister at this time to consider this suggestion seriously because I think this problem will escalate if something is not done immediately.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): As the hon. member pointed out, this question was asked on June 4. It came not only from the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) but the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) also participated by way of supplementary questions.

I do not wish to indicate that the number of programs the government has initiated, and indeed the other actions that have been extended and expanded but not initiated during this past year, do in fact add up to a complete solution of the problem of grain marketing and the restriction of the cash flow that comes from that problem.

If the hon. member will look at page 10,264 of *Hansard* of June 17 he will find listed there a number of measures. As I said, none of them is a complete solution, but there are a number of measures which do in fact cost the treasury substantial sums of money that go a long way toward alleviating the situation.

The hon. member spoke about the matter of a transfer of some $60 million to $70 million from the treasury into the wheat economy. If he added up what has been paid by the treasury into the wheat economy by way of the temporary Grain Reserves Act plus the interest that is paid on cash advances, plus a number of other items all of which are listed on the pages I mentioned, he would find that it comes to $60 million or $70 million or indeed more.

Furthermore, since that time another announcement was made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) who reports to the house for the Canadian Wheat Board. He indicated that the cash advances which were doubled last November by parliament will be fully reinstated in the new crop year in about three weeks, regardless of whether or not the advances for the past crop year have been fully paid.

These are the series of measures that have been brought in, and they are substantial. In addition to that, as has already been announced very frequently, there will be a meeting in Washington of the ministers of the major exporting nations to the international wheat market to see if a basis cannot be found for re-establishing some stability in the international market. The hon. member knows that Canada has taken the lead in seeking to make the International Grains Arrangement work for and on behalf of producers of grain in this country and in the rest of the world, but we do not have complete control beyond our borders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. minister, but his time has expired.

NATIONAL REVENUE—INGERSOLL, ONT.—STEPS TO RESTORE CUSTOMS SERVICES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes at my disposal I wish to bring to the attention of the house and of the minister a gross example of administrative incompetence in his department, and express the hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to do something to rectify this.

I am in no way blaming the minister or even his deputy minister for what has taken place. I suggest that officials further down the line have supplied the minister and his senior officials with inaccurate information in that they have misled the minister with regard to the subject I am about to raise. I suggest they are the same officials who caused the administrative mess at Port Dover, Ontario, where the customs officer was removed to the inconvenience of visiting Americans who were then set upon by the R.C.M.P. and fined for not clearing their boats that weekend, although no arrangements had been made to enable them to do so.

In this case a decision was made to close the customs port at Ingersoll, Ontario for reasons of economy. I have no quarrel with that motivation. I received a letter from the minister last January marked private and confidential, so I was not able to discuss the matter with other parties concerned, indicating that the local interests had been consulted in advance of the decision. In fact, none of the important local interests involved were informed that the customs port would be closed, until 12 days before the event and this caused great inconvenience and confusion. The mayor of Ingersoll called a meeting attended by representatives of the industries concerned, and the responsible official of the Department of National Revenue from London, Ontario was in attendance. I attended the meeting myself. I regret to say that the behaviour of the customs official was not only high handed but exceedingly discourteous to the mayor of Ingersoll and to myself. There is

certainly no politics involved here as the mayor is a senior official of the Liberal party.

It turned out that none of the local industries had been consulted by the department before the decision was made, or before a recommendation was sent to the minister. The customs official did agree that he would try to work out an effective service for the industries concerned. But nothing has been worked out to date, and the only person sent to consult with representatives of the industries was an official junior to the one who made the decision—and one can well imagine the situation this would create.

I received a letter from the minister's office dated July 3, a copy of a letter which had been sent to the mayor, indicating that everybody was happy and that all the industries were satisfied. Today, I discussed the matter with the heads of the companies concerned and I found that no one is happy at all. They are all extremely dissatisfied.

The industries concerned are all industries which require large amounts of material from the United States. They include the Ingersoll Machine Company and its related company, the Morrow Company, the Chemical Lime division of "STELCO" Chicago Vitreous, North American Cyanamid, Moto-Mower Limited and Standard Brands.

The removal of the customs port has caused the greatest possible inconvenience. Let me say that Ingersoll Machine alone has to bring in 175,000 lbs. a week of forgings and castings for use in the automobile industry, particularly in the making of gears. If normal customs duty were paid it would amount to nearly $12,000 a week; it is not the fault of the local industry that the government entered into an automobile pact with the United States with the result that duties are not collected. As a result of the closing of the port, 90 tons a week now have to be shipped to Woodstock and sent back 20 miles with all the extra cost which this involves. I do not have the time to give further examples, though I have pages of them before me. I have given the minister an account of the administrative incompetence of certain officials who act without proper consultation and, much worse, misinform senior officials of the department and the minister. This cannot help but cause embarrassment.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I shall be glad to provide the minister with any additional information he may require; he will understand I do not have sufficient time to do so at the moment under the limit imposed. I hope the minister will take a firm stand in this matter and do something to clean up the mess.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member this evening are quite different from the question he asked in the house the other day, which was whether it was the government's intention to reopen the customs port of Ingersoll, Ontario. It is the feeling of the department that equivalent and equally satisfactory service could be provided more economically from the nearby port of Woodstock, which is ten miles distant. I know it is always very hard when a customs port is closed but this department, like every other department, has been asked to cut its expenditures, if possible without hurting anybody.

As far as the disruption of major industries is concerned, I will have my officials look into this matter, with a view to giving advice and assistance to the industries affected, if the hon. member will provide me with the names of the companies in question. I see he is ready to give me some more information.

I will take note of other remarks made by the hon. member. I am surprised at the serious accusation he made in connection with officials in the area, but I will certainly look into the matter and write a report to the hon. member later on.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.24 p.m.

29180—696½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 9, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

9 July 1969

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Wishart F. Spence, O.B.E., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 9th of July, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Esmond Butler,
Secretary to the Governor General.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

REQUEST FOR CONSENT UNDER S.O. 43 TO DEBATE MOTION RESPECTING GRIEVANCES OF POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to ask the unanimous consent of the house, seconded by my hon. friend from Oxford, to move the following motion pursuant to standing order 43:

That the reports of W. S. Martin of the grievances by postal workers against the Post Office be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Under the terms of the standing order, I am entitled to explain the urgency of this motion. In the coming weeks the Post Office will be entering into negotiations with the postal workers, and unless some extremely pressing situation arises it appears unlikely that the house will have an opportunity to discuss this matter before adjourning for the summer recess. Consequently, we shall have no opportunity to consider the attitude of the Post Office in dealing with its employees until these important and delicate negotiations have been completed.

I would therefore ask that the house grant unanimous consent that this motion go forward in order that these reports and the important matters with which they deal may receive the immediate attention of a committee of this house.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, had there been advance consultation it might perhaps have been possible to give unanimous consent; but there was none. Consequently the government is unable to agree to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest that unless hon. members have a point of order to raise we should not allow debate of a motion moved under Standing Order 43. The hon. member is quite right to present a motion in this way under Standing Order 43, but he does require unanimous consent. If unanimous agreement is not given, then the matter cannot be proceeded with and there should not be a debate. However I do not wish to preclude other hon. members from raising other questions by way of a point of order.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR CONSENT UNDER S.O. 43 TO DEBATE MOTION RESPECTING MOVEMENT OF FEED GRAIN

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising on a point of order. I also have a matter with respect to which I am sure the house will grant unanimous consent, since the question relates to a very urgent situation. The motion to which I am asking the house to give unanimous consent is as follows:

That this house recommends that the government take immediate steps to alleviate the particularly distressing and urgent agricultural situation prevailing in the area of Peace River, by expediting the delivery and transportation of large quantities of feed grain in the hands of farmers, including the appointment of a person or persons to take charge of the expediting of this feed grain movement.

Movement of Feed Grain

I should like to make five brief points which I am sure will persuade the government to consent to the motion.

First, farmers in the Peace River country have experienced unusually difficult conditions in five out of the last seven years which have aggravated their position.

Second, there is in the Peace River country, and in the district of Falher in particular, between five and six million bushels of feed grain including barley, oats, and low grade wheat, for which there is an immediate market for sale in British Columbia and eastern Canada.

Third, so few box cars have come into Peace River country that some farmers have not even had a one bushel quota and most are still limited to the two and three bushel quotas and may well not achieve the five bushels promised by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pépin). Farmers will be able to sell feed grain to the British Columbia part of the Peace River country where buyers are willing and available to purchase it.

Fourth, a meeting of farm representatives was held on Sunday morning at the town of Falher which I attended and to which the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) were invited but were unable to attend.

Fifth—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid I have suffered as long as I can. I suggest to the hon. member that the rules do not allow a lengthy statement at this point. In attempting to use standing order 43 in this way, the hon. member is circumventing the provisions of standing order 26. I think that standing order 43 was never intended to be used in the way hon. members are attempting to use it today. If I am wrong about this the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization ought to take a look at standing order 43.

Mr. Baldwin: Your Honour is quite right, but I have only one more sentence.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Baldwin: At this meeting it was made perfectly clear—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member might be allowed to finish his statement.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Baldwin: At this meeting it was made perfectly clear that the situation was urgent and difficult, but that great help would be provided by moving this feed grain, particularly as it could be immediately used in other parts of Canada and the box cars would only be required for a short time. I hope that the house will give unanimous consent, in light of this statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member having put the question under Standing Order 43 I have to ask the house whether the hon. member has unanimous agreement to proceed as suggested.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to inform the hon. member that he does not have unanimous consent.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

LAW GOVERNING OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS PUBLICATION

Question No. 1,419—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the government studying, has it studied or will it study the desirability of passing a law dealing with the publication of official documents?
2. Will the government examine the Swedish legislation in this respect?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): 1. and 2. The government's policy concerning access to public records was announced in the House of Commons on May 1, 1969. In the formulation of that policy, due account was taken of the methods of publication of official documents in a number of other countries, including Sweden.

RECEIPT OF FUNDS BY U.S. COMPANY UNDER DEPARTMENTAL VOTE

Question No. 2,007—**Mr. Saltsman:**

What is the name of the Canadian company referred to in the 1968 Auditor General's Report, on page 60, paragraph 107, whose United States' parent company received $552,000 under the Department of Industry, Vote 10?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The name of the Canadian company referred to in the 1968 Auditor General's Report, on page 60, paragraph 107, is FMC Beloit Sorel Limited.

OVERPAYMENT TO CANADIAN COMPANY

Question No. 2,009—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What is the name of the Canadian company, referred to in the 1968 Auditor General's Report, page 61, paragraph 109, which received an overpayment from the Canadian Government of $86,000?

2. Is the Government of Canada presently attempting to obtain this overpayment from the above company?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The project referred to in the Auditor General's Report, page 61, paragraph 109, is still current and the interests of more than one allied country are involved. It is not considered in the public interest to disclose the name of the company at this time.

2. The Auditor General and the Justice Department differ as to whether an overpayment situation exists. The Justice Department is of the opinion, relating to this specific agreement, that no distribution of the proceeds of sale can be effected until the sale is concluded. When the sale is concluded the government will receive all monies due under the contract.

TREATY RIGHTS RESEARCH BY INDIANS

Question No. 2,225—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. Is the Minister committed to granting the Indian people the resources they need to undertake their own research into treaty rights and related matters as was requested by Indians at the April 28-May 2 National Indian Conference in Ottawa?

2. Did the Minister take the opportunity on the weekend of May 2, 1969 for a preliminary meeting with the Committee of six designated by the National Indian Conference to deal with him on this matter?

3. When will the first formal meeting of that group occur, and when will the Minister announce a firm decision regarding financial assistance to Indian research?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. At a meeting with the Indians during the National Indian Consultation Conference April 28-May 2 it was stated, as in December 1968, that the Canadian government was ready to help them form into an association and take advantage of the most modern means of operation; these statements are still valid today.

2. An opportunity has not yet arisen to meet officially with the members of the Committee of six designated by the national Indian delegation.

3. The Committee has not yet informed the department when their first formal meeting will occur. An announcement will be made in the near future as to the form of financial assistance which will be made available for Indian research.

CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATORY BOARD

Question No. 2,245—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the government considering, has it considered or will it consider, establishing a crime victims compensation board?

2. Will these studies be tabled in the House?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1 and 2. On May 15 and again on May 21, I stated, as recorded in *Hansard*, that I shall defer this matter to the commissioners of legislation uniformity and to the representatives of the provinces' Attorneys General.

CREATION OF POST OF OMBUDSMAN

Question No. 2,249—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the government considering the advisability of presenting a Bill which would create the post of ombudsman to ensure better protection for citizens?

2. At what stage are the studies on the protection of the citizen vis-à-vis the government and bureaucracy?

3. Who is carrying out these studies and will they be tabled in Parliament?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. The government has not announced any policy with regard to the advisability of creating an office of ombudsman.

2. The protection of the citizen vis-à-vis the government and bureaucracy is a matter which is under continuous study by the government.

3. Such study is done in particular in relation to the formulation of policies by the various departments concerned and the preparation of legislation by the Department of Justice.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE PRE-OPENING ENTERTAINMENT

Question No. 2,369—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the total cost of the pre-opening entertainment provided to guests of the directorate of the National Arts Centre?

2. How many groups were invited to attend pre-opening ceremonies?

3. What was the estimated total number of individuals involved and what was the reason for the pre-opening entertainment?

4. What are the names of the individuals given the responsibility for selecting and entertaining the individuals and groups invited?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Arts Centre as follows: 1. $4,036.54.

Questions

2. National Press Club; National Press Gallery; prospective support organizations; local, national and international critics.

3. The purpose of pre-opening entertainment was to show the Centre to those who wished to organize community support, and to attract local, national and international news coverage—800 people.

4. G. Hamilton Southam, Director General.

PROFICIENCY OF FIRE ARMS APPLICANTS

Question No. 2,389—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

Is it the federal government's intention to require of applicants for fire-arms permits the same proof of proficiency required of applicants for driving permits?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No specific test of proficiency is laid down in Bill C-150 but the persons authorized to issue firearms permits are entitled to consider the question of proficiency in deciding whether to issue a permit.

ROADS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,430—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. How many miles of public road are there in each of Canada's National Parks?

2. How many miles of public road have been built in each of the National Parks in each year since 1960?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Banff, 177.0; Cape Breton Highlands, 53.0; Elk Island, 17.1; Fundy, 44.0; Georgian Bay Islands, Nil; Glacier and Mount Revelstoke, 58.0; Jasper, 231.0; Kejimkujik, 10; Kootenay, 66.5; Point Pelee, 14.9; Prince Edward Island, 20.0; Prince Albert, 158.5; Riding Mountain, 93.6; St. Lawrence Islands, Nil; Terra Nova, 48.0; Waterton, 42.7; Yoho, 52.0; Wood Buffalo, 266.0.

	1960–61	1961–62	1962–63	1963–64	1964–65	1965–66	1966–67	1967–68	1968–69
2.									
Banff	—	—	—	—	—	—	.4	2.9	5.0
C.B.H.	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Elk Island	—	—	—	—	—	5.5	1.8	—	—
Fundy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgian Bay Is.	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Glacier & Mt. Rev.	—	—	36.2	.1	—	5.4	14.5	—	—
Jasper	14	25.1	22.7	9.7	14.5	15.9	27.8	2.8	—
Kejimkujik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	5
Kootenay	—	—	7.7	1.0	—	—	—	1.5	—
Point Pelee	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Prince Albert	—	—	—	12.66	—	—	—	—	.4
P.E.I.	1	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Riding Mountain	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
St. Lawrence Is.	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Terra Nova	Nil	1.6	4.1	2.4	3.0	1.1	Nil	Nil	0.2
Waterton	—	—	8.0	—	6.2	—	—	—	—
Yoho	—	—	—	1.2	—	—	—	—	—
Wood Buffalo	—	35.0	—	—	—	—	71.0	—	—

N.B.—Public roads are defined as roads which are used by the public and do not include fire roads, etc.

TIMBER BERTHS IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,431—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. How many timber berths are at present held in National Parks?

2. How many mining claims exist at present in the National Parks?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Twelve timber berths.

2. Two mining claims exist.

READJUSTMENT OF CRIMINAL CODE FINANCIAL PENALTIES

Question No. 2,447—**Mr. Fortin:**

With regard to the financial penalties provided for in the Criminal Code, does the government intend to adjust these penalties to reflect the capacity of those concerned to pay, in order that the poor may not be penalized more severely than the rich and, if not, for what reason?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Sections 622 and 694 of the Criminal Code make special provision for allowing time for payment of a fine if the court is satisfied that a convicted person is not possessed of sufficient means to enable him to pay forthwith.

COMPENSATION TO VICTIMS OF CRIMINAL ACTS

Question No. 2,448—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the government studying, will it study or has it studied the problem of compensating the victims of criminal acts?

2. Will a report on such a study be laid before the House and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, on what date?

3. Will the government introduce a bill to provide for compensation for the victims of criminal acts?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1, 2 and 3. On May 15 and again on May 21, I stated, as recorded in *Hansard,* that I shall defer this matter to the commissioners of legislation uniformity and to the representatives of the provinces' Attorneys General.

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,488—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1, 2 and 3. The Public Relations and Information Services Branch of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has a total staff of 42, which include 15 people working at public information on a full time basis. The remaining staff is concerned exclusively with the editing and production of scores of scientific and semi-technical reports intended for scientific and specialized audiences.

The information requested is not immediately available from departmental records, as it is not recorded separately. To obtain such information would require an extensive search of departmental files, in various branch distribution centres and many man hours of clerical work. It would also require the hiring of additional casual staff.

COST OF AIR CANADA MACHINISTS STRIKE

Question No. 2,497—**Mr. Robinson:**

1 What was the total cost to Canada of the recent Air Canada strike of machinists?

2. Has the government any knowledge of the total cost to the Union of the recent Air Canada strike and, if so, what was such total?

3. How many Air Canada employees were unemployed as a result of the recent Air Canada strike and how many of them were strikers?

4. What was the total loss in wages and other benefits to Air Canada employees other than strikers, as a result of the recent Air Canada strike?

5. Has the government any knowledge of the amount of strike pay a striker received per week from (a) Canadian Union or Union Headquarters (b) International Union or International Union Headquarters (c) income from any other source and, if so, what amount or amounts?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Air Canada and the Department of Labour as follows: 1. Air Canada has no information available on this.

2. It is assumed this question refers to the International Association of Machinists, and could only be procured from them directly.

3. 6,300 strikers were removed from the payroll and 5,000 other employees were placed on off-duty status without pay. In addition approximately 1,300 employees had their work week reduced in varying degrees; i.e. were put on part-time duty.

4. $3,750,000.

5. (a) The government has no confirmed knowledge on amounts of strike pay received by strikers. Indications are, however, that all strikers, who were IAM members for six months or more, were eligible for strike pay of $25 per week after a two-week waiting period. The strike pay is reputed to be paid out of an international strike fund to which all U.S. and Canadian IAM members contribute $0.50 per month; (b) As in item (a) above; (c) The government has no knowledge of income strikers received from sources other than the strike fund.

ACTION TO WIND UP POWER AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES

Question No. 2,508—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has any action been taken upon the recommendations contained in paragraph 288 of the Auditor General's Report for 1968 that the Dawson City Water and Power Co. Ltd., the Davison Electric Light and Power Co. Ltd. and the Yukon Telephone Syndicate Ltd. be wound up and, if not, for what reason?

2. Does the government intend to alter the membership of the Northern Canada Power Commission, of which the above companies are subsidiaries?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Action was commenced in the fiscal year 1968-69, through the Department of Justice, to wind up the Dawson City Water and Power Company Limited, the Dawson Electric Light and Power Company Limited, and the Yukon Telephone Syndicate Ltd. It is expected this action will be completed in the current fiscal year.

2. No.

Questions

PUBLICATION OF REVISED STATUTES

Question No. 2,510—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. How much progress has been made in the revision of the Statutes of Canada and when will the Revised Statutes be published?

2. Will the expression "Crown" be replaced by the words "Government" and/or "State" in the Statutes and, if not, for what reason?

3 In the French version, will the expression "statuts revisés" be replaced by the expression "lois revisées" and, if not, for what reason?

4. Are the French and English versions written independently or is one version a translation of the other?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. Manuscript for the revision is going to printers for composition; new legislative matter from this session is being incorporated into the manuscript when received from parliament. The printing schedule still calls for completion of copy by October 31st, 1969. Publication would follow acceptance of revisors' report by Governor in Council and the fixing of an appropriate promulgation date.

2. No. There is neither statutory nor constitutional authority for a change of this kind.

3. No. The Commission is not authorized to do so under the Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1964-65, c. 48.

4. Neither version is "written". Each version is reviewed and revised independently and adjusted to each other as far as possible under the authority provided by 1964-65, c. 48. In this sense, there is no "translation" of versions.

"WILDERNESS WHO'S WHO"

Question No. 2,528—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many times has the Canadian Wildlife Service advertisement "Wilderness Who's Who" appeared on any CBC TV station in Canada (a) in the fiscal year 1968-69 (b) from April 1, 1969 to date, and (c) the number of times for each station, each year (d) how many times has the same or similar type advertisement been broadcast on any private TV stations?

2. What is the number of requests for Wildlife pamphlets for each animal described, received and sent (a) in the fiscal year 1968-69 (b) from April 1, 1969 to date?

3. What was the number of employees in the Canadian Wildlife Information Branch for the fiscal years (a) 1966-67 (b) 1967-68 (c) 1968-69 (d) 1969 to date?

4. What was the cost of printing, mailing and distribution of Canadian Wildlife Service pamphlets on animals covered by these advertisements for each of the last four years and to date this year?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. As mentioned in the answer to Question No. 545, tabled November 6, 1968, the one-minute TV clips produced by the Canadian Wildlife Service are telecast as a public service without charge by C.B.C. and C.T.V. stations across Canada. Accordingly the stations are under no obligation to report their use of the films, therefore, no complete data of the number of uses are available.

2. During the fiscal year 1968-69 the branch serviced 46,743 requests for information about wildlife. From April 1 until this date the total has been about 10,000. Records of individual species requested are not kept.

3. Two permanent employees handled the wildlife information program from 1966-67 to 1968-69; for 1969-70—3 employees. The duties involved in handling the wildlife information program constitute approximately 5 per cent of the employees' time.

4. 1965-66, $4,812.00; 1966-67, $534.60; 1967-68, $6,267.00; 1968-69, $2,566.00.

GOLF IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,529—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

What were the golf fees in 1967 and 1968 and what are they during the current year for (a) single rounds of play (b) season tickets for man and wife in the National Parks in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The fees shown below apply to all National Parks in Canada:

	1967	1968	1969
Single round, 9 holes	$ 1.50	$ 1.50	$ 2.00
Single round, 18 holes	$ 2.50	$ 2.50	Discontinued*
Season, man and wife, 9 holes	$ 90.00	$ 90.00	$105.00
Season, man and wife, 18 holes	$ 96.00	$ 96.00	$115.00

* A daily fee of $4 is now being charged.

GRANTS TO IMPERIAL OIL, ALBERTA

Question No. 2,559—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

What is the location, and what are the facilities constructed by Imperial Oil Ltd., in Alberta, as referred to in Question 2,437, which qualified for two grants of $5 million, under the Area Development Agency?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The two facilities are located near Redwater, Alberta and provide for the manufacture, by different processes, of phosphatic fertilizer and nitrogenous fertilizer.

*PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AND CROWN CORPORATION PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,567—**Mr. Trudel:**

1. How many people were employed by the Public Service Commission and Crown corporations in Canada in 1968?

2. How many employees of the Public Service Commission were employed in Quebec during the same year and what was their total salary?

3. How many employees of Crown corporations were employed in Quebec during the same year and what was their total salary?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following information is supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics: 1. As at Sept. 30, 1968 the total number of persons employed was as follows: Departments and departmental corporations, 234,394; Crown corporations, 144,871; Total, 379,265.

2. Total number employed in Quebec by departments and departmental corporations as at Sept. 30, 1968, 38,976; Total salary for the period Jan. 1 to Sept. 30, 1968, $161,907,000.

3. Total number employed in Quebec by Crown corporations as at Sept. 30, 1968 was 35,132; Total salary for the period Jan. 1 to Sept. 30, 1968 was $186,481,000.

[*English*]

*UKRAINIAN CANADIAN COMMITTEE BRIEF ON LANGUAGES BILL

Question No. 2,573—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Did the Ukrainian Canadian Committee present a brief to the Prime Minister on the subject of the languages Bill on the 14th of December, 1968?

2. What reply, if any, was given by him to the Committee in regard to the representations made in the said brief?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of this starred question is, yes. The answer to the second part is: The committee was thanked for the concern which it had shown in matters of constitutional reform and was promised that its thoughtful brief would be studied with care by the government.

GRANTS TO CANADA EXECUTIVE SERVICES OVERSEAS

Question No. 2,581—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Does Canada Executive Services Overseas receive any grants or assistance from the federal government?

2. If so, what has been the total amount advanced to date?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes.

2. As of July 2, 1969, grants to Canadian Executive Service Overseas (CESO) have amounted to:

$123,310.62—1967-68—(paid in 1968-69)

$175,000.00—1968-69

$175,000.00—1969-70

$473,310.62

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS TO "TAMARACK REVIEW"

Question No. 2,595—**Mr. Hales:**

1. What was the total amount of the Canada Council grants paid to the publication entitled *Tamarack Review* in each of the last 10 years?

2. What was the date and amount of the last grant?

3. Is the *Tamarack Review* still published and, if not, on what date did it cease publication?

4. Will the Canada Council make any effort to reclaim all or part of its last grant?

5. Was Mr. Naim Kattan a member of the *Tamarack Review* Editorial Board and a staff member of the Canada Council when these grants were made?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,526—Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

2. As above.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. No.

Questions

YEARLY INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING INDEX

Question No. 2,608—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the increase per year in the cost of living index since its inception?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: The yearly percentage change in the Consumer Price Index since 1913, is shown in the attached table. An explanation of the linking of the indexes to produce a continuous series is given below.

The All-Items Consumer Price Index for Canada
(1949=100)

The primary purpose of a consumer price index is the measurement of current price movements. Therefore, the items and their weights in the index should reflect the full range and relative importance of commodities and services bought by the population group to which the index relates. As the spending habits of the population change over time, the index based on a particular pattern of expenditure becomes a less and less reliable measure of price movement. For this reason major revisions of the index "basket" are made periodically. Such revisions break the continuity of the index and the separate indexes must be linked to provide an historical index.

The All-Items Consumer Price Index, from 1913 to date expressed in terms of 1949=100, incorporates five distinct series each covering part of the entire period. In each index the items and their weights are appropriate to the period covered by the specific index; i.e. each index relates to a particular "basket" of commodities and services.

The five indexes "linked" to produce one continuous series from 1913 to date are designated in the following table in terms of the period for which each constitutes the measure of price movement. The successive weight base periods are also indicated. The beginning and ending months of each index are specific link dates.

Index	Base Weight Period
1913, January 1914—January 1926	1913
January 1926—January 1935	1926
January 1935—January 1949	1937-38
January 1949—January 1961	1947-48
January 1961 forward	

[Mr. Pelletier.]

CANADA CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Percentage Change Since the Preceding Year[1]

1914	+ 0.6	1943	+ 1.8
1915	+ 1.8	1944	+ 0.5
1916	+ 8.3	1945	+ 0.5
1917	+ 18.4	1946	+ 3.3
1918	+ 13.1	1947	+ 9.4
1919	+ 9.9	1948	+ 14.4
1920	+ 15.8	1949	+ 3.1
1921	— 12.0	1950	+ 2.9
1922	— 8.5	1951	+ 10.5
1923	+ 0.3	1952	+ 2.5
1924	— 1.7	1953	— 0.9
1925	+ 0.9	1954	+ 0.6
1926	+ 1.1	1955	+ 0.2
1927	— 1.7	1956	+ 1.5
1928	+ 0.4	1957	+ 3.2
1929	+ 1.2	1958	+ 2.6
1930	— 0.7	1959	+ 1.1
1931	— 9.8	1960	+ 1.2
1932	— 9.1	1961	+ 0.9
1933	— 4.7	1962	+ 1.2
1934	+ 1.4	1963	+ 1.8
1935	+ 0.7	1964	+ 1.8
1936	+ 2.0	1965	+ 2.4
1937	+ 3.1	1966	+ 3.7
1938	+ 1.1	1967	+ 3.5
1939	— 0.8	1968	+ 4.2
1940	+ 4.0	[2]Average	
1941	+ 5.9	Change	+ 2.2
1942	+ 4.7		

[1] Data derived from Consumer Price Index for Canada (1949 = 100). See explanation for details.

[2] Simple average of the fifty-five annual percentage changes listed.

[*Translation*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

AGRICULTURE

ALLEGED SERIOUS SITUATION FACING MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a speciific and important matter requiring urgent consideration.

[*English*]

Because of the urgency and importance of this matter and this motion, may I be permitted to explain in the second official language.

I wish, under the provisions of Standing Order 26, to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the serious situation facing the milk producers of Canada as indicated in the release of the B.F.S. of July 17, 1969. There is an urgent need for this matter to be discussed in parliament, so that hon. members can make known the needs of their constituents and so that the government may make a statement of policy without delay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I think that under standing order 26 of the House of Commons, this motion to adjourn the business of the house is extremely important because the house could give its full attention to a more than alarming situation since there is every indication that a very serious agricultural crisis is impending.

The situation has fallen upon us very suddenly. It is new in that it could not be foreseen. In fact, specialists had at best underestimated it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that under the rules, he can only indicate the subject of his motion. He cannot make any points to prove the urgency of the debate, the decision being left to the Speaker. The hon. member should conclude his statement as soon as possible.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your helpful remarks and your kindness.

The famous report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics dated July 7 states that in 1968 the farmers' net income accruing from the agricultural industry was 8.7 per cent lower than for the worst year since 1961.

Now, this same document states that this is due to higher operating and amortizing costs.

As such a situation could not be foreseen and will certainly not come up for debate, judging from the orders of the day, I ask, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse, for the consent of the house to study this matter, to put forward the views of our electors and to find out the government's policy on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has given notice to the Chair of the question he intended to ask pursuant to Standing Order 26. Even by bending over backward and even if his argument was put to the house in what he terms the second official language of this country, I am not fully satisfied that his motion is in order and can now be considered by the house.

I feel that the subject that the hon. member wants to discuss refers to a lasting situation and not to one of sudden urgency. May I be allowed to refer the hon. member to Citation 100 (8) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, and I quote:

> —what I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs. But I do not think it was contemplated—if the House will allow me to state my views—that a question of very wide scope, which would demand legislation to deal with it in any effective manner, should be the subject of discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the House.

To my mind, the relevant part of that quotation is that the motion is acceptable only if it concerns a matter that has unexpectedly become urgent, to a certain extent, and not if it concerns a situation that has prevailed for some time.

If I understood correctly the hon. member's comments, the question is no doubt both important and urgent, but it has prevailed for some time. To that extent, I do not believe that it would be in order to adjourn the business of the house to allow the hon. member to make known his views on the matter.

Mr. Fortin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I willingly accept your comments but, in all kindness, if you would allow me to show that there is a new set of circumstances—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In all kindness, I might allow you to do this, but the rules do not allow it.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 146, 211, 218 and 229 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

TRANSFER OF MINISTERIAL DUTIES

Motion No. 146—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and organizations of Native Indian people regarding the transfer of duties of the Minister without Portfolio (Port Arthur)—from Indian Affairs to Housing responsibilities.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

GRANTS FOR STUDENT PILOT TRAINING

Motion No. 211—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all agreements or arrangements between the Government of Canada and the Royal Canadian Flying Club Association, flying instructors and private flying clubs and schools regarding the payment of grants towards the training of student pilots.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO INTERCITY JETPORT

Motion No. 218—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all reports or studies undertaken by the Department of Transport regarding an intercity jetport for Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF COMPUTER SCIENCES BY C.N. TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Motion No. 229—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Order in Council allowing Canadian National Telecommunications to purchase an interest in Computer Sciences Canada Limited.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 109, 140 and 158?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Motion No. 109—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, etc., between the Government of Canada and Canadian life insurance companies regarding the Budget proposals on taxation of life insurance companies.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): This motion is acceptable to the government with the customary proviso that any such correspondence containing information which if disclosed would prejudice the competitive position of an individual life insurance company would be excluded.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 109 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF O.E.C.D.

Motion No. 158—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Preliminary Report of the OECD submitted to the government after its assessment of Canada's Science Policy in 1968.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the report, the tabling of which is being sought, was received in draft form and is to be revised and published in the fall of this year. The Organization of European Co-operation and Development has asked that this document not be released pending publication of the final report. In view of this the hon. member might wish to withdraw the notice of motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I am in a congenial mood today, and so I agree.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, more than two months ago the house agreed to a motion calling for the tabling of the research documents prepared for the Woods committee. I have not yet received them and I wonder when we will get some action on this?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I recall the discussions which took place at the time and I will make an inquiry right away.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, two months isn't too bad. It is about six or seven months ago that some notices of motions in my name were adopted asking for the production of correspondence between the government and various provinces relating to the education of native Indian children, and an order made then has not yet totally been fulfilled.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I shall make inquiries about that as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

UNITED NATIONS

MIDDLE EAST—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN PROMOTION OF PEACE—ARMS SHIPMENTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations that warfare has been resumed throughout the Suez Canal ceasefire zone, I wish to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he can assure the house that Canada is responding to the Secretary General's plea that all members of the United Nations exert all possible influence in promoting peace in that area?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can associate myself fully with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. We fully support the Secretary General's appeal to the parties to put an immediate end to all military actions, and to observe the ceasefire.

Mr. Stanfield: As a supplementary question, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicate to the house what he is doing, in addition to agreeing with the Secretary General of the United Nations, and in particular will he say whether Canada has called upon the countries that are the chief suppliers of arms to the belligerents to impose an embargo on arms shipments to that area?

Mr. Sharp: As the hon. gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, Canada is not supplying arms to either side. We have expressed ourselves as opposed to this. I do not think we can exercise any more influence than by publicly supporting these pleas that are being made by the Secretary General and by others for a cessation of the arms shipments.

Mr. Stanfield: I gather from what the Secretary of State for External Affairs says that in fact the government of Canada is doing nothing, except endorsing the position taken by the Secretary General of the United Nations. Perhaps he would say what position the government of Canada is taking with regard to the possibility of a Middle East settlement being imposed by the great powers. Can he indicate to the house what positive movements, what activities the government of Canada is engaged in, with regard to helping out in this area?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have been working as effectively as we can with the governments of the area concerned to get them to support the efforts being made by the Security Council through the aegis of Ambassador Jarring to reach a peaceful settlement of this dispute. When we were on the Security Council we helped in drafting that resolution, and since then we have been supporting it very strongly.

Mr. Stanfield: Is the Secretary of State for External Affairs considering visiting the area himself, to see what he can do directly?

Mr. Sharp: I thank the hon. gentleman for his confidence in me, which I accept with gratitude. I trust he will continue to have supreme confidence in my ability to handle these matters. It had been my intention at some time to visit that area, and I hope it can be done soon.

FINANCE

DISCUSSION OF INTEREST RATES WITH CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct this question to the Minister of Finance. Since the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, David Kennedy, had a meeting with the 24 leading bankers of the United States at which he asked them to hold the line on interest rates and use selective lending rather than raise interest rates any higher, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether in the meetings he held recently with the bankers of this country he made similar representations, and whether or not he received any assurances to the effect that an attempt would be made to hold the line on bank interest rates.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the question of interest rates is presently undergoing a public inquiry before a committee of this house. I should say to my hon. friend that I did urge the banks, when their credit was tight, to lend money in areas of lesser development in the country, and also to small businesses.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the minister secured any assurances from the representatives of the chartered banks of Canada that an attempt would be made to hold the line on bank interest rates?

Mr. Benson: I think the matter of interest rates and how they are formulated and determined was pretty fully explained just a day

or two ago by the governor of the Bank of Canada before a committee of this house. The banks themselves, as my hon. friend knows, do not determine over-all interest rates in Canada, as was ably expressed by the governor of the Bank of Canada. For me to forecast what interest rates will be in the future is rather impossible because so much depends on what happens in the United States and in Canada, and on whether we succeed in our battle against inflation in this country.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am not asking the minister to forecast anything and I am not asking for a dissertation on bank rates. I am asking the minister whether he made representations to the chartered banks of Canada and whether he has received any assurance from them that they will attempt to follow the same course the bankers in the United States agreed to follow, namely to hold the line and to use selective lending rather than to raise interest rates.

Mr. Benson: No one in this country would like less to see interest rates increase than I would. The government of Canada is the major borrower in the country and would not want to see interest rates go any higher.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Finance has chosen to hide behind the fact that a public inquiry is going on by a committee of the house, will the minister undertake to carry out the recommendations of the committee of the house when it reports?

Mr. Benson: I will await with interest the recommendations of the committee of the house. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition I am not trying to hide behind a committee of the house. I simply suggested to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, as I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, that he read the very able evidence given by the governor of the Bank of Canada before that committee.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the minister that not only did I read the evidence of the governor of the Bank of Canada but also the evidence of the minister, and I am still rather confused.

Mr. Benson: On a question of privilege, I should like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that I have not appeared to date before the committee.

[Mr. Benson.]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance with regard to the committee that is studying interest rates. Can he give the house any guarantee that the recommendations of that committee will not be written by the house leader?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

ALLEGED INCONSISTENCY IN APPLICATION OF PENALTY

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice.

Would he tell the house for what considerations Mr. Justice J. A. Archambault's decision has been reversed in the Borg case, when it was a matter of implementing the law enacted by parliament on capital punishment to the effect that any person found guilty of the murder of a police officer or a prison guard must be put to death? Why does the law say one thing and the people responsible for the administration of justice do the contrary?

Mr. Speaker, a death sentence has just been commuted—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me the hon. member's question is put to the house in the form of an argument and is therefore out of order.

Mr. Latulippe: It is not an argument, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of justice, a social matter, and justice must follow its course. Justice rather than injustice must prevail. As for me, Mr. Speaker, that represents—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that when the Chair suggests that a question is not in order, he can of course rephrase it differently or, if he so wishes, he can give the Chair notice for its consideration at the time of adjournment. It is always possible to do that. I am sure the hon. member would have the chance at that time to consider the problem.

I am not suggesting to the hon. member that his question is not important or urgent, but I am telling him that in my humble opinion, it is raised under the form of an argument and as such, is out of order.

Mr. Latulippe: At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

MEDICARE—DISCONTINUANCE OF EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION IN PROVINCES IMPLEMENTING PLAN—APPLICATION TO ARMED FORCES AND R.C.M.P.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I asked the President of the Treasury Board a question which appears at page 10753 of *Hansard* concerning the discontinuance of employer contribution by the government of Canada in provinces implementing the medicare plan. I wonder whether the minister is in a position to reply to that question today.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in provinces which are implementing federal medicare programs the basic Government Services Medical Insurance plan is being discontinued since, in large measure, the benefits under this plan are provided by the medicare program in the province. Accordingly, neither employer nor employee contributions are now required for this basic G.S.M.I. plan in such provinces. Of course the hon. member is aware that the government contributes a substantial portion of the cost of the medicare program.

A supplementary G.S.M.I.P. is being introduced in these provinces coincident with the changeover to medicare to provide those benefits which were provided under the government plan but which are not provided by the medicare program and thus at least maintain the level of benefits which had existed previously. The cost of the supplementary G.S.M.I. plan is being shared by the government and the employees on a 50-50 basis.

I may say to the hon. member that in his own province where we sought the agreement of the minister of health of that province to making available a reduced contribution rate under the provincial medicare plan for members of the armed forces that was not agreed as it has been in the other provinces.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence because I believe there are variations in respect of the services. Is the Minister of National Defence prepared to outline just what is happening with regard to the federal government's contribution for basic medical care programs for servicemen serving in a province?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think the President of the Treasury Board has indicated that in all provinces which have implemented medicare, except Alberta, the provincial government has reduced premiums for the armed forces personnel in recognition of the fact that they already receive medical services from the armed forces themselves.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but in respect of this problem federal employees of the armed forces and the R.C.M.P. are in a turmoil.

Mr. Speaker: I am wondering whether the hon. member thinks the question should be asked about all the services.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is the last. The question is whether the R.C.M.P. are dealt with in the same way and whether the policy of the government is the same with regard to them.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the question as notice and bring forward a reply.

CONSUMER CREDIT

CO-OPERATION WITH PROVINCES TO EFFECT CONTROL OF INFLATION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the statement yesterday by the governor of the Bank of Canada that consumer credit restrictions would probably have been imposed during the past two years if federal authorities had possessed the power to impose them, does the government intend to approach the provinces with a view to obtaining these powers in order to obtain an effective means of controlling inflation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Not at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Is it the intention of the government to completely disregard this effective means of controlling inflation and do nothing about it?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Well, what in the world do you intend to do to control inflation? Let the house know what you intend to do, for heavens sake.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE—TRANSFER OF MATERIALS ACROSS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, on June 23 and again last Thursday on July 3, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs to inform the house as to how materials used for research at Shirleys Bay and Suffield, Alberta, in connection with biological and chemical warfare get to either or both of these laboratory grounds from one point in Canada to another, or from the United States to points in Canada. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said the Minister of National Defence would answer the question. May we now have an answer?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): I think I should preface my answer by saying that all activities of the Department of National Defence pertaining to these materials are only of a defensive nature. As far as the particular question is concerned, I am informed that the Defence Research Board does not ship toxic materials by commercial aircraft, and has never at any time shipped disease producing organisms by commercial carriers of any kind. Canadian Forces motor vehicles and cargo aircraft have been used to transport small quantities of toxic materials to Suffield for testing purposes.

Small laboratory samples of chemical materials have been shipped by rail in accordance with Board of Transport regulations. These shipments are in the same category as those made by a hospital or laboratory to another such institution. The samples have been about the equivalent of a tablespoonful, carried in specially designed containers, and the shipments occur very infrequently—on the basis of about one or two a year.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has not stated whether these shipments come from the United States to these points in Canada. May I have an answer as to where they originate?

Mr. Cadieux: Mr. Speaker, I have one example I can give my hon. friend, involving the last shipment of these organisms. They came from the United States in 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the information given by the minister in reply to the supplementary question asked by the hon. member is the type of information that should normally appear on the order paper.

[Mr. Hees.]

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the governor of the Bank of Canada, who appeared yesterday before the committee on finance, trade and economic affairs, stated that the steps to be taken to check inflation will cause the number of unemployed to increase, would the Prime Minister tell us whether he shares that opinion, and also how many jobless he needs to govern the country properly?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member might put this question on the order paper.

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF WATER ACT—POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of resources. Several weeks ago, in answering a question concerning a water act, the minister advised the house that it would probably not be reached until mid-July. At that time it was believed the house would not be sitting in July. Will the minister now be presenting the proposed water act during the current session of parliament, so that we may know what he proposes concerning water pollution.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I believe that my words to which the hon. member refers indicated I would present the water act in July, and that is still my expectation.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

RESIGNATION OF MR. DOUGLAS FULLERTON, CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to advise the house whether Mr. Douglas Fullerton, chairman of the Cape Breton Development Corporation has resigned and, if so, will he provide the house with the reason for his resignation?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that he has sent a letter to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, since the minister is in charge of the department responsible for the Cape Breton Development Corporation, can he tell the house whether this resignation is going to be accepted, whether it was given voluntarily to the government and whether a reason was asked for by the minister?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the office of the Prime Minister that the resignation was accepted.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): While I am on my feet may I ask in relation to this particular development corporation whether the minister is in a position to reply to the question I posed to him on Thursday?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): This matter was discussed by the standing committee of this house, particularly on April 22 and there has been nothing new since.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, was this resignation voluntary or was it asked for by the government?

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in light of unusual developments and things that have taken place, will the minister present to parliament its long term plans so members of this house will not be accused of discriminating against the miners of Cape Breton and these miners will have a choice to decide for themselves to come within these plans?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, there is no discrimination at all in respect of these plans.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he does not consider it discrimination in respect of a man who, after 49 years service, is arbitrarily dismissed?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): These are isolated cases.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the minister reply to my last question?

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question regarding traffic safety—

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond is rising on a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member for Surrey would defer his question.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my point of order arises from the fact that I asked the minister a question to which he gave an answer, but for some reason the answer did not come across. Would he repeat it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure the question should have been allowed or that the minister should have been allowed to reply. He did reply, but in my opinion the simple answer would be for the hon. member to put his answer on the order paper. The supplementary question was allowed and perhaps the minister now may wish to reply.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what in the hon. member's question is really a question and what is a statement. However, if I am asked whether we are ready to disclose information about the early retirement plan and whether it is a public plan, I will answer that one can easily get such information and I do not object at all to its being given to hon. members in the house.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, in the future will the minister listen to the question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will now listen to the hon. member for Surrey.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

AUTOMOBILES—INSTALLATION OF INFLATABLE AUTOMATIC DEVICES

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with traffic safety and I should like to direct it to the Minister of Transport. Will he consider taking similar action to that taken last week by his counterpart in the United States, who at that time told car manufacturers that they are going to be required to instal on their new automobiles an automatic inflatable device which, at the instant of a car crash, expands and cushions the shock to the occupants of the car? Will the minister consider taking this or similar action?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation to the minister in respect of an assumption he may take into account.

PEST CONTROL

USE OF D.D.T. IN FOOD CROPS

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): My question is directed to the Minister of

National Health and Welfare. Is it the intention of the Food and Drug Directorate to issue new standards reducing the amount of d.d.t. allowed in the cultivation of crops used for food? If so, when will these new standards be issued?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The matter is under review by the Food and Drug Directorate. No decision has been made as yet.

Mr. Harding: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the constantly increasing mass of evidence that d.d.t. and other toxic pesticides are reaching unsafe proportions in many areas of Canada, will the minister, in conjunction with other government departments, initiate a full study of the effects on our environment of d.d.t. and other toxic pesticides, and in particular on the source of our food supply?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked by the hon. member comes close to being an argument. However, perhaps the minister might want to reply.

Mr. Munro: The most recent surveys we have had from the department indicate that they are not at levels such as to constitute a danger in the terms described by the hon. member.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ALLEGED IMPROPRIETY IN SUPPRESSION OF ADJUDICATION REPORTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council whether he is now in a position to explain why the reports of Mr. Martin relating to the Post Office were released only last Friday, seven to nine weeks after the decisions were made. I direct this question to the President of the Privy Council because the Postmaster General indicated last week that it was the responsibility of the President of the Privy Council.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): This is not my responsibility, Mr. Speaker. I believe that one of my colleagues is ready to answer the question.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): The three reports, which are inter-related, of the chief adjudicator of the Public Service Staff Relations Board, and which pertain to the grievances of the Council of Postal Unions were received by the Public Service Staff Relations Board on June 16, 1969. These reports were distributed on July 4, 1969. The thirteen working days between the date of receipt of the reports and the date of distribution were spent in printing, proof reading, final printing and distribution. That period of time is normal and there was no evidence of delay in these procedures.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The time may be normal, but if so it requires further explanation.

However, I should like to ask the Minister of Supply and Services whether he has any explanation to give of the fact that Mr. Martin's decisions were dated in one case April 30 and in the other case May 15. Are the mail services in this country that slow?

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

FIR PLYWOOD—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CANADIAN AND U.S. PRICES

Mr. J. G. Lind (Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if the minister can assure the Canadian people that he will investigate the difference in the cost of U.S. fir plywood, which is approximately $40 per thousand cheaper than Canadian fir plywood, and would he also investigate the possibility that the B.C. Plywood Association is not maintaining prices for the manufacturers, thus milking the Canadian public?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to look into this matter, although I understand that Canadian, and particularly B.C. plywood, is far superior to U.S. plywood.

Mr. Lind: I realize that some grades of U.S. fir plywood are inferior to our Canadian plywood, but their waterproof plywood, I should like to point out to the minister, is of far better quality.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE

RESIGNATION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR—SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is directed to the Secretary of State. Has Miss Mary Jolliffe resigned as public relations director of the Performing Arts Centre because of the provision of inadequate

funds from his department, and if so, what action does the government contemplate to deal with this problem?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet been able to confirm the news published in some newspapers this morning. I myself learned about it through the newspapers and the radio, but I have asked the authorities of the National Arts Centre for a report on the incident, and I will gladly communicate to the house any information I receive.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Secretary of State been advised of the intention of the Performing Arts Centre to request a supplementary grant of $300,000 to cover its financial problems?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: I have received no official notice, Mr. Speaker. It was mentioned casually in a conversation with the director and the president of the Centre.

[*English*]

Mr. Dinsdale: I have a further supplementary question. Is it the opinion of the government that the present administrative structure of the Performing Arts Centre is adequate, or does the minister contemplate a reorganization?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking for a statement of opinion. We have reached the point at which, according to practice, I should remind hon. members that we are running short of time. I still see a large number of members who are anxious to ask questions and who have risen from the first moment. May I say that the time I took to make this announcement to the house will not be charged to the question period.

SPORTS

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO MEET PAN-AMERICAN GAMES DEFICIT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. On June 10 I asked him the following question:

> In view of the government's action in writing off the Expo deficit of $125 million, will it consider making similar arrangements in respect of the Pan-Am games, also a 1967 national event?

There was a supplementary question and then the minister said he would look into the matter. I wonder if he has anything further to report at this time.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Not at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

STUDY OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat earlier, but in his absence, the President of the Privy Council could perhaps answer my question.

Could the minister tell us whether the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which must normally be submitted to the house and which has been prepared following a trip in eastern Canada, could be considered by the house before the recess?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I doubt it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question arising from the one put by the hon. member for Bellechasse a moment ago to the President of the Privy Council.

In view of the fact that the President of the Privy Council stated that it is unlikely that the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, just back from its visit in eastern Canada, will be published to enlighten hon. members, would the President of the Privy Council tell us if he is willing to meet with the Minister of Agriculture in this respect and perhaps change his decision?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I will inquire on this matter and give an answer to the house.

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

SPRINGHILL, N.S.—TRANSFER OF INMATES TO OTHER MINIMUM SECURITY ACCOMMODATION

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): I have a question for the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Is he in a position to outline the program he intends to

carry out with regard to the Canadian penitentiary service in the maritime provinces which will result in the closure of the minimum security penal institution at Springhill, Nova Scotia?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that if the minister were to make such an announcement it would have to be made by way of a statement on motions.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder if the minister would make such a statement on motions at an early date.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I would be very glad to do so but I do not think it would require a great length of time. The Springhill minimum security institution was set up in 1959 to meet an emergency situation on a temporary basis. Since that time the new medium security penitentiary has been built at Springhill and two new minimum security institutions have been built in the maritimes and there is no longer any need for the minimum security institution at Springhill.

Mr. Coates: Is the minister in a position to give us an assurance that the 43 members of the staff of the minimum security penal institution will be integrated in the operations of the penitentiary service?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

SUGGESTION TO REFER ADJUDICATION REPORTS TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as government house leader. Has he given any consideration to my question of Monday requesting his initiative in taking steps to have the newly discovered reports of the chief adjudicator, Mr. Martin, referred to the standing committee before our summer or autumn adjournment, and before the conclusion of the employer-employee negotiations in the Post Office?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I have been giving certain other things consideration, but I thank the hon. member for his reminder and I will give this matter further consideration.

[Mr. Coates.]

FISHERIES

COHOE SALMON—BANNING OF OPERATION IN STRAIT OF GEORGIA

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry whether he intends to ban fishing for cohoe salmon in the Straits of Georgia to commercial fishermen during July and August?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): This matter is under active consideration because of the concurrent demand by the sports fishermen, but I am not prepared at this moment to say what decision will ultimately be made.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Is the minister considering applying any such closure to the sports fishermen or is it to be applied only to commercial fishermen?

Mr. Davis: Consideration will be given to both sides and to the claims of both parties.

DOGFISH—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN CANADIAN AND JAPANESE OFFICIALS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has the minister any report to make on his recent visit to British Columbia and especially on his proposal that the Japanese be permitted to harvest dogfish in British Columbia waters to protect our salmon from this predator?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): The visitors from Japan are men from the technical level. They were not prepared to discuss policy but we have some hope we can develop a trade with the Japanese in this surplus fish.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): In view of the interest taken in this matter by the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour, would the minister consider changing the name of this species from the bigmouthed dogfish to the Burnaby cod?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

SOCIAL SECURITY

DRUGS—SUPPLY WITHOUT CHARGE TO SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would he consider entering into negotiations with his opposite numbers in the various provinces with a view to

making arrangements to provide free drugs to senior citizens who are receiving old age supplements? I ask this question in view of the fact that all provinces are not able to participate in the arrangements under the Canada Assistance Act, which are not working out too well.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I do not believe that information to be correct. To the best of my knowledge all the provinces are participating in the Canada Assistance Plan under which provision is made to meet these payments on the basis of need. This includes medical charges and drugs.

WATER RESOURCES

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM HUDSON AND JAMES BAYS

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): My question is for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Is the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in co-operation with the Ontario department of energy and resources actively involved in the planning of a proposed massive water diversion program to take water from the Hudson and James Bays watershed in northwestern Ontario and divert it into Lake Superior?

An hon. Member: Ten years old.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure to what degree the hon. member's question is urgent. It might very well be discussed at the time of adjournment. If there is urgency, I will be pleased to see that his question is given priority at ten o'clock.

Mr. Penner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With due respect, there is a great deal of urgency attached to this question. I have just returned from this region.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Penner: A great many of the Indian population as well as the tourist camp operators have heard there may be such a plan for massive water diversion. They are fearful and uncertain—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may wish to reply—at ten o'clock.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

REQUEST FOR REASONS PROMPTING BORG REPRIEVE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of public disquiet in connection with the reprieve in the Borg case, I put this question very seriously: Does the right hon. gentleman not think it would help toward a public understanding of the reasoning behind reprieves if some kind of statement could be issued giving the background? For example, could we be told whether there was a recommendation from the jury, or whether psychological or psychiatric considerations were involved?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am prepared to raise the matter with the Solicitor General. I thank the hon. member for his question. I think the reasoning might be more apparent if the house were to remind itself that at the time the present law concerning capital punishment was passed there was a clear statement on behalf of the government by the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General then in office that this in no way interfered with the use of the royal prerogative by the cabinet.

It was pointed out that cases in which it might be used were cases where, for instance, the jury recommended clemency, as they did in the instance to which the hon. member has referred.

ELIGIBILITY OF BORG FOR PAROLE

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Have any instructions been given to the National Parole Board concerning Borg's eligibility for parole in approximately ten years time?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question might be placed on the order paper.

DRUGS

MARIJUANA—TRANSFER IN CONTROL METHOD

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can the minister indicate to the house whether he is giving favourable consideration to the resolution passed yesterday by the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation requesting the federal government to remove regulation of marijuana from the Narcotic Control Act and place it under the Food and Drugs Act?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be aware that there was recently an amendment to the law which provided that a first offence for possession of marijuana could be dealt with by summary proceeding rather than by indictment. As for extending this principle to deal with any offence of this nature in accordance with the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act, I imagine that this subject will be very pertinent to the study now being undertaken by those conducting the drug inquiry which has been instituted. This inquiry has been asked to let us have a report in approximately six months time.

Mrs. MacInnis: Is it the intention of the minister to introduce legislation this fall with regard to changing—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps that question might be asked when we resume the session.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

REQUEST FOR AGREEMENT TO PROCEED WITH DEBATE ON AMENDING MEASURE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand there have been discussions among those involved in the work of the Transport and Communications Committee with respect to government order 65, the bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act. There is some urgency in this matter. I understand that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is prepared to withdraw the amendment which appears in his name on the notice paper, and that there is general agreement that all stages of this bill would be completed at this sitting without debate or amendment. If my statement of that matter is correct, perhaps an order to that effect can be made, and we could call order No. 65 before returning to the debate on the procedure motion.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): That is correct as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. I operate on the premise that half a good loaf is better than no loaf at all.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to the proposition that has been advanced by the President of the Privy Council?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to agree. I think this is an example of what can be accomplished through agreement and consulation.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, in view of the kind of subject matter now before us I see no reason that there should be any agreement on anything.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous consent.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, would the President of the Privy Council give in some detail the business of the house for the balance of this month?

• (3:10 p.m.)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I hope we may be finished before the end of the month but I will consider making a statement not only in respect of this month but in respect of the following month as well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: What about September?

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): In view of the fact that the Committee on Procedure and Organization may be sitting again to consider those parts of standing order 43 to which Your Honour has referred, would the leader of the house give every assurance that he will not attempt to interfere with the ability of that committee to report honestly to the house, and not treat the chairman like a puppet?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, July 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, when we interrupted the business of the house last night at ten o'clock, I was saying that we, of the Ralliement créditiste, were not opposed to the adoption of orders

75A and 75B, but that under no consideration could we accept order 75c, which says among other things, and I quote:

A Minister of the Crown ... may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage;—

Mr. Speaker, when we read that, we can realize that it amounts to closure, and since such a rule already exists, the government should have the courage to apply it when they are not satisfied with the course of events. As for us, we will fight all summer long if necessary this measure which, in our view, would be nothing more than a permanent and automatic rule of closure.

All hon. members know that we have collaborated with the government, as for instance in the case of a motion moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), to change the hours of sitting to expedite the business of the house.

Yesterday, I also pointed out that Bill C-202 had been passed quickly, even if it was not perfect.

It seems to me that proves our co-operation, and now the government alone is responsible for the fact that the house sits on and on, because it will insist on having a rule of closure adopted when one already exists.

Besides, we all wonder what the government wants to hide in the next three years of administration. Every time an attempt has been made to muzzle the opposition, it was done to camouflage something fishy.

Let us assume, for one moment, that this parliament is living situations similar to those of 1963 and 1964, namely the furniture deal, that of the hon. Yvon Dupuis, whose friends deserted him, the escape of the prisoner who was to water a skating rink in the middle of May. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that similar situations should occur. We would then see the majority government apply Standing Order 75c, in order to prevent the Canadian people from finding out the truth.

We are also wondering whether the government intends to do away with the family allowances as it indicated some time ago. Does it intend to restrict credit or to let the interest rates increase? What new tax does it intend to levy? Finally, does the government intend to muzzle the provinces in deciding what it wants? We wonder about all these things and that is why we ask that Standing Order 75c be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, when I was young, my father who had an orchard, used to forbid us to place a rotten apple in a barrel. The role of the opposition, today, is to prevent the bad apples from spoiling the others. Our role wants that we should adopt the good laws and reject the others, that rot should not invade the whole barrel.

Last night, at the time of adjournment, at ten o'clock, I was quoting a statement by a very well known journalist, Mr. Claude Ryan, who wrote in *Le Devoir* on October 30 an article on "The true face of the new federalism".

In my opinion, such an attitude must be exposed because the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is doing the Prime Minister's bidding. In the past, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) fought articles such as this, but today, the President of the Privy Council, because of the orders he gets from the Prime Minister, is compelled to act.

I subscribe to this statement by Mr. Claude Ryan and I quote:

Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau had the extraordinary luck to be elected leader of his party, then brought back to power without having to reveal to the Canadian public the real nature of his political ideas.

He was able for months to say the most outrageous things in the euphoria created by the advent of the Messiah.

No criticism could seriously reach public opinion. Even beforehand, confidence was placed in the hands of the wonder child of Canadian politics: every reasonable discussion was, as it were, interrupted during the time of the epiphany of Mr. Trudeau.

Four months after the election of June 25, things began to get back to normal. Fancy must give way to fact. Now, what we have been given to see for some time bodes no good—

When such a statement is made, we come to the conclusion, because of the orders that are given to the President of the Privy Council, in co-operation with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), that the Prime Minister gives orders and that all the government members obey them.

Besides I have in hand another statement published in the June last issue of *L'Action nationale,* where one can read:

In resolving to oppose constantly that opinion, to deny it the right to be heard at the negotiating table, on the false pretence of having to ignore its existence in favour of a Canadian prejudice, Mr. Trudeau obviously tramples a whole sector of the French Canadian nation perhaps even the whole of it, gives insult to the dignity of those who believe in it and directly and immediately incites the extremes of such an opinion to violence which in any event rumbles in the heart of those who have not been spoiled by partisanship.

Besides it is in that manner that statesmen become oppressors, by justifying themselves of the violence

they provoke in order to establish the police state, and crush the opposition instead of allowing it to dialogue.

● (3:20 p.m.)

It is obvious that, by refusing to face facts and to make a real try at consultation, Mr. Trudeau is progressing from the violence of a refusal to co-operate to the violence found in a police state.

We agree with him that we are now under the threat of tyranny. We beg of him to give thought to the responsibilities that will be his if he persists in closing his mind to the real problems through plain arrogance and ideological intransigence.

Everything will come to a standstill in Canada. In the face of such statements, the only possible conclusion, with regard to what we have before us, is that it is precisely because of his arrogance that the Prime Minister wishes through permanent and automatic rule of closure, as I was saying a short while ago, to impose or prevent possible debates that could take place so that the Canadian people could at least be aware of what is going on in the Canadian parliament.

In support of my contention, I have here some quotations and, in particular an article entitled *La liberté des débats et de la discussion publique*, written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Members on the government side who have known Sir Wilfrid Laurier are no doubt in a position to state that he wanted liberty to prevail in this parliament. I shall read an article that was published in 1913. It is customary in this parliament to refer to facts already belonging to the past. Therefore, it should be normal that I read in full what Mr. Borden, prime minister at the time, had to say on the matter and what was the reply of the Liberal members sitting in the opposition.

We realize that Tories or Grits always feel the same way. When one party is in office, the other one feels that the government is too arrogant, and if the latter is in power, the other party feels that a dictatorship is being established.

But let us rather read the reported facts and I quote:

On April 9, the right hon. R. L. Borden, M.P., brought before the House of Commons some amendments to the standing orders, the purpose of which was to limit the freedom of the proceedings and of the public discussion through a procedure generally known under the names of "closure" and "guillotine".

If this is not similar to standing order 75c, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what it is.

And Mr. Borden went on:

The excessive strictness of his amendments were already blameworthy, but the methods by which it was attempted to force them on the opposition are far more arbitrary and hypocrit than anything bad that has ever been done in the parliament of Canada. The Prime Minister first protested his good faith and that of the government.

What the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said yesterday: If the opposition parties are reasonable, we shall never use rule 75c, was stated in 1913.

At that time, a Conservative prime minister told the Liberals: Be quiet, there are only two parties. There is no minority party, as has been said. We shall get along very well and when you leave, you will be appointed to other places, lucrative positions and there will be no problem. That happened in 1913.

Let us examine the statement made by Borden to strengthen his position. He declared, and I quote:

No one is more ready than I to acknowledge that freedom of speech and of debate must be preserved.

It is with those words that the prime minister began his speech on the amendments which he was moving for concurrence.

And to further eliminate any doubts he had raised, he added:

My hon. friends are very suspicious; I think they should be prepared to accept my word in the matter.

And Sir Wilfrid Laurier pointed out, on behalf of the opposition, that as a result of those amendments, a constant threat was hanging over them. Borden protested so candidly and with such frankness that one can hardly recognize the same man in the person who was talking that way and the one who, a few minutes later, was to become guilty of such a shameful treason.

He replied to Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the following words:

Not at all; that is not the way in which I would desire to exercise a power of this kind. I would think that if this rule passes, things might go on in future just as they have in the past.

That is the same statement as the one we heard yesterday. We are assured that everything will go well, that no problem will arise. Yet, as I said a while ago, except for the consideration of the omnibus bill, we have fully co-operated. During the debate on the omnibus bill, it was a matter of principle. We had the duty, as Christians, to oppose it, but except for that bill, many other pieces of legislation have been introduced.

We have agreed to longer working hours, as proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), and not satisfied

with that, he comes back at us with a closure rule to which we cannot agree and as I said earlier, we are ready to fight all summer if we have to, to prevent its passing.

I continue quoting Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said:

All through that speech the right hon. gentleman stated—

Speaking of Mr. Borden.

—and reiterated that the object of the Government in proposing this new resolution was not to impede in any way the freedom of debate or to prevent free discussion, but simply to avoid the abuse of it. My right hon. friend was profuse of declarations that the minority, when these rules have been adopted, can always rely upon fair play; but the words were scarcely out of his lips when we were brought to realize how much fair play we may expect at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. By the unwritten law of Parliament, not to speak of the courtesy which generally prevails between the two sides of the House, it is expected that when the Prime Minister brings an important measure to the consideration of the House, the Opposition, by its leader shall be allowed to present the views which are entertained on the other side.

These statements were made in 1913 and today a majority government would once again have us accept rules which are unacceptable. And I quote again from the statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

The task which he set himself to accomplish, and which the majority will accomplish, I have no doubt, was simply to put a gag upon the rules which we, in this House, have looked upon almost as sacred and which have come to us from the Mother of Parliaments.

These are the same words as those I heard yesterday from the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest). Sir Wilfrid Laurier went on saying:

These rules were not made in a day; they are the embodiment of the wisdom of many generations of statesmen and the result of the experience of men, whose whole life was devoted to the public welfare, and who brought British institutions to the degree of excellency which they had reached at the time Confederation was established.

We have heard it stated that these rules are antiquated. I do not admit that at all. These rules are not antiquated. They were not made for a day or for a period; they were made for the ages. It can be said of them, as has been said of the maxims of civil law which have come to us from the Roman jurists and which are the basis of the civil law of most of the nations of Europe, and they are reason crystallized into writing.

The maxims of the civil law have been applied to the relations of the people in daily life and the maxims of our parliamentary procedure have been accepted as the duties of the transaction of business in all deliberative assemblies.

Statements such as these were made in 1913, and today those who would always remind us with pleasure that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was one of them—he who made statements such as I have just quoted—would be ready to throw all those things overboard by introducing a rule of closure in Standing Order 75c. We certainly cannot accept Standing Order 75c, but we will accept Standing Order 75A and 75B. In fact, immediately after the withdrawal of 75c we would be prepared to extend the sitting hours.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to quote a few words, of the late Ernest Lapointe, who was also a member of the opposition and who said the following:

The duties of an opposition are to discuss the measures introduced in parliament during the various stages of the bills and certainly not to filibuster.

He said that it would be a crime against the state. I continue the quotation:

But, Mr. Speaker, when a measure is intended to eradicate parliament, to deprive it of all its rights, privileges and powers, it is the duty of the opposition to seek to prevent its adoption, and those who are guilty of a crime against the state are those responsible for the introduction of such legislation—

It is believed, Mr. Speaker, that we should stand at attention and salute when the Prime Minister wishes it. In fact, Parliament should be ready to do the goose-step at the Prime Minister's will.

Czarist methods have given birth to Bolshevism, and that is something we do not want in Canada. It is blameworthy to undermine in this way parliament's authority and to do so, the Prime Minister orders the President of the Privy Council and the Minister of Agriculture to muzzle the opposition.

Have no fear, hon. members of this house. If we must—as I said a while ago—spend the whole summer here, we will, because history is written thanks to defenders of liberty and not by hypocritical dictators, who represent the Liberal party.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Furthermore, here is what Mr. Ernest Lapointe had to say in this regard, and I quote:

I have followed the discussion very closely and listening to the supporters of this legislation, I could not help but think of Disraeli's words: "A Tory government is organized hypocrisy".

If that could be said in 1913, why should we on this side of the house not be able to say it today, since an attempt is being made

to impose rules of closure on us, as I said a while ago?

I go one with the quotation:

> The Secretary of State, to whom this undemocratic legislation was attributed, after having been recognized as the author of the rule of closure and other narrow Tory legislations, was more honest when he cynically admitted that he excepted the Conservative party to obtain the votes of those to whom is given the right to vote on this bill and the Liberal party to lose the votes of those to whom that right is denied.
>
> I hope the Secretary of State was not talking seriously; he did not do himself justice. I have great admiration for his talent, but I do not hesitate to say that a man whose morals and convictions allow him to consider as justifiable the trituration of the elections act just before a general election in order to ensure the return to power of his party, is not morally fit to hold a high administrative position in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this motion constitutes, in my view, an expression of non-confidence on the part of the government, in itself and in the Canadian people. It is an admission that it does not have the support nor the confidence of the country. It is a self-accusation, which proves its weakness as a democratic government.

Parliament is forced by the government to pass a measure which is contrary to the most elementary principles of a democratic government. It breaks the fundamental law without which liberty cannot exist, that is, the equality of all citizens before the law. One of the major clauses of the Magna Charta for which the French people have fought in the past provides that any citizen has an equal right to take part in law-making and in the appointment of his representatives and agents.

A representative parliament must properly and justly reflect the nation, as well as its proportions and characteristics. Any Canadian citizen has a sacred right to have his fair share of the national representation. Those are not German principles, but the tenets of freedom. And it is in order to uphold and preserve such principles throughout the world that Canadian soldiers have fought in Europe.

The rights of the people and the privileges of parliament must be preserved against all comers. But, Mr. Speaker, what can we expect of the present government which sets a bad example and shows absolute contempt for the authority of parliament.

During a trip that I made to Paris last December, I had the opportunity of discussing with French Parliamentarians all the improvements that they wanted to make to the National Assembly. In this connection, I shall mention only one article which stated that members who wished to have the right to speak in the National Assembly were justified.

England and France, cradles of culture, surely deserve our attention.

What was this new amendment seeking? It reads as follows:

> Of course, the representation of the isolated members—that is those not registered with a political group (approximately 3 per cent of the total number) gives rise to a special problem. Special provisions have been approved in June 1967 to allow them to have access to committees; previously, once established the committees could appoint isolated members by means of a vote. The present orders have been worked out so as to allow any isolated member to sit on a committee, although there remains the principle that a member can be appointed to only one standing committee.

While within the Canadian parliament some people try in every way to prevent democracy from making itself heard, in a country as old as France, on the contrary, elected citizens, even though they do not belong to a political party, are allowed to express their views in committees. And it is in the name of that freedom which can express itself in those democratic countries that we ask that democracy be also respected in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, because they were for convenience and efficiency, democratic governments throughout history have collapsed. In the absence of other grounds, hon. members would be well advised to establish the kind of government that now exists in Russia and that existed yesterday in Nazi Germany. Of course, such governments leave nothing to be desired with regard to convenience and efficiency, but they do not put up with certain other things, as hon. members, I am sure, will readily understand.

History offers plenty of pertinent instances. I have some before me. However, I shall not take my time nor that of the other members to quote long excerpts of history books to show how convenience and efficiency have wrecked democratic governments in the past, but I shall merely refer to a few cases.

Let us think, for instance, of Athens, Rome and Venice, which had democratic governments, as well as of England at the time of Oliver Cromwell.

We can make a remarkable comparison between the present situation and the one which cost Athens its democracy. I shall quote a short paragraph of the works of Basil

Hammond regarding the conditions prevailing at the time Athens was threatened. Here it is:

> Alcibiade's contribution to that revolution was only to get it under way by raising the false hope of a Persian alliance. His agents went to Athens, and Pisandre, their leader, said to the citizen's assembly that their only hope of survival was an alliance with the Persians. He declared it possible if Alcibiade were asked to come back, if the democracy which the Persian king did not like were abolished and if in its place an oligarchy on which the king could rely were established. The assembly did not like the idea of losing its democratic constitution but, yielding to the circumstances, it nevertheless approved the suggested change.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in view of the quick changes the government wants to make on the eve of the adjournment of the 1st Session of the 28th Parliament, we cannot accept the closure rule which it wants to impose upon us and we will fight for the survival of this democracy.

This, Mr. Speaker, was happening in ancient Athens. It was the first step towards the fall of democracy. They received a proposal which it was impossible for them to look into. Its approval had to be hastened so as to conclude the alliance. It was passed in haste without the required consideration and that was the end of the democratic government.

A little later, the same thing happened with the Romans. They were compelled on many occasions to resort to dictatorial powers in order to dispose of certain matters. That was more efficient, as the government seems to tell us in the house. What happened then? The house knows it. The Senate of Rome was so well used to totalitarian methods that it was easy for dictator Julius Caesar to eventually assume full powers.

Well, I can say that today there are Julius Caesars who introduce amendments under another form, such as standing order 75c and who wish to set up in parliament an unacceptable dictatorship. The hon. members might think that could not happen.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Clothes, cars, TV sets, material things can change, but human nature is unalterable from one generation to another. Once the thin edge of the wedge—in the present case it is rather blunt—has penetrated, the destruction of democratic machinery has begun. When opportunism and efficiency are the arguments used to destroy parliamentarian rules, a long step forward has been taken towards the destruction of democracy itself.

We are here, we should not forget it, not for ourselves, but to form a Parliament for the Canadian people. Among our duties, we have to facilitate relations between both sides of the house, in order to enable us to contribute, as is suitable, to the affairs of the state.

Without wishing at all to blame someone or express recriminations, I can say that whoever objectively studies the atmosphere in the House of Commons at the present time will admit that we do not have the kind of institution to which the Canadian people are entitled. I ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the whole government to consider the situation from that angle.

I do not want to quote authorities, citations, or the Standing Orders; in a frank and straightforward manner, I tell the government what I think. It is obvious that the present atmosphere in the House of Commons does not allow us to deal with the affairs of the country, because of Rule 75c which, in my opinion, should be removed without more ado.

At the beginning of the debate on the omnibus bill, we said: Remove from the bill the provisions on abortion and homosexuality, and we shall immediately vote for this legislation which, without being perfect, is nonetheless acceptable.

Today, we say: Remove Rule 75c and we shall agree to expedite the business of the house and get on with our jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I read complete official report of the 1913 debate, when they inserted in the Standing Orders, the provision which was merely a rule of closure of which Rule 75c is a replica. I read the report of debates when the closure was applied in 1913, 1917, 1921, 1926 and 1932.

Mr. Speaker, in that vast documentation on the rule of closure, nowhere can we find a definition which would allow the government to impose a limit of time. Rule 75c is precisely a permanent and automatic rule of closure which is unacceptable to us.

Mr. Speaker, how long will justice prevail in our country under such a system? What will happen to order and honesty? That is precisely what happened in the House of Commons.

Those who lived through the events of the last two or three weeks will no longer have for parliament the feeling and the respect they had for that institution. No unbiased

observer, Mr. Speaker, can deny that a climate of tension prevails. There is bitterness and resentment on both sides of the house. Because of what happened, has the house the right morally to carry on its business? There will be doubts in that respect, as long as that rule 75c will keep on being brought before us.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that we can say that nobody is overly impressed by efficiency as a means to carry out concrete programs in a democratic parliament.

It has been said that democracy would not even exist were it possible to establish other types even less desirable of government. I think that is true. In spite of all its deficiencies, it is the best system we could find. But in order to retain the respect of the people for it—and that is an important factor—it is therefore essential that the house should do nothing that might lead the people to believe that they are not well represented here, no matter whether they support the government or the opposition.

I have only one more word, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat. I quote Frank Oliver, another Liberal whom I particularly commend to the house. That man had said that closure is not a blow aimed at the opposition, but at the rights of Canadians. When a provision such as rule 75c is moved, it is a blow aimed straight at the heart of democracy.

The primary duty of a Parliament is to be a sovereign body, not a subordinate institution, of a purely decorative character. Parliament holds an undeniable right, transcending the whims of the Prime Minister, or of the President of the Privy Council, and that is the right to exist. That right, may I suggest, comes before the disappointments of the Prime Minister or of the Minister of Agriculture. Parliament has the obligation to prevent any encroachment on its rights and privileges. It is the will of Parliament and not that of the Prime Minister which represents the will of the country. When the Prime Minister suggests that he speaks for the whole country, he is mistaking the echo of his own words for the voice of the Canadian people.

Parliament is and must remain the approved representative of public opinion and public will. The people's sovereignty is delegated to parliament not to the executive, and when I say parliament, I mean the minority as well as the majority.

This parliament, this institution, should be the temple of freedom, not a place where

restraint and a false interpretation of the rules are used as a means to brush aside the rights, in order to gain some precarious advantage.

And before concluding my remarks, I can assure the house that I am wondering, in short, I am much concerned about the survival of democracy in Canada. That concern stems from the fact that the government is resorting a little too much to "Castro-type" methods. That is why those Castro-type methods, a concrete example of which can be found in 75c, will never get our support and the generations to come will commend us for having fought against the passage of this order which imposes dictatorship in this country.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the debate continues may I say that I understand the discussions about government order No. 65 have been progressing favourably, and I believe there might now be agreement in the house to pass the order which I previously suggested. If that be the case I wonder whether we can temporarily interrupt this debate in order to call order No. 65 and put it through all stages?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is this agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS DEFINING "AIR CUSHION VEHICLE" AND CLARIFYING OTHER PROVISIONS—REPORT STAGE—BILL No. S-23

The house proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-23, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Before proceeding to the consideration of this bill, I should like to point out to the house that a notice of amendment appears on the order paper, in the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) and—

[*English*]

I believe that the hon. member wishes to drop his notice of motion.

Mr. Barnett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have agreed not to move that amendment.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill S-23, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Stanfield: By leave.

Mr. Jamieson moved that Bill S-23, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, be read the third time and do pass.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You see what can be done by consultation.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF POWERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have also been discussions held with regard to a proposal made by the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments for an expansion of its order of reference, and I wonder whether the house might be agreeable to adopting an order in the following form:

That the powers of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, appointed by order of the house on September 30, 1968, be extended by adding the following powers:

To consider and, from time to time, to report on the adequacy of existing statutory authority for the making and publication of statutory instruments and on the adequacy of existing procedures for the drafting, scrutiny, and operational review of such instruments, and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

Perhaps there is general agreement that this could be made an order of the house.

Mr. Stanfield: I am not objecting, Mr. Speaker, but I know nothing about it, and I would prefer if there were an opportunity for consultation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I believe the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) was the source of my information. However, if there is not consent I will not put a motion now.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and on the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the matter which is now before us is one of the most important subjects we will debate in this 28th parliament because it has to do with nothing less than the rights of parliament itself and the rights of members in a free assembly to have an adequate opportunity to express the views of those who sent them here. If this matter were not so serious the government's handling of it could be described as a comedy of errors. It began last December when the government endeavoured to ram through the house the iniquitous and abhorrent rule 16A which would have virtually given the government power to cut off discussion in any debate, and even to limit the time of debate before it began.

The government backed down on that proposition because of the united opposition of all the parties on this side of the house. It is noteworthy that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tried to save face by telling press and television audiences that he had set a trap for the opposition. He implied that he had never really wanted to put 16A into effect but by drawing the opposition's fire to that clause he had succeeded in getting all the other rule changes accepted by the house. If this is true, Mr. Speaker, then I would like to know why the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has brought in a motion which is almost identical with 16A. By his action the President of the Privy Council has destroyed the Prime Minister's credibility and has exposed his transparent attempt at face-saving.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The second act in this comedy of errors has to do with the work of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to which the matter of time allocation was referred. The representatives of the opposition parties on that committee not only agreed to but

helped to formulate 75A and 75B. I think both those provisions would help bring about a more orderly handling of the business of the house and would provide for an allocation of time on the basis of agreement and consensus. But the President of the Privy Council was not satisfied with that. Noting the approach of the end of the session he rammed 75c through that committee supported only by the government members on the committee. Then he sought to ram it through the house, not in the way it is being done now by discussion of the committee's report, but by introducing a motion.

Yesterday the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) sought to excuse his quiescent inactivity by saying he was waiting until the business of the house had been disposed of before he got up. Well, of course, if it was the intention of the government that the report of this committee would be discussed, why is item 99 on the order paper? Why did the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) find it necessary to file his motion? He did so for the obvious reason that he wanted to make two minor changes in the report of the committee. He knew that if those changes were to be made they could be made only by referring the report back to the committee. Therefore he sought to block the report of the committee and to produce his interpretation and altered version of the committee report.

The government has been caught in its own tangled web of duplicity and subterfuge. Its machinations have backfired and it stands exposed for its blatant attempts to muzzle parliament and denigrate the rights of opposition members.

Mr. Stanfield: An arrogant, miserable bunch.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the government members across the way have now dwindled to three. I see two of them in the rump, which makes five. There are no cabinet members present. They certainly are interested in this subject. I suppose if all the opposition members left we would not have a quorum. I think this is an indication of this government's attitude toward parliament and a—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: No respect for parliament at all.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —complete contempt for a democratic deliberative assembly. The question which has been asked and which must be answered in this debate is, why has rule 75c been introduced? It was rammed through in committee and now it has been brought in after all the business of the house has been disposed of and normally members would not be here to deal with this rule 75c. The government has given us no valid reason for introducing a streamlined form of the guillotine. The President of the Privy Council, if this rule is passed, will go down in Canadian parliamentary history as "Mac the Gag", because that is the sole purpose of rule 75c. The government cannot claim it is introducing this rule because it has faced obstruction in this session of parliament.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): There has been no obstruction. The opposition have co-operated fully with the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I point out first of all that the opposition voluntarily gave up four allotted days during which it would have been the privilege of members of the opposition to criticize the government and raise matters which they thought were of interest to their constituents and the country.

An hon. Member: So that we could adjourn on June 27.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We gave up those four days in order that government business could be discussed. I wish to point out what may not be generally known. Through the house leaders of the various parties on this side we offered to sit extra hours during the latter part of the month of June so that we could finish up the business of the house by June 27, provided the government would not proceed with rule 75c. The government turned that down. The government's legislative program could have been finished on June 27 as planned. There was no question of obstruction.

When the members of the government complain about the length of debates I should like to say that in no parliament with which I have had any association has there been any government which has had more co-operation than this government has had. When I compare this parliament with the antics of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—Pearson,

Pickersgill, Martin and Chevrier—from 1957 to 1962 when they kept this house in a constant wrangle for weeks on end on constitutional and procedural matters, I say that this government has been very fortunate in the kind of co-operation it has received from this side of the house.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in his speech yesterday complained that if the debates during this session had been shorter we would have been able to deal with some additional legislation. Let me ask two questions. First, let me ask which debates he thinks were too long. There were only two lengthy debates. The first was the debate on the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code. Of course that took time. It was a very large bill. I for one supported all the provisions of that bill except the provision for a national lottery. But I respect the rights of those who were vigorously opposed to the clauses dealing with abortion and homosexuality. They were not arguing a political question. They were arguing a moral question, a matter of conscience, and nobody in this house has a right to curtail the views of any member who is trying to express his moral opposition and the moral opposition of his constituents to a proposed piece of legislation.

The other piece of legislation which took some time was the official languages bill. It also was an important piece of legislation which has far-reaching implications. Does anyone suggest it could have been curtailed? My complaint was that the government had not done a good enough job in explaining it to the public. I think that the fact it was a fairly lengthy debate helped to disabuse the public's mind and remove some of the fears existing in some parts of Canada in respect of the purport of that legislation, and other legislation that has resulted in extended debate.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The second thing I want to ask is, what legislation that the government wanted could not have been dealt with at this time? If the government had additional pieces of legislation it thought was important, the house could have continued on into July or reconvened after Labour Day. There is nothing sacrosanct about adjourning the house until October. There is no legislation the government really wants that could not be dealt with now. The government has had so much co-operation it has really had no problems. As a matter of fact, members on the government side have been making speeches, according to press reports, indicating to their constituents how much fine legislation has been passed this session. The government members cannot have it both ways. They cannot boast about how much legislation has been passed and talk about obstruction by the opposition. The real fact is that the government does not have very much important legislation and is not being prevented from proceeding with anything it deems sufficiently important to place before parliament.

Another reason given for the need for rule 75c was put forward by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on a television program I watched. He said that the rule change was necessary so that parliament could respond more quickly in order to meet changing social and economic needs in Canada. The truth is that it is the government which is failing to respond to the social and economic needs of Canada, not parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Parliament has been prepared for months to deal with some of the major problems facing this country. It is the government which does not know how to respond. Day after day in the house we have asked the government what it intends to do about rising prices. We asked for months about setting up the commission on incomes and prices. It has taken the government almost a year to get around to naming the personnel. We have talked about high interest rates and the government is still doing nothing. Only after a high degree of prodding was the matter finally sent to a standing committee of the house.

How did the government respond to the problem of housing in Canada? It did absolutely nothing until a minister of the Crown resigned in disgust and disappointment. Only then did it bring in a half-baked commitment that hardly deals with this problem. How has this government responded to the question of pollution?

Mr. Stanfield: It has created a lot.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Volumes of data are available about the terrible ravages of pollution in this country. Member after member on this side of the house has risen day after day to ask the government to take some steps, but there has been no action. It is not parliament that cannot respond quickly, it is the government which is completely ineffective, inefficient and unresponsive.

We have had a report on veterans for which we waited over five years. The government has been sitting on it now for over a year. It was only after a great deal of probing that it was sent to a standing committee, and we are now waiting for a white paper.

We have been waiting for a year for a white paper on the Carter commission report. We have been waiting for some action on old age pensions to compensate the old people for the effect of the rise in the cost of living. It has been increasing at a rate of 4 per cent per year but the old age pensioners cost of living bonus is set at only 2 per cent per year.

Members on this side of the house have been pointing out to the government that the farmers in western Canada are facing bankruptcy. Day after day and month after month we have been pressing the government for some action, for some statement of policy, but nothing has been forthcoming. If anyone thinks this is exaggeration let me refer them to a statement in the Ottawa *Citizen* on June 25 in an article by Charles King, which he wrote at a place called St. Jean, Manitoba. The article was headed "Peter Trudeau's The Ogre in St. Gene". This is what he said:

> Because the feeling is deep and genuine, Trudeau is broadly considered to be the greatest disaster that has hit the west since the great drought of the thirties, if it doesn't go back to the Riel rebellion.

The article goes on to state:

> It's a bit late now, Peter Trudeau, but you should come out here and check the situation for yourself.

I certainly hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will do that, but if he does not react any more effectively to what he will face in the west than he has in the last eight months I fear the farmers of western Canada will get no relief. To suggest that 75c is needed in order that parliament can respond quickly to an emergency situation is a farce. This government's response to the social and economic needs of the country has been continual reviews, the appointment of task forces and the setting up of commissions. It has done absolutely nothing about the major problems facing the country which are causing such widespread dismay and disaffection.

There is only one reason we have 75c before us. The government is contemptuous of parliament and is going to use its majority to muzzle dissent in the name of efficiency. The Prime Minister's statement last year in the house when he said, "We are the masters of the house", is now taking tangible form in an amendment to the rules. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has never been able to conceal his complete disregard and contempt for parliament. He has never been able to make up his mind whether he wants to be a reincarnation of Joan of Arc or Louis XIV. "L'état, c'est moi" has become the attitude of the Prime Minister in respect of parliament. He has shown contempt for parliament first of all by blocking the report of the committee on transportation, then by attempting to block the discussion of the report now before us through the motion introduced by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). He is now seeking to reduce debate on any measure to a minimum of four days, and where a bill is sent to a standing committee, to only three days in the house.

The President of the Privy Council, in his address to the house, suggested we should remember that this will only be done after consultation. I laughed and he rebuked me for laughing. I apologize for that burst of laughter, but I want to point out that such laughter was almost inevitable. Consultation with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is not an easy thing in any case because he has the diplomatic finesse of a piledriver. But just imagine negotiating with the President of the Privy Council when he has a meat axe in one hand and rule 75c in the other. It would be like going to a poker game to play against a fellow who had a loaded gun pointed at your head.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Hees: And a loaded deck as well.

An hon. Member: And an olive branch in the other hand.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This contempt for parliament and for parliamentary tradition always seems to assail the Liberal party whenever it gets into office with a large majority. It is true that power sometimes corrupts but absolute power corrupts absolutely. Many of us remember the statement made in 1956 by the Right Hon. C. D. Howe, who was a great Canadian. Few men made a greater contribution to Canada's war effort than Mr. Howe. But long years of power brought him to the point at which in 1956 he said, "Who is going to stop us" and "what is a million bucks?". The pipeline bill was pushed through parliament by closure before members could open their mouths and it was applied on every clause of the bill. But a day of reckoning came. The people of Canada are patient and slow to anger but when

they are aroused their wrath is something to behold, and in 1957 and 1958 that wrath was aroused.

I remind the members of the government that the Canadian people cherish the right of dissent and they will not sit idly by if this government tries to ride roughshod over the rights of private members, particularly the members of the opposition. I am not thinking only in terms of those of us who sit in the house. A letter which I thought was very significant came in my mail this morning. It was written by a young man from the province of Ontario whom I have never met. This is what he wrote:

> I am a student in grade 10. At this time I would like to express to you my views on the government's proposed rule change which would limit debating time in the House of Commons.
>
> I cannot see how such a measure has a place in Mr. Trudeau's "Just Society".
>
> By adopting such a measure legislation could be railroaded through before it could be fully debated. The opinions of many members and those of their numerous constituents would not be heard if debating time was so limited. And this seems out of place in a democratic country such as Canada. With mail service as slow as it is, some members would not receive letters from concerned constituents commenting on legislation before it is given third reading.
>
> I sincerely hope that such a measure is not adopted and the opposition parties will work against its adoption.
>
> Sincerely and with all best wishes.

An hon. Member: What is the postmark?

Mr. Morison: Have you a son in grade 10?

An hon. Member: Go back to sleep.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the hon. member has recovered from his afternoon nap may I tell him that, as I just said, I do not know the young man and have never met him but I would be very proud to have a son like him. I would be surprised if the hon. member had a son as intelligent as that young man. Here is a boy who I think represents thousands of young people across this country who believe that dissent and the right to express one's views and, even more important, to express the views of the people one represents in parliament, is an inalienable part of our democratic system.

I urge the house, before we come to a final vote on this matter, to stop and realize that the measure of our democracy is the extent to which we recognize the rights of minorities. After all, a free parliament is the basis of all our freedoms. Destroy it and our democracy will begin to crumble before our eyes.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) argued in his speech yesterday that the small parties have too much power. I can understand his impatience with the small parties that keep trying to prod the government out of its lethargy. But I want to say that we are not here by virtue of the good graces of the President of the Privy Council or of the government. The New Democratic party is here because nearly 1,400,000 Canadian voters voted for us last June. Our party and the Ralliement Créditiste represent 1,875,000 voters, and much has happened since then. On June 25 a Gallup poll was published which showed the New Democratic party at 22 per cent, the Créditistes and others at 7 per cent, making a total of 29 per cent, and the government at 41 per cent. These small parties at which the President of the Privy Council sneers are not a miniscule body.

Mr. Stanfield: You may have overtaken the government by this time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They represent nearly a third of the voters of this country, and if the government keeps on in this way we will soon represent more than the government in the Gallup poll. I want to tell the government that the minor parties will not disappear if the government resorts to measures of repression and curtailment of free speech. I want to tell the gentlemen opposite that the representatives of this party will be here long after some of those who are seeking to destroy them have disappeared from the political scene.

In a free parliament what we have to do is to find the fine balance between the right of dissent and the right of the government to get on with the business of the country. Everyone recognizes that no member or group of members should have the power to prevent important decisions being made by the parliament of Canada. I believe that rules 75A and 75B go a long way toward finding that balance. After all, the government is not dealing in this parliament with obstructionists. They are dealing with reasonable and responsible men who are answerable to their constituents. I want to ask the government members, when they rise to speak, to point out any instances in this parliament during this session when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the Leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) or myself have acted irresponsibly and held up the business of the house or tried to prevent the government from getting measures before the house and reaching decisions with respect to them. They have been dealing

with reasonable and responsible people. If they come to the point where they are faced with obstruction and filibuster, then of course it is a different matter. They then have the right, if they want to, to use Standing Order 33, to use the power of closure, and let the public decide whether they are justified in using it.

• (4:20 p.m.)

What the government seems to forget is that we are answerable on both sides of the house to the public. If we on this side obstruct needlessly, if we waste time, if we facetiously prevent decisions from being reached, our constituents will deal with us. The voters will react against any party which conducts itself irresponsibly and the public will support a government bringing in closure if it finds it necessary to do so after a prolonged debate has taken place. But the public will not support the idea of imposing closure virtually in advance; the public will not support any government which makes rules so that a minister can introduce a measure and after speaking we would be allowed two hours of debate, then one day on the bill for the first stage, two hours and another day of debate on the second stage, one day on third reading and one day in committee—three days in all.

The Ottawa *Citizen*, which has always been very friendly to the Liberal party, carried an editorial on Wednesday, June 25 with the heading: "Hidden Closure. Proposed Rule Violates Rights." I shall not read the whole of the editorial, though it is an excellent one. I shall read the last two paragraphs:

> A minority has more than a right to debate legislation. It has a right to try to rally public opinion to its side. Especially should it be able to exercise this right when examining legislation dealing with matters of conscience. Only when the minority has had a full opportunity to do this should debate be cut off.
>
> Some form of closure is necessary if parliament is to do business but it should be applied after exhaustive debate, not before.

This is not what the government is proposing to do. We believe that 90 per cent of the business of the house could be allocated on the basis of orders as to time through 75A and that probably the rest could be dealt with through 75B. If there is one per cent which cannot be arranged through either 75A or 75B, the government always has the right after protracted debate to resort to Standing Order 33.

By ramming 75c through the house the government is doing violence to parliament and is weakening the democratic process. I remind hon. members that when we demean parliament we demean ourselves. As Members of Parliament the only power we have is derived from the fact that we are Members of Parliament. We are here by virtue of the fact that the people in our constituencies sent us here. If we belittle this house, if we make it irrelevant, if we make it a mere rubberstamp for a dictatorial government, we make ourselves mere puppets and will be so judged by the people we represent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If we are muzzled, if dissent cannot be expressed in this assembly, I warn the government that dissent will take to the streets. If democracy is to survive it must survive in this place of all places. If dissent cannot express itself in words it will inevitably express itself in violence. I remind supporters of the government, particularly the younger members who sit on the back benches, that rule 75c is a two-edged sword and that it can cut both ways. Governments come and governments go. I have seen five different prime ministers sit in that seat. I have seen scores of cabinet ministers come and go. Political fortune is a fickle goddess.

An hon. Member: Who knows better?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The hon. gentleman will learn it.

An hon. Member: The people will decide.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Yes. And may I point out to the hon. member that when they decide it is quite possible that many of those who sit opposite today will be sitting on this side of the house. Not all of them, of course. Some of them will not be back at all; they came in for one term on the coat tails of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). But there are some who will sit on this side of the house. I wonder what they will think then about rule 75c. What will they think, for instance, about a bill to rescind the Official Languages Act to be passed in three days of debate—one day on second reading, one on the report stage and one on third reading? What will they think of a bill to discontinue family allowances, to be passed by parliament in a total of four days? Or what about a resolution to amend the British North America Act to take away some of the privileges of French-speaking Canadians?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This is your program you are setting out?

Mr. Stanfield: A great sense of humour.

An hon. Member: A great sense of stupidity.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is showing just how much regard he has for parliamentary tradition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Paproski: Shame.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): He couldn't care less about parliamentary tradition. He sits where he does because he happened to back the right man at a political convention and because he is an obedient and supine hatchet-man.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He is being pretty funny so I hope he will continue.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am almost through, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): You have been through for some time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Has the hon. member unanimous consent to continue?

An hon. Member: By all means.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I do not intend to waste any more time on the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) because that is not the important question. The important thing is that whoever may sit in the seats of government—it may be the Liberal party today, it may be another party four years from now—ought to remember that the day may come when it will be on the other side of the house and that it has a duty to ensure that members of the house will always have the inalienable right to be heard and to express the views of the people they represent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is what the present debate is all about—the right to be heard. I believe in the democratic process. I have always said throughout my adult life that if ideas can be argued and debated in the marketplace of ideas the truth will ultimately prevail.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have great faith in the common sense of the ordinary man and woman. I believe that if they are given the opportunity to listen to both sides, in most cases they will make the right decision. But they can only make that decision if adequate opportunity is given for discussion, if there is a proper dialogue. I refer not to a dialogue in this chamber alone but to a dialogue that is carried on across the country as a result of the debates in this chamber. That is what makes this chamber important; not the fact that we argue here back and forth but that we express ideas which are reproduced in the press and propagated on radio and television. Out of this comes public discussion in various communities, and there is a feedback to members of parliament. Little by little a consensus is developed. That is what democracy is all about.

• (4:30 p.m.)

If discussion is curtailed and we reach the point where one day is allotted to the report stage, for instance, and the house is facing five or ten amendments, I ask private members who is going to do the talking? The talking will be done by the minister in charge of the bill, the Leader of the Opposition, the leaders of the other parties, and then time will just about be gone. When will the backbenchers be given a chance to say anything? They will have no chance at all. Rule 75c will choke off private members and in most instances will deny them the oppostunity to express the views of their constituents.

I say that this situation will be very dangerous. The very essence of democracy is the right to speak and to be heard, to argue and to debate. Whether we agree among ourselves is not important; what is important is that we all have the right to express our views. Voltaire said this a long time ago but it is still true. Writing to a man with whom he violently disagreed, he said: "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it". That is what we are fighting for here—the right for people to speak. We may not agree with what they say, but their right to express themselves is an inalienable part of our democracy.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, my growing experience in this house continues to be very rewarding, but perhaps the remarks of the last speaker, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Doug-

las), demonstrate best of all the theatrical skill that can be developed after many years' experience in this chamber. One could scarcely detect, in light of the pontifical attitude that he displayed in his remarks about good will and co-operation among the members of the house, that he came fresh from having to rap on the wrist one member of his party, the obstreperous member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), who only a few moments ago on his own initiative and in that "spirit of good will and co-operation" that the last speaker was boasting about, frustrated what had apparently been an agreement reached by all parties in the house.

Mr. Aiken: No, it was not frustrated at all.

Mr. Jerome: I say to the leader of that party—

Mr. Peters: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Timiskaming is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, at no time was I instructed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) to make any retraction; neither did he suggest in the first place that I should give my agreement. I believe, and I have always believed, that members of parliament should make up their own minds. When certain matters were brought to my attention I withdrew my objection, and if the hon. member had been in this chamber he would have known that this matter was taken care of in another manner.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine what it is that I am supposed to have witnessed since I have been here all afternoon.

Mr. Fairweather: The measure was passed, that is all.

Mr. Jerome: The hon. member who just raised a question of privilege stood in his place and frustrated an agreement that had been reached. He withdrew and entered later, the party having somehow managed to control him. This is why we are discussing this subject at this time.

Other experiences as a member of the standing committee have taught me that when members of the house speak of good will and co-operation among members it is proper to heed the advice of one of the senior members of the committee given to me at the beginning of the deliberations, first, of the special committee on procedure and, latterly, of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. The advice was that good will that is spoken of in that way rapidly vanishes when the prize of political advantage looms on the horizon.

If there is any doubt about that let me quickly move to a discussion of the attitude of all members of that committee to the proposal made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in regard to rule 75B. I was pleased and delighted to hear his answer to a question that was put yesterday by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who asked whether or not it was the opinion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that it was necessary to include in rule 75B a specific reference to the presence of the government house leader among the majority that the rule anticipates. I submit that his answer, to be found in yesterday's *Hansard*, gives a clear indication of the thought that was in the mind of every committee member when his proposal was discussed and then passed by the committee.

However, when the members of the opposition parties saw that there was a potential trap, that it looked as though, in the absence of that specific phrase, there might be an opportunity for three opposition members to try to gang up on the government house leader and to use the rule in this way, how quickly did they rise to the occasion! I might even quote the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), who in his remarks welcomed back the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the ground, he said, that the right hon. gentleman was here to bail out the government house leader from the trap he had walked into. "Trap" was the word he used.

Mr. Nesbitt: It was the Prime Minister who used the word first.

Mr. Jerome: I hasten to say that I do not give hon. members opposite credit for setting that trap. I do not think they even saw any difficulty until it was pointed out to them. But as soon as it was pointed out to them they descended upon it and are now cherishing the point to the death. That shows how fast good will and co-operation in this house, at least in the eyes of a fledgling member, can dissolve in the face of political advantage. This is precisely what was taking place—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Jerome: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member say whether he thinks there is any possibility of rule 75B being brought into play, worded as it now is, unless the minister representing the government is part of the majority?

Mr. Jerome: No. I agree with that interpretation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Then what is all the talking about?

Mr. Jerome: We are talking about the fact that the house leader for the official opposition took precisely the opposite view from that just stated by the hon. member. I completely agree with the hon. member's view. I think his is a proper and sensible interpretation of the rule.

That was the atmosphere in which the rule was discussed in the committee. The rule was inserted into the committee's report. But the minute the difficulty to which I have referred became apparent, all opposition members who have spoken, as did the hon. member, of good will and co-operation dropped the expression like a hot potato because they thought they had an opportunity to gain political advantage over the government. This is what happens to this kind of good will and co-operation in the face of political advantage.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit one more question? If the hon. member is satisfied that there is no difficulty about the rule, then why all the panic?

Mr. Jerome: The reason I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, is that what we are dealing with here is whether or not it is necessary to leave in the hands of the government an instrument for resolving our difficulties when good will and co-operation break down. If anyone thinks that good will and co-operation do not break down quickly, then I suggest they are being totally unrealistic. That is why we need rule 75c: where good will and co-operation break down, the situation must be resolved.

To highlight this aspect of the discussion and to put the matter in its proper perspective, I draw the attention of the house to the fact that the last speaker said that we are talking here about one per cent of our business. In giving examples of the kind of difficulties that could be encountered, the hon. member listed three or four items that I think are so ridiculous as to be absurd. However, it was the nature of his argument, and when you do not have a strong argument, Mr. Speaker, the best thing to do is to try to reduce it to absurd and ridiculous terms. The same can be said of last Christmas, when instead of facing the real issues we talked about one-man meetings of the house leaders—a reduction to absurdity.

In order to maintain a proper perspective, we are talking about the application of rule 75c to about one per cent of the business of the house. If I have misquoted the hon. member who last spoke, then I stand to be corrected.

An hon. Member: Then why do you need the rule?

Mr. Jerome: May I explain why I believe the government needs precisely this power. One of the difficulties about debate and discussion in this chamber is that all hon. members have a tendency to look inward, and they fail to step back and look at the entire problem before them in perspective. Certainly when we concentrate our attention on one subsection of one rule we tend not to see the ramifications of the entire picture.

• (4:40 p.m.)

One manifestation of our concentration is that we fail to appreciate that we have in this matter a long-standing impasse. We are not talking about the elimination of obstruction by opposition parties and anyone who says we are is simply confusing the issue. We are not talking here about something that is designed to eliminate obstruction. We are not trying to whip members of the opposition into line. We have come to the point of realizing that it is a good idea to have meetings of house leaders and that it is a good idea for them to agree on how debates should be limited. Let us remember, therefore, that substantially we agree that proposed rules 75A and 75B are a good idea. These rules do say that there must be time allocation before the debate has begun. They contain good ideas and there is nothing reprehensible about them. When the hon. member stands up and says with tears in his eyes that the nation will never stand for the allocation of time in advance of a debate he is losing sight of the fact that his party promoted and supported the provisions of proposed rules 75A and 75B.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jerome: The nub of the situation is this. Having started on the road of allocation of time for debate, the opposition feels that the ultimate control of how time shall be allocated ought to rest with it. Our simple position is that we think that control ought to rest with the government. If we have arrived at an impasse because of our positions, by all means let us conclude our discussion, cast our ballots and suffer the political consequences or rewards that may flow from our decisions, as the case may be.

When members of the opposition speak about resolving these matters by consent they surely cannot deny that the withholding of such consent amounts to a veto. If one looks at the proceedings of the United Nations Security Council, one will see that that body proceeds on the basis of consent. Where that consent is withheld, that is tantamount to a veto. We hear little about consent operating in the United Nations and we hear much more about the veto. The nub of this issue, therefore, is not obstruction.

Where is the ultimate control here going to rest, Mr. Speaker? Is it to rest with the opposition, which is what it wants and all it will tolerate, or is it going to rest with the government, which has been given a majority by the people of this nation and which, I submit, should be entitled to submit its program, have it considered and rest on its majority strength, and if that is not the right thing for it to do it can face the voters at the next election. That is the way the country is supposed to be run.

Mr. Barnett: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does he not recall that when the hon. member for Nanaïmo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) was discussing the one per cent he was talking about cases with respect to closure? Has the hon. member forgotten the existence of Standing Order 33?

Mr. Jerome: I have not forgotten Standing Order 33, but I say it is time we got into something that is a little more sensible—programming our time for debate in advance. This is something entirely different. I cannot help feeling that the opposition is inclined to accept the idea of having programming in advance but is not inclined to let go of old traditions because it feels that difficulties may arise. I cannot help comparing the position of the opposition—and I cannot claim originality for this thought—with that of the Australian who was very pleased with his new boomerang but who could not bring himself to throw his old boomerang away.

[Mr. Jerome.]

I think the second manifestation of the opposition's inability to see the whole picture here stems from its failure to grasp the fact that this particular rule change is part of a composite series of rule changes which will enable the government, as part of its program, to change its way of doing business in this house. Let us make no mistake about this. There are hon. members opposite who said, when the Ralliement Creditiste day after day kept talking about the question of conscience and how that was related to the proposed changes in the Criminal Code, that in debates of that kind this new concept ought to be invoked. I say that we ought to divide here and now, because the kind of parliament I want to see is the kind of parliament to which Canadians can come and instead of saying, "My God, is this the way you have been doing things for 100 years", say, "I am glad to see how efficiently and diligently parliamentary work is being done." That is the kind of parliament I want and I would not hesitate in going to my constituents and saying that is the kind of parliament I want.

We are promoting these rule changes because, as other rule changes have been salutary, so we think these will be. Opposition members welcomed the changes in the standing committee structure which enabled all members of the house in a very real way to take part in the work of the standing committees. Every single member of the house now enjoys the opportunity of participating in a much more meaningful way in the machinations of government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is a good word.

Mr. Jerome: The individual member can now question the minister when estimates are being discussed or when legislation is before a committee. He now has the opportunity to examine and cross-examine a wide range of witnesses who may deal with any relevant subject matter before the committee. I think every hon. member will agree that those rule changes enable him to participate in a much better way in the affairs of this house.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Another aspect which appears to have been forgotten by hon. members opposite is that the funds which were allocated to opposition members for research assistance have given them a better opportunity to anticipate in a very meaningful way the deliberations of this house and its committees. The manifestation

of the use of those funds for research assistance is often different with various members. In one case it may take one house leader back to the days of the Colonial Laws Validity Act and in another case it may give assistance in writing a letter to a constituent. One must at the same time realize that these rules are part of an over-all program to try to modernize the way of doing business in this house.

If those hon. members opposite who have participated in this debate say we do not need modernization and programming, they should fire away and say so to the public of this nation. I say we need programming and modernization very badly and we need it now. If hon. members have a role to play in pursuing a given subject matter, a given department, a phase or activity of the house or government and are required to attend a particular committee, when that debate is called in the House of Commons, on estimates or any other aspect of our work, if the time is programmed in advance so the number of speakers from any party who can rise is limited, for example, to one frontbencher and one backbencher from that committee who has become knowledgeable and specialized in that particular field, I have no hesitation in saying that is a step forward.

The stand taken by the Creditiste party on the abortion amendments to the Criminal Code, which was repeated many times, could have been adequately handled by one or two of their members. I have no hesitation in saying we wasted time that could have been used on very important legislation. It is folly to carry out business in that way.

Mr. Benjamin: What legislation was held up?

Mr. Peters: We are going to be here for two weeks, so let's get on with it.

Mr. Jerome: If the time in this chamber is limited, what will happen is that the length of the debate will diminish but the quality will increase. That is what we should strive to do. We should arrange our affairs so that the paramount feature of the debate is its quality and not its length. I personally do not feel this nation is being served by a debate featuring only its length. That is what took place in that filibuster that has been talked about so much. It was a performance that had as its focus of attention one singular point, its length. I cannot feel that the needs of the nation were in any way served by that particular performance. The sooner we move to eliminate that kind of thing and require a debate to be meaningful and to the point, the better off we will be.

The tragic manifestation of our inability to look at the composite picture of this problem is in respect of the youth of our country who have been referred to so frequently. I said this in December when talking about the rule changes proposed at that time and I say it again. It has been mentioned here this afternoon that if democracy does not rest in this institution and if resentment and opposition cannot be expressed in words, they will be expressed in violence. I think that is a very important point. It is capable of many interpretations.

The youth of our country are a tremendously powerful force in our nation. They are protesting and demonstrating in public. There are riots and insurrection—in our universities. When that kind of performance takes place, we must wake up to the fact that the youth of our country have the power to change our society and way of life. In addition to possessing this power, they also possess the inclination.

I believe we all respect this institution. If we do, we must give the youth of our country the sense that change can take place here and that we can keep pace with the needs of our nation. If we do not do that, their expression will be one of protest against this chamber, as well as disinterest and hostility.

We have a solemn duty to encourage the youth of our country to participate in the parliamentary way of life. Before we can do that we must show them that this is a place where they can make a meaningful contribution. This must be a place that will command their respect and attention. This is not a place which simply has roots in the past that will never die, an institution built solely on tradition, but a place where we are striving to do a good job of administering the affairs of the citizens of our country.

We have the opportunity to demonstrate that this is not a parliament that intends at any cost to preserve and cling to those anachronistic traditions which tie our hands and hold us back from carrying out the business of the nation. We have an opportunity to demonstrate the revolutionary spirit present in the youth of our country today. That has been an essential ingredient of every great nation. It is present in the youth of our nation and we do not have to look very far to see it.

That revolutionary spirit has a place here and we are fooling ourselves if we think the youth will not demonstrate this spirit when

they are dissatisfied with the institutions of our country. We must be prepared to say that the business of the country is being carried out in a proper, meaningful and intelligent way and that the parliamentary process can and will exercise good judgment and control without giving the appearance of senility or petrification from age.

We have the opportunity to demonstrate that this house is not just a haven for orators. We should not insist on operating under the terms and conditions popular in the days of the Colonial Laws Validity Act which, I might say, does not mean a colonial damn to anyone who voted me into this House of Commons.

Mr. Aiken: Why don't you dispose of it then and change the constitution?

Mr. Jerome: One might anticipate the difficulty we would have in changing the constitution when we are having this kind of difficulty making a change in the rules. We have an opportunity to demonstrate that this House of Commons is not merely something from the past but is and will continue to be the heartbeat of our nation, worthy of the zeal and talent of the young people of our country.

I plead with members opposite to face the real dangers in this regard of their resistance to intelligent change. I plead with them to embrace these changes and look for more. Instead of staying on this point, we should move on to considering whether proceedings in committees should be such that freedom can be exercised to make changes for or against the government. We should discuss whether the people of this country are better served when governments can be defeated and put out of office in a year or two, or whether the government should be allowed to carry out its program in four or five years. These are changes we should be speaking about. We should embrace these present changes and accept them as being the first step. We should look for many more changes so we will always be able to ensure that parliament will remain a source of pride, not just to retrospective historians but to all Canadians, especially the youth of our country who, thank God, do not have their eyes constantly on the past but on the future.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the speech just made by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) cries out for a reply.

[Mr. Jerome.]

An hon. Member: From you?

Mr. Aiken: From me, and I am going to tell him a few facts of life. The great plea that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) have made on behalf of proposed rule 75c is that the government wants to program its business. How can it possibly program its legislation when nobody knows what its legislative program is? What kind of programming is it when the government puts an item on the order paper one day and wants it passed the next? What kind of programming is it when bills like the water act are promised for a year and a half but never appear on the order paper? How can parliament support the government in programming its legislation when items are put on the order paper but never proceeded with, when promised bills are never put on the order paper, and when other things which are promised never appear in parliament so that we may consider them?

What kind of programming is it when committees report after due deliberation and their reports lie on the order paper without concurrence being moved in them? What kind of programming is it when government decisions are made and announced in the house even when committees are still in session deliberating the subject matter of those announcements? How on earth can the government say in these circumstances that it wants support for programming its legislation?

There are other circumstances to consider. We have an order paper. What is on it of importance that still remains to be passed? Nothing at all. Everything of importance was duly considered and passed in this parliament. But there were lots of things in the Speech from the Throne that never appeared on the order paper. Is that the kind of programming we want to support? This is nonsense. The whole question of programming is an invalid excuse for putting the opposition out of business.

What the government really wants is programmed disorganization. Members of the government want to be able to do what they want when they want, but they do not want to tell the house anything about it. They do not want us to know what they are planning. They do not want the public to know what they are planning, because they might change their minds before their plan appears in final form.

I cite as an example something I am keenly interested in, the Canada Water Act, which we have been asking about for three years. I cannot blame this government and the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for all the delay. He has been in office a little over a year, and that is the amount of delay he has caused. But the previous Liberal government was responsible for the rest.

I am informed that the water act has been revised two or three times in the departments concerned. Cabinet ministers cannot agree among themselves on what should be in it. There is a feud among the various departments as to which will have authority in administering it. Now the attitude of the government is, "After three years when we have our quarrels all settled you fellows must dispose of this thing in 24 hours." That is the kind of programming the government wants, and that is what we are not going to give it.

Much more can be said about programming but now I wish to deal with something else. It is fairly obvious that planning is the purpose of 75c in the mind of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome). But he destroyed his own argument because he said 75c will be used only one per cent of the time. Then he went on to add, "We want to use it so that we can program our whole legislative program for a year." What can one do with an argument like that? It has no validity. Programming is the poorest excuse for the enactment of rule 75c.

The position we are in now is a pretty fair example of the kind of programming the government has in mind. The procedure committee made a report. That report was substantially the same as the motion put on the order paper by the President of the Privy Council, which he subsequently allowed to stand in priority but for some reason or other has not withdrawn. I wonder whether he intends to withdraw it as soon as we have disposed of this item one way or another. Certainly it has no advantage just in lying on the order paper.

What happened was that the actual wording of the committee report was not just what the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) liked. I do not know why he did not like it because he was the one who personally pushed it through the committee. I shall not go into the internal proceedings of the committee as the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) did, but it is quite clear that proposed rule 75B, which the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) said was brought on by the government, was actually proposed by someone else. Those of us who were on the committee know who that was. It was not a government proposition at all, but the government eventually bought it, put it in and tacked on 75c to go with it. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) then pushed it all through the committee with a majority vote, all the opposition members voting against it. But as I say the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) did not like the exact wording in it and he did not want the bother of referring it back to the committee for reconsideration. He said, "We have got a majority in the house. Why should we worry about the committee? We will just put an item on the order paper and jam it through."

As I mentioned on a previous occasion, Mr. Speaker, it is easier and faster to blot out the opposition here in this chamber in one nice little motion than to introduce the committee report, send it back to the committee, and later bring it back into the house again. All I am doing is showing what the government is prepared to do if it has the power. This warns us that if the government gets rule 75c it will use it, properly or improperly. I do not restrict my remarks to the present government. We are putting a rule into our Standing Orders for parliament, not for this government and not for this opposition, and we have to be constantly alert that the government, no matter who it is, and the government house leader, no matter who he is, do not have the authority to wipe out the opposition and have legislative items, that they are particularly concerned about, pass without any discussion.

The hon. member for Sudbury said that what the people of this country want is to participate. That is what we want to do, Mr. Speaker; we want to participate in these legislative matters; we want to take part in the discussions and debates. If the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) wants to talk about the young people, and if he feels so darn happy about them I suggest he had better start looking around the country and see what has happened to young people in the past year, because they are not as great supporters of the Liberal party as they were a year ago. Great promises were made to them, but those promises have been ignored to the point where the young people no longer believe that the government wants them to participate. They no longer believe this. They see examples time after time of the government wanting merely to make its own proposals, go its own way and not care who participates.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The very simple fact is that this is the place in which the public should participate. Fortunately we have young people in this parliament. There is no one under 21 years of age because that is where the line is drawn. But we have one who is 22 years of age and we have others who are in their twenties. These young people are here to participate. Will the government give them an opportunity to participate or will they be cut off?

I think the whole program that has been put forward by the government in respect of this rule which we are considering is not one that would permit reasonable parliamentary participation by the people of Canada. Fundamentally that is the reason we intend to stay here to oppose it. This is the only power an opposition has. We always lose. We lose every vote when it comes to a division. We might as well be somewhere else because it does not matter what I say, what the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) or anybody else says.

We are not likely to change the opinion of any members opposite and even if we do we will not change their vote because they will support the government. So we lose every time there is a vote. The only defence the opposition has is to prevent a vote in cases where it is unjust to proceed with the legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Aiken: I hope we can prevent a vote by carrying on an orderly debate. I think we can do this because we have plenty to talk about. We have plenty of speakers and we have plenty of people in the opposition parties who feel there is a principle involved here which is being downgraded. I refer to the principle that parliament is a place where public opinion should be aired, where discussions should be held and where the public is informed through the medium of the press, radio and television so that they will know what is being said and can form their own conclusions.

On this particular point it was most discouraging last night for anyone who watched the C.B.C. news to find that there was no mention whatever of this debate.

An hon. Member: What—

Mr. Aiken: The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) or perhaps some other hon. member said—

An hon. Member: The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman).

[Mr. Aiken.]

Mr. Aiken: If he said that, I think it is a disgrace—"What difference does it make; there is nothing worth talking about."

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I believe the record will show I did not make any such remark and have not made any remarks since the hon. member began his speech.

Mr. Aiken: As my colleague said, perhaps it was the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). If it was not he then perhaps he could stand up and say so.

Mr. Deachman: I was not even listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Aiken: He generally talks without thinking anyway. In any case there is something here worth talking about. If the C.B.C. does not know this then they had better make some changes in their news broadcasting system because there is a principle involved here. The feature item last night was the resignation of the publicity director of the National Arts Centre. That was considered to be much more important than the fact that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) backed down in his effort to bulldoze and overrule the Standing Committee on Procedure of this house to the point where parliament was being downgraded. Maybe there are people who do not think this is important. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) did not seem to think it was. He seemed to think our main business is to get the program through. I do not know whether he said what the program is, but I can assure him that there is more involved than that. If the other news media can carry this particular debate as a matter of importance then the C.B.C. ought to wake up. I am not one of those who stand up daily to criticize the C.B.C. It has a tough job to do. I think, however, when a mistake has been made by the C.B.C. it should be pointed out. I think in this instance it has made a mistake. I am not suggesting they should report this speech, but there have been a few good ones today. I believe the C.B.C. could at least mention the fact that a good principle is being debated.

I should like to get down to the matter of rule 75c. There has been a good deal of discussion about what it really means. How many days of debate will be allowed if 75c becomes effective and how many days of elapsed time will be involved? I think this in a sense is an academic question because it is too short a time under any circumstances for

debate to be limited on a particular item. I estimate that it could take 11 days from first reading to third reading. It could take 11 days to put a bill through. But as I read the rule, in those 11 days there would be three days of debate on the subject which would be assured. Those days would be the fourth day on which there would be one day allotted on second reading, one day which would be day 10 allotted on the report stage and one day which would be day 11 on the third reading stage. Those are the three days which would be provided for debate on any of the legislation which is so important and so earthshaking that the government wants to put it through without the public finding out what is going on.

The only reason the government wants this provision is so that it will be able to get legislation through which it feels the public will not like. They do not mind stretching out the time spent on bills which they feel are popular. The back-benchers on the government side can get up and talk about the good legislation. It is the bad legislation which the government wants to ram through. It is our business to stop that and we must. There might be a day at the committee stage. A day is allotted but no one knows what might happen in the committee. So we may have three or four days on which there will be debate on a bill on which closure has been used under rule 75c.

There are some immutable laws in this parliament. They are immutable because no matter how many governments try to override them the attempt is never successful. If they are overriden it is only for a short period of time. One immutable law is that there must be co-operation and negotiation on both sides of the house in order to accomplish anything at all. There must be co-operation. Things cannot be done by closure. There is a second one. Undertakings and understandings cannot be broken without adverse consequences. These are the rules I would commend to members on the government side who may feel that perhaps the opposition is dragging its feet.

• (5:20 p.m.)

It is impossible to put through legislation immediately if the opposition does not want it to go through. Remember this because it is immutable. If you do not find a loophole in one place you can find one in another. This is where the government is making its greatest mistake, in trying to force rule 75c on us. If it does so against the wish of the opposition it may be assured it will not get any co-operation in respect of other legislation. I am not making a threat; I am merely stating the position of the house. This is a very difficult thing to define or envisage. One must be here a while to be able to recognize a mood. If the mood is bad it does not matter what rules the government may have; it will not get its legislation put through. This is why I urge the government to be reasonable.

The opposition has gone along with rule 75A and 75B with some hesitation, but 75c is much too strong for us to accept.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): It is dictatorial.

Mr. Aiken: I should like to point out as an example to hon. members who have come to this house in the last year what can really happen when an opposition sets out to stop a legislative program. There was a legislative program on the order paper between the years 1958 and 1962. I was sitting on the opposite side of the house when the government had a majority of 208 members, yet there were four or five members sitting on this side on the front benches, all now departed from this place, who held up the legislative program and brought the government down at the expense of the country. This indicates how short our term here is, and I have in mind Messrs. Pearson, Pickersgill, Martin and Chevrier. They managed to hold up that legislative program.

I am not citing this as the most terrible example I have ever had the misfortune to sit and watch, but I do know this can happen and has happened in the past. I quote this example to show hon. members on the other side that it would be well to remember that an opposition has a duty to let pass in parliament what it considers valid and oppose legislation that it considers bad. This does not necessarily mean there are more members who agree with the legislation than disagree.

I have had the good fortune to sit on both sides of the house, and know that most of the government's legislation comes from within the depths of the government services. It comes to the ministers, then to cabinet and hon. members on the government side go along with it or complain. Occasionally they are successful in changing the legislation. The legislative program itself is not necessarily supported by a majority merely because it comes from that side of the house. It may be

that in many cases the majority of members in the house feel a legislative measure is wrong.

Very often we on this side of the house must defend members on the government side who do not agree with a certain legislative measure because they must sit mute in their places. We have seen a terrible example of this during the past week. An hon. member who was chairman of a committee was being compromised daily but had to sit mute in his seat because he was a member of the government party. It was only because the opposition on a united basis managed to get the government to change its attitude that he was relieved of a duty to resign his seat.

Let me mention some of the things which have happened during this session in proof of what I suggest can happen on a co-operative basis, and in proof of my suggestion that rule 75c will be of no particular benefit in the over-all picture and very damaging in the narrow picture. I have here today's order paper in which is listed the government orders adopted during this session. This is issue No. 185, so presumably we have been sitting for 185 days. Listed on pages 8 to 17 are those government orders adopted at this session of parliament. There are 116, and that does not include various items referred to committees as shown on pages 12 to 15. The opposition permitted, if I may use that word—perhaps allowed is a better word—116 government orders, to go through with debate in some cases and without debate in other cases. What will the government do if it puts through this closure measure in an attempt to jam everything through parliament? Under rule 75c I suggest we will have to multiply the number of days to put through as many legislative measures by four. This would increase our sitting days to approximately 450, or approximately two years of continuous sitting.

I am merely trying to prove that you cannot successfully proceed with a legislative program, even if you know what it is, by pressure. If an opposition takes it upon itself to force the government into using a rule such as 75c on each of its legislative items a government could not get through a quarter of what we have accomplished so far this session. What I am trying to point out is that you do not successfully pass legislative items in parliament by using a heavy hand. This has never been the case and I have seen this on several occasions.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Let me close my remarks by pointing out that the proposed rule 75c is too severe for the opposition to accept. We are prepared to co-operate in respect of any legislative program. We have co-operated to a great extent during this session. Hon. members might ask what we intend to do next session. They will have to wait to find out, and a good deal will depend on what happens with this proposed rule 75c.

We have had a good legislative session and we have done a great deal of work. We in the opposition are prepared to co-operate if we know what the legislative program is, but how can the house leaders sit down and decide what they are going to do at certain times without letting us know about the government's intention? We now have a reasonably programmed timetable. New rules were brought in last December, and other rules have evolved over the last ten years. This has assisted us somewhat in dealing with certain legislative matters including the debate in reply to the throne speech, our consideration of the estimates, legislation and so forth. In this regard the opposition has co-operated. It is up to the government to decide what legislation it intends to bring in, and it is up to the government to persuade the opposition from time to time that this legislation is necessary.

• (5:30 p.m.)

We are prepared to accept a reasonable arrangement for the orderly conduct of business. Rule 75A is reasonable. Rule 75B, if the majority of the parties of this house agree, can be acted upon. But I am going to call on the government now to have its spokesman stand up and advise us whether it is prepared to withdraw the limitation on the committee stage, for example. There was an intimation in what the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said yesterday that perhaps the one day in committee stage was unreasonable, that perhaps the time could be extended. All right, that is a good place to start because the committees need time to consider these matters.

Is the government prepared to increase the minimum number of days spent in debating a bill? If so, I would like to hear them say so. Is the government prepared to set an over-all time during which any piece of legislation may be passed? I think it is reasonable to expect them to say what it is because yesterday the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said that the way things go in the house, it will take three to four weeks to get

through any bill under rule 75c. If that is what he believes, is he prepared to accept an amendment that no bill shall pass in less than four weeks from the time it is first introduced? Many measures go through here in a day and many go through in two days, but if it is a piece of legislation to which we object, surely the government should be prepared to give us a month in which to debate it. These are the sort of things that could perhaps get us out of here some time before we are due to come back.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before the hon. member takes his seat I should like to ask him to clarify his last point. He said that the opposition would like a month in which to debate a piece of legislation. I take it he means a month of elapsed time, not debating time.

Mr. Aiken: Oh, yes, the proposal which I understood the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to make yesterday was that it should take at least a month of elapsed time. I do not think we would ever suggest that we want to debate any item for a month.

Mr. Nowlan: Except this rule.

Mr. Aiken: There are always exceptions. But certainly the suggestion I am making is not that we should have a month's debate. I am suggesting that we should have a reasonable number of days on any item and a month of elapsed time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): How many days would the hon. member consider reasonable, bearing in mind that there must be a general rule relating to the time for debate of bills?

Mr. Aiken: The house leader has three opposite numbers here with whom he can consult and I am sure they are anxious to consult with him. I do not happen to be one of them.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would find it interesting to hear the hon. member's views on this question.

Mr. Aiken: You have heard them.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, debates on matters such as this always bring out interesting aspects of the house during the process of debate. Even if members do take a rather long time in debate sometimes because of a lack of will to co-operate and make arrangements, perhaps it may be a good thing—every cloud has a silver lining—because we at times learn some quite unexpected things from debates.

I noted with some interest as, I have observed, a number of hon. members did this afternoon, the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome). He is a new member of the house and apparently a very promising one. I take it he is expressing the views of the new bright young men in the Liberal party who are represented in the house. If not, perhaps members on the other side would correct me in that regard. But I was certainly most interested in his theories regarding parliamentary government and how it should be run. For a while I thought I was listening to a speech which I had heard before. I tried to search my memory to discover where I had heard it. It was not a speech of Joseph Goebbels or Benito Mussolini, but after a while I realized where I had heard it and I was quite surprised. It was a speech I heard as quite a young man in the days when I was attending university. The speech was made over the radio—we did not have television at that time—by Ann Morrow Lindbergh in the late 1930's. It was called "The Wave of the Future". She spoke about what the young people must look forward to and what they must expect from the government.

People of my generation listened to that speech with interest because the Lindbergh family was very famous. Charles Lindbergh had achieved many things in the field of aviation, they had an unfortunate family tragedy, and they were also mixed up in political theories regarding the German-American *Bund* in the 1930's. That speech made by a member of the Lindbergh family was the closest thing I could recall to what I heard from the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome), except that it was more moderate than the views he expressed. Perhaps I misunderstood him. I will have an opportunity to read *Hansard* tomorrow, but I would be rather upset, as I think other hon. members might be, if he was in fact expressing the views of the bright new members of the Liberal party.

So far as the motion before us now is concerned, may I say that one should never impute motives to others for a very good reason, because no one really knows what goes on in the skulls of hon. members opposite or indeed of anyone else. So one can only draw conclusions from evidence and facts. It seems to be a reasonable conclusion to most people that in view of the timing of this debate there was not much good faith exercised in bringing up this matter at this time.

As has been pointed out by the other hon. members, we ran into the same situation last Christmas. This matter was brought up just when everybody was getting ready to go home for Christmas. I hesitate to use the word "vacation" because all hon. members know very well that when they return home it is not much of a vacation since so many people wait to see one with requests, but at least all members were getting ready to change the locale of their work.

What was brought in was called rule 16A. After a few days' discussion some arrangement was made to refer the matter back for further discussion. I am not a member of the particular committee but I understand that there was discussion off and on during the winter and spring and then, just before the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced that parliament would adjourn for the summer months on June 27, the matter was brought up again. Everything else that the government wished to be done was cleared off the order paper and only this was left. It is like putting a carrot in front of a horse and telling it "you eat it and then you will get out to pas ure for the summer". This is the gimmick. They tried it at Christmas but it did not work. Again they are trying it now. Many people are on vacation. The press gallery is empty, and that is important to the government. Nevertheless, they are trying to see if this ruse will work again. This bit of gamesmanship is all right, I suppose.

• (5:40 p.m.)

There is another aspect I should like to bring before Your Honour, and it is one which I believe to be important. Under 75c as now proposed, the length of time during which a bill may be discussed in a standing committee can be laid down by the leader of the house. But suppose a complicated bill dealing with transport, the Criminal Code, finance or taxation is before a committee. Witnesses are, of course, asked to give their views. The other day in the Finance Committee the President of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Rasminsky, gave evidence. He was asked a very simple question, or at least it was a very short question. Being an eminent man in his field, Mr. Rasminsky attempted to give a complete answer, which took him 20 to 25 minutes. How can the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) or anyone else for that matter possibly figure out in advance how long it would take to examine adequately a complicated bill on taxation, justice, or what have you? Witnesses are invited to express their opinions, and to say in advance that they should be limited to an hour or an hour and a half is utter nonsense. I do not know whether the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has thought of this aspect or not, but if he has not he should have done so.

There is another area which has been well dealt with by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), among other hon. members. What are we here for? One of the purposes of this place is to allow opportunities for elected members to express their views and those of their constituents. It does not matter whether they are from Montreal or Toronto or Prince Edward Island or British Columbia. Every member here has a right to express himself on matters which concern his conscience, his constituents, and so on. This may not be very interesting to members from Montreal or Toronto who dominate the government party, but members from western Canada, a region which is now facing problems in connection with the sale of grain, or members from Cape Breton, which is having trouble with the coal industry, have a right to make those difficulties known. It may not be of much interest to members from Toronto or Montreal, but it is of great interest to people in the parts of Canada which are directly concerned. It should not be necessary to remind people of this, but obviously it is.

Everyone agrees that the government must not be unnecessarily impeded in the discharge of its business. The leader of the N.D.P. put it very well this afternoon, I thought. The whole question here is now to strike a balance between a reasonably expeditious conduct of the government's program on the one hand, and opportunities for members who are really interested in these things to express themselves. As several hon. members have said this afternoon, this is best done by agreement. In parliament as everywhere else, you cannot do business by forcing people or by threatening them at gunpoint or by using rules such as 75c. You can bring in all the rules you like but if there is not agreement to get things done, ways can be found of frustrating them.

I have not seen much evidence of business being held up in the present session. Some have suggested that members of the Creditiste party did so. That is not my opinion. They felt very deeply about some of the matters dealt with in the Criminal Code, perhaps more deeply than did others, but they were matters of conscience and it is understandable

they should have taken advantage of the opportunity to express their views.

In any event, why should there be such haste all of a sudden? When parliament is dealing with moral questions such as abortion, homosexuality or gambling, or with income tax matters which will be around in one form or another in years to come, what difference does it make whether a debate takes three days or five days? Really, there is none at all except that some members on the government side are anxious to get things done, or to get measures passed so that they can build up their image. As one old fellow is supposed to have said when he saw people hurrying to get things done in a rush: Why the hurry; it will all be the same in a hundred years? It will not make much difference in the end if a debate takes five days or six days or seven days, especially if it provides an opportunity for someone from some part of the country to express a viewpoint which he believes to be important. I know this is annoying to people from the Montreal and Toronto areas. They do not particularly want to hear from people outside those areas. I know. I see those members laughing and scratching over there. That shows the regard they have for this house.

We might ask ourselves exactly why the government has seen fit to bring in the present motion at this time. The question has been asked by other hon. members and I do not wish to be repetitious. Why was it thought necessary? Under Standing Order 33 they have power to institute closure if there is unnecessary obstruction. In my view there has been pretty good co-operation from this side of the house in getting things arranged with regard to the government's program, whatever that may be. The only reason I can think of is that there must be a genuine desire on the part of the government to emasculate parliament. I do not think the triumvirate which runs this country—I mean the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier)—

Mr. Dinsdale: The troika.

Mr. Nesbitt: —and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), to judge from their writings and speeches, have any great regard for the parliamentary system of government.

They appear to have a much greater regard for the presidential system, either that of France or of the United States, whose system derives from that of France. It is a matter of viewpoint. It might be that the presidential system is the better one. I do not happen to think so, but it is a legitimate point of view. I can understand why those three gentlemen, who are of French cultural background, would prefer it. After all, the parliamentary system of Canada is an Anglo-Saxon institution and it has never worked very well in areas of French culture—in France, for example. Perhaps this is why they would be in favour of changing to a presidential system of the kind established in the United States. But in that case, why not tell us so and let the matter be debated openly?

The Anglo-Saxon parliamentary system operates on a pragmatic, ad hoc basis. Of course it does. It is intended to deal with human beings, not to run in accordance with strict rules or with computerlike precision. I can understand rule 75c being put forward by the leader of the house; it is the kind of rule which would fit into an application of the presidential theory. Everything must fit into its little slot. The government must be able to tell how long everything will take—half an hour for this, an hour for that, and so on. It is just the kind of thing which would fit into a cabinet system of government. I think it should be made clear to us whether this is what is being sought to be done. I think, on the other hand, one can assume that it is not part of an over-all plan that the triumvirate wishes to impose upon Canada. Perhaps one can express the less charitable view that the house leader is plain greedy for power. I would not want to think that for one moment, of course, but that view has been expressed by others.

• (5:50 p.m.)

What makes me curious about this is that the house leader has suggested that rule 75c is necessary, though it may only be brought into use in about one per cent of the cases, in order to arrange the government program. If that is the case, it would not be needed very often. This makes me very suspicious. Perhaps one should not be suspicious, but in view of what has been happening in the house during the first session of this new parliament one cannot help but be suspicious.

The remainder of my remarks will be devoted to some of the reasons why I think members on this side of the house, regardless of to which opposition party they belong,

have every reason to be exceedingly suspicious. At this point may I adjourn the debate.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

And being returned:

● (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment.

An Act to authorize assistance to transportation in the Atlantic Region.

An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada.

An Act respecting The Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).

An Act respecting Boy Scouts of Canada and to incorporate L'Association des Scouts du Canada.

An Act to amend the Patent Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

It being ten minutes after six the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 10, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate requesting this house to unite with the Senate in the appointment of a special joint committee to consider the government's proposals for tax reform and also to select members of this house to act on the special joint committee.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—OUTLINE OF STEPS TAKEN BY CANADA TO EFFECT DAYLIGHT RELIEF FLIGHTS—NEUTRAL INSPECTION

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members of the house would like to know the steps Canada is taking as a result of recent developments in Nigeria.

I have instructed our High Commissioner in Lagos to tell the federal military government that Canada is prepared to supply the neutral inspectors both sides are ready to accept as a precondition for the resumption of relief flights into the secessionist territory. We are prepared to supply these inspectors for service either inside or outside Nigeria. We have urged the Nigerian government to give careful consideration to the acceptance of outside inspection sites.

We are told that if these flights are not resumed there will be countless deaths from starvation. Urgent action is required and Canada is ready to act urgently. Contingency planning is now under way so that we can move immediately if agreement is reached.

All interested parties are now looking to daylight flights as the best way of getting the food to those who need it. Canada has advocated this course for many months. There appears now to be agreement that a way must be found to get these flights going.

Relief flights in this civil war situation should be readily recognizable as relief flights and it should be clear that the aircraft are carrying only relief goods. If these things are done, both sides should be able to agree on the necessary details.

There is no problem identifying relief flights in the daylight hours. Our proposal to the Nigerian government further suggests that this could be reinforced by filing flight plans of agreed daylight flights with the interested authorities before take-off.

We are encouraged by the fact that the principle of inspection by neutral as well as Nigerian inspectors has been accepted by the authorities on both sides. We and others are continuing efforts to see whether agreement can be reached in this matter.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I must point out however that the success of our efforts, and those of others, to get the relief goods moving again regularly and in large quantity into the secessionist area still depends on the parties to the conflict. Unless they co-operate, a great human tragedy may take place. This we will do all we can to avoid.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I think one must resist the temptation to say to the government, "We told you so." This issue has been before parliament since last September and perhaps the words of this folk song are apt. They go something like this:

If I could have the world the way I want it, I would set these children free.

Some think that some of us here are becoming emotional about this issue. I do not apologize one whit for our emotions. Although the countdown tonight begins for what promises to be the most spectacular achievement so far of science and technology, the landing of man on the moon, it seems that man has not yet found a way to feed his brother's children. Actually, through the medium of joint Churchaid, Canairelief and the International Committee of the Red Cross, man has found a way, but his efforts have been frustrated by narrow concepts of national interest and thwarted by policies of non-intervention

not now acceptable to civilized men. A deliberate policy of famine stopped those efforts; the world now finds unacceptable such policies. We do not approve any longer of policies of non-intervention.

We can do some things to help and I think we all welcome the positive steps the minister has outlined. Canada could also take other steps, such as providing a ship which could be used as a neutral site for discussions between Nigeria and Biafra. I notice that in his statement the minister referred to Biafra as the secessionist area. Calling it Biafra is better, I think, since we are all used to the name. We could also press more vigorously for the establishment of an agency of the United Nations which could provide formal relief to areas afflicted by civil as well as international strife. We are lucky now to live in a world in which people are increasingly willing to cross boundaries,—boundaries which are artificial, anyway,—and see that aid is given to people on the other sides of those boundaries.

The heading of the most powerful editorial on this subject I have so far read, contained in the London *Times* of June 28, 1969, is, "A policy of famine". The editorial says in part:

> It is the principle of dissociation of sensibility—out of sight out of mind—which permits the most evil things to be done by quite ordinary men.

I think a good many ordinary men of the world ought to be accused of this "dissociation". Arms supplied so cynically by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, France, have only served to make a terrible situation worse. I hope that in making this announcement the Canadian government is at last showing evidence of willingness to pursue a policy of supplying food and medicines to a distressed area now cut off by a government that feels starvation is an acceptable part of war.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I warmly welcome the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We understand that delicate negotiations are presently going on in an effort to obtain consent for daylight flights, which are essential if this matter is to be solved. In the face of what is an immense and grim human tragedy it would be wrong for us to speak in any but non-partisan tones.

I too would like to quote from the editorial in the London *Times* of June 28 to which the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) has already referred. This is the tone of the spirit we should all have. These words were directed to the government of the United Kingdom and I direct them to this government. "We should now devote all our diplomatic power, all the influence that remains and all the effort of the government to secure the effective relief in terms of food for Biafra at all costs and at once.

I welcome the fact that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) has indicated Canada's willingness to provide neutral inspectors. I think this is an important suggestion. I believe it was made to the minister by Canairelief, which has played such an important part in the relief of starvation in Biafra. I agree with the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) that Canada should offer to take the initiative in providing a neutral locality for the parties to negotiate face to face, which might relieve the atmosphere of suspicion which the long distance negotiations have produced.

The arrangement as to conditions for daylight flights can only be made if the parties are brought face to face in the presence of some party which is neutral and friendly to both sides. There are two other matters which must be considered. I hope in future this government will direct its assistance to aid, not only to the International Red Cross, which has done a terrific job, but also to the joint Churchaid of which Canairelief is a part. This has been the most successful and effective agency. It has been assisted by the United States government and I hope this government will do the same.

I hope too that this government will follow through on the invocation of the jurisdiction of the United Nations to deal collectively in the name of humanity with the humanitarian problems involved. I hope this government will express publicly, repeatedly and clearly its objection to the importation of arms from Europe or anywhere else by either of the warring factions.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note that the government seems to be doing all it can to relieve this grim and tragic situation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, while listening a while ago to the Secretary of State for External Affairs delivering to us a quite important message, it reminded me of another message which we must never forget: Peace on earth to men of good will!

The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to the facilities which Canada could

provide for the transport of food to Nigeria and Biafra and this is to the credit of all Canadians. I welcome the fact that the government is ready to provide the neutral inspectors needed in order to organize those relief flights.

Canada must do its best to help those who are suffering, because not only do we have food in abundance but we have surplusses, so we are told. Therefore, while helping those who are suffering, Canadians will be able, through their work, to make a greater contribution to peace in order to alleviate world suffering.

I really hope we shall find proper ways to organize those relief flights as soon as possible. Some were found during the war, for the transport of all kinds of weapons. So I hope that we, who are enjoying peace, will do all we can to help those unfortunate people who do not want war and who are the victims of war. This way, we shall contribute to the establishment of true peace in the world.

[*English*]

• (2:20 p.m.)

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO CONSULT NATIVE PEOPLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the failure of the government to have consulted the native Indian people in Canada in the development of its policy statement on Indian Affairs presented to this house on June 25, the almost universal rejection of this policy statement by Indian people, the growing discontent among Indian people over the manner in which the government has treated them both with respect to the policy statement and in general terms, the refusal of the government so far to indicate it is prepared to enshrine in the constitution those aboriginal and hereditary rights arising out of the treaties, and the similar rights relating to land, resources and the like in areas where no treaties exist, the general refusal of the government to enter into meaningful discussions with the native peoples of Canada over such rights and inheritances, and the attendant possible turbulence and fury which may follow from the aforementioned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) gave the Chair the necessary notice pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 26 and I have had an opportunity to study his proposal at length and in depth.

There is no doubt but that the question raised by the hon. member's proposed motion is one of importance; indeed it is one which I am sure is of deep and continuing interest to all hon. members of the house. However this is not the only consideration which the Chair has to take into account in making a ruling at this point. The Speaker has to determine whether under the terms of Standing Order 26 the house should be adjourned for the purpose of a debate on the subject matter dealt with in the hon. member's motion.

I have suggested before that Standing Order 26 requires a statement of the problem and that hon. members should not attempt to argue the case for or against the adjournment of the house. It is a bit difficult to determine in the hon. member's motion what is the statement of the matter requiring urgent consideration and what might be considered argument in support of his proposal for the adjournment of the house.

The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has based his motion on what he terms, and I quote from his statement to the house

> —the failure of the government to have consulted the native Indian people of Canada in the development of its policy statement on Indian affairs presented to this house on June 25.

This statement is accompanied by a number of additional statements which might well be interpreted as debate or argument. In any event my understanding or interpretation of the hon. member's motion is that he calls into question the failure or alleged failure of the government to hold consultations with the Indian people of Canada in the development of the policy announced on June 25 last. Essentially the hon. member's complaint deals with matters of record which are already some weeks old. I have serious doubts as to whether the debate today could correct a situation which occurred before June 25.

According to my interpretation of Standing Order 26 and my understanding of the motion proposed by the hon. member, it is not open to the Chair to agree to the adjournment of the house at this time under the provisions of that standing order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I intend to do this, anyway; but I give Your Honour notice of my desire to rewrite the motion in accordance with your prescription and present it again tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Before the next item of business is called I might add that notice of a proposed motion was received over the signature of the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Peddle). It is my understanding the proposed motion was not submitted for the consideration of the Chair within the time limit prescribed by the rules. I wonder whether tomorrow or on some other occasion the hon. member might not consider the advisability of giving the necessary notice as required by the rule.

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would it be in order for me to ask the unanimous consent of the house to hear the motion.

Mr. Speaker: It is always in order—

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is always in order for the hon. member to seek the unanimous consent of the house. However, there is at least one nay coming from the house.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALBERTA—CONSIDERATION OF POLICY PRECEDING FEDERAL ACCESS TO LANDS—GUARANTEE OF HEREDITARY RIGHTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development what action he proposes to take in light of the decision of the Indian Association of Alberta to instruct the Indian people in that province not to talk to federal officials and if necessary forcibly to exclude federal officials from Indian lands until there is time to consider the new policy statement made by the minister and to consider it in depth.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take any particular decision, and in that sense, I have already announced that policy. I also stated that I intended to meet with the provincial premiers and the leaders of the various Indian associations, and if they wish to talk with me, I will be glad to oblige. However, if they are not prepared to do so at this time, and that is their privilege, we intend to enter in the next few months into numerous consultations with the Indians, and we do not intend to change that policy of consultation.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Is the special unit which was created within the department to discuss the minister's statement with the Indian people now in the field and, if so, will the minister recall it or instruct it to take into consideration the view of the Indian people that they need a fair chance to consider the implications of the minister's proposals before an attempt is made to involve them in discussions?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the body concerned is not yet in operation to meet the various Indian bands in Canada. I think it is very wise, on the part of the Indians, to take a few months to consider that policy and I am sure that after it has been studied for a while, they will see that in the best interest of all Canadians, their own interest included, there is no discriminatory legislation in this country.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: I have one supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In view of the attempted motion by the hon. member for Skeena under Standing Order 26, perhaps he might be allowed a supplementary question at this point.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): It is very kind of you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the translation system did not clearly reflect what the minister said, but I understood him to say in response to the first question of the Leader of the Opposition that the government had no intention of changing its policy. Would the minister clarify that first?

Mr. Chrétien: I said the government did not intend to change the policy of consulting the Indians.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question in a supplemental way. Would the right hon. gentleman be prepared to make a statement on behalf of the government indicating that the government is prepared to set out in the constitution those guarantees necessarily related to hereditary and aboriginal rights of the native Indian people, which appear to be a prerequisite to any meaningful consultation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the statement issued by the minister some weeks ago, I seem to recall, had the approval of all parties in the house. If there were comments they were just to the effect that we had not done quickly enough what for many years hon. members had asked us to do. It is also true to say that the minister had the authority of the government, and on the question of aboriginal rights the government stands by the statement.

FUNDS TO PERMIT STUDIES BY NATIVE PEOPLE—MEETING BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he has reached any decision in respect of making any grants of funds to the appropriate national committee of the Indian peoples to enable it to conduct the studies they consider necessary to determine their position, and to get the necessary professional advice to put them in a position where they can form appropriate opinions about this proposal or others they may suggest as an alternative?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, it was clearly indicated in the Indian policy statement that as soon as the ombudsman is appointed, he will be empowered by the government to provide the committee on Indian rights and treaties with the necessary funds to undertake its own research.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Am I to understand from what the minister has said that he is refusing to make any grants to assist the Indian people in order that they may determine their stance or attitude in respect of their total position vis-à-vis the federal government and the country?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: No, Mr. Speaker. I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is confusing the two organizations. I was just speaking about the committee appointed by the Indians themselves in April to study Indian rights and treaties. The funds to be provided to that committee will be granted through the ombudsman who is to be appointed for that purpose.

In regard to the financing of the Indian organizations, provincial as well as national. I hope to be able to announce a decision soon.

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

Is the minister in a position to tell us whether official meetings have been held between officials of his department and those of the provincial governments concerned and, if so, will the report of those official meetings be published or made available in some way or other for the guidance of the members of this house?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I have undertaken to visit the provinces. During those visits I meet with the premiers and the leaders of Indian associations who wish to see me and I explain to them our policy with regard to Indians. To date, I have visited two provinces, Ontario and Saskatchewan, and tomorrow I will be in Nova Scotia, I hope to be in British Columbia early next week.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a further supplementary question.

If I understand the remarks made by the minister, he is now conferring with provincial governments and Indian associations, and making policy statements. Do those policy statements include negotiations with the provincial governments and Indian associations?

Mr. Chrétien: No, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet reached the stage of negotiations on matters of policy. This trip is merely for educational purposes. In fact, I answer the questions put by the premiers and their ministers as well as by the Indian chiefs whom I meet.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR PRIOR SETTLEMENT OF TITLE AND TREATY RIGHTS—FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY PENDING POSSIBLE COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary, a related or a new question, whichever you like, for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the fact that the difficulties which have arisen in respect of the statement of June 25 appear to relate to the

fears of the Indians about their lands, and similar rights which will go down the drain once the policy of getting rid of the discriminatory laws is implemented through provincial action, can the minister state to this house and thereby assure the Indians of Canada that the problems in respect of their title to land, as well as related treaty and other rights will be settled before they are handed over to the provinces?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Indian lands, we have stated that we intended to submit a legislation in this regard, and, as for the observance of the treaties, the government has repeatedly stated that it would respect them.

In order to clarify the situation and help the government and the Indians to understand the exact nature of the treaties, we intend to appoint a commissioner who, together with the Indians, will study the nature and the scope of the treaties that were signed with the native peoples of our country.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I know perfectly well, as do all other hon. members, about the intended appointment of a commissioner to study the laws, treaties and so on. May I ask the minister that, in order to make sure the consultations with the Indians are on a proper basis and that there is no fear on their behalf in respect of the consultations, he will give the Indians the assurance that nothing will be done to remove federal responsibility until such time as the issue of their rights under treaty is definitely disposed of?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the question is not to take away anything from the Indians. We wish to assure them that they are to become full citizens not only at the national but also at the provincial level, and the idea is not at all to deprive them of any services they may enjoy at the present time.

For instance some provincial governments provide them with various services in the fields of education and welfare and we only wish that the process be speeded up in future.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: I have a further short supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the commissioner's investigation is likely to be very lengthy and that it might even result in some approach to the court or courts, is the minister in a position to assure the Indians that until that issue is settled the federal parliament and the federal government will remain the authority responsible for their welfare?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, let me make this quite clear. The Indian Act is a federal law and it will not be amended until the government has passed a new legislation to protect the rights of Indians to their lands.

We told the Indians that we intend to respect their treaties. It is obvious that by giving them such an assurance, we do not intend to hand over their lands to the provincial governments or to disregard the treaties. Furthermore, Indians will be reassured and ready to take the place which belongs to them in Canadian society, as provincial citizens.

CONSIDERATION OF NEW LEGISLATION BY COMMITTEE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, since the legislation respecting Indian lands is a federal statute, could the minister indicate when he thinks his new legislative proposal in that regard will be introduced in the House of Commons?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we announced our intention to submit this policy to the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. As soon as the house reconvenes in the fall, I hope to be able to refer it to the committee.

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

VERIGIN, SASK.—ALLEGED UNDUE SURVEILLANCE OF DOUKHOBOR CELEBRATION

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General, but in his absence I will direct it to the Minister of Justice. In view of the orderly and quiet celebration by the Doukhobor sect in Verigin, Saskatchewan, of the 70th anniversary of the sect's arrival in Canada, will the minister inform the house why there was an excessive number of R.C.M.P. officers present?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe that question should be considered at the time of adjournment.

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON STATUS OF PROGRAMMING FUNCTION

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Secretary of State and preface it by saying it has nothing to do with asking for an amendment to the act establishing the Company of Young Canadians. In light of the elections now in progress to establish a permanent council of the Company of Young Canadians, will the minister say whether anything is being done to alter the original intention or structure of the Company of Young Canadians before the permanent council has been elected and has met, and in particular will he report to the house upon the status of the program department of the company?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the statement the hon. member is asking for at this time should normally be made on motions. Perhaps the hon. member might invite the minister to make such a statement on motions.

Mr. Schumacher: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister whether he would be prepared to make a statement at an early opportunity before these elections have been completed. If necessary, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the house for the minister to make a statement at this time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister the unanimous agreement of the house to return to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there are slight objections to the hon. member's proposition.

Mr. Baldwin: We will remember this: No dialogue.

GRAIN

INFORMATION ON I.G.A. WASHINGTON DISCUSSIONS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received any information concerning the discussions on the international grains arrangement now taking place in Washington?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. The two ministers concerned are down there representing the interests of the grain producers. I have no report as yet.

Mr. Skoberg: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Prime Minister assure the house that there will be a full statement on motions immediately upon the return of the two ministers?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

INDIAN AFFAIRS—AMENDMENT TRANSFERRING POWER TO LEGISLATURES

Mr. J. E. Brown (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Could the Prime Minister advise the house whether it is the policy of the government to arrange with the provinces to amend the British North America Act by deleting therefrom section 91, subsection 24, so that all legislation affecting Indians in Canada will henceforth come within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures rather than of parliament?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is no; it is in no way our intention. If the hon. member wants to ask for supplementary explanations, perhaps he could address them to the minister who speaks for the government on Indian affairs.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

KENNEDY ROUND—PASSING ON OF LOWER PRICES TO CONSUMERS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Now, shall we start again?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: That's a lot better. Has the minister's department completed setting up the machinery necessary to require importers to pass along to consumers in their entirety the tariff reductions which were introduced in the budget of June 3? If so, how effective has

this move proved to be in achieving this desirable end?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I outlined the position of the department in a speech I made in the house some two weeks ago.

Mr. Hees: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have read the minister's speech word for word and there is not in it one word dealing with the matter about which I have asked. As I have said before, there is not in that speech one word answering my question. The minister has said he is setting up this machinery. I ask him a straightforward question: Has that machinery been set up? Would he honour his obligation as a minister in this house and answer the question yes or no?

Mr. Basford: I said I would consider the matter, Mr. Speaker, and this situation was dealt with carefully in the speech I made.

Mr. Hees: Has the minister's department completed setting up that machinery or is it in the process of setting it up; and if so, when does he expect it will be set up? This matter is not dealt with in the minister's speech.

Mr. Basford: I have completed my consideration of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister insists on making statements which have no basis whatsoever in fact, and is deceiving the house.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

FISHERIES

D.D.T. IN GREAT LAKES—CONDITION OF CATCH

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the alarming d.d.t. levels found in fish in Lake Michigan, will the minister state if this condition exists in fish taken from Canadian waters?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I made some inquiries through our departmental officials about d.d.t. levels in fish caught in the Great Lakes. I am told that the samples tested are well below the level of five parts per million, accepted by the United States Food and Drug Directorate. In practically all instances the residue has been less than two parts per million, and on the average less than one part per million.

[Mr. Hees.]

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

RESIGNATION OF MR. DOUGLAS FULLERTON, CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I ask whether Mr. Douglas Fullerton indicated to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, either in writing or verbally, the reason for resigning from his position.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, he expressed his reasons in writing. I have had no verbal communication with the gentleman for a long, long while. The reason he gave in the letter tendering his official resignation was that he was resigning for personal reasons.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would be so kind as to table the letter of resignation.

Mr. Trudeau: I will check whether this is the practice, Mr. Speaker, and if it is usual I will do so. But I remember that the letter stated quite clearly that it was for personal reasons. If the house doubts my word, hon. members can always check with Mr. Fullerton. There was no pressure of any kind by the government on Mr. Fullerton to resign. We received a letter to that effect.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the right hon. gentleman how soon he expects to fill this most important position.

Mr. Trudeau: I would have to defer to the minister responsible for this agency to answer that question.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Then may I direct my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): As soon as we find someone as competent and effective as Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Referring to this question, yesterday I asked the minister

responsible to assure us that the discrimination against the Cape Breton miners would cease. I would point to *Hansard* to verify that the minister accepts the statement that discrimination has been practised. I ask the Prime Minister whether when choosing a replacement for Mr. Fullerton he will assure that whoever takes over as chairman of the Devco board will stop the discrimination carried on against Cape Breton miners, as indicated by the minister yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising from the answer I got from the minister yesterday. I would call the attention of the Prime Minister, and his just society, to answers given to me by the minister. In answering my question about discrimination, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion said:

> Mr. Speaker, there is no discrimination at all in respect of these plans.

A further question brought this answer from the minister:

> These are isolated cases.

This is a definite indication that the minister recognizes there is discrimination against the Cape Breton miners, and I would ask the Prime Minister and his just society to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is now making a representation, and he has to assume that it will be taken into consideration.

DRUGS

ALLEGED INEFFECTIVENESS OF PRESCRIPTION PRODUCT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Given the similarity of drug production in Canada and the United States, could the minister indicate to the house whether his department is investigating the results of the study released yesterday, prepared for the United States Food and Drug Directorate, which showed that large numbers of prescription drugs were ineffective; and if so, would he make a statement on motions regarding what action his department will be taking?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will agree that his question is acceptable only in the sense that he is asking whether the minister will make a statement on motions. To that extent the question is in order.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I shall be glad to consider making a statement.

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—POSSIBILITY OF MINISTERIAL INTERVENTION

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): My question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Is the Parliamentary Secretary in a position to inform the house whether in view of the increasingly serious nature of the telephone strike in British Columbia any action by the Minister of Labour is anticipated in the next 24 hours to assist both sides to reach an agreement?

Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): There has been no official request for federal intervention, but I can assure both parties in this dispute that if such a request is forthcoming we are ready to render assistance at any time. The house may not be surprised to learn that the Minister of Labour, who is in the west on official business at the present time, may be in informal contact with either or both of the parties.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY AS TO SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I have a question to address to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Mr. Speaker. It arises out of a statement the minister made in this house on March 25 in which he said his department was considering a government program this summer to assist students, not merely to obtain jobs but also to obtain jobs which would have a socially meaningful content. I should like to ask the minister whether such a program has been initiated and, if so, how many students are now involved in it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): As I recollect, I was referring to a long term consideration presently under way with respect to a possible program of this nature in a future year. It is not proposed to introduce a program of this kind during the present year, but it is one of the alternatives now under consideration.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister undertake to make a statement in this house on the programs which the department does have with respect to student employment this year?

Mr. MacEachen: I will undertake to make a progress report which will be available to the house, either by tabling it or by making it orally.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): When the minister makes that statement will he give this house the best information the department has on the extent of employment among university and high school students?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to outline the situation which is facing the country in respect of this matter.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

MILK—ISSUE OF SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, could his parliamentary secretary tell us whether the cheques for the adjustment of subsidies to the producers of manufactured milk for the 1968-69 dairy year have been sent, and if so, when?

If you allow me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a further question. Has the subsidy for April and May been paid and if so, when were the cheques mailed?

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I know that the cheques will be issued from July 15 to the end of July, but since there are over 256,000 milk producers, some delays might occur. Starting July 15, we will start forwarding cheques to farmers.

Mr. Lambert: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The parliamentary secretary answered insofar as the subsidies for April and May are concerned, but in connection with the adjustment for the 1968-69 dairy year, many producers have complained, that is at least what they told me, that they had not received anything as yet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Côté: Mr. Speaker, I answer again in the same fashion. Some have not received any cheques, because their production was equal to the average production of the year. As to those who are entitled to subsidies, they will begin receiving them as of July 15.

[*English*]

FINANCE

IMPOSITION OF RESTRICTIONS WITHOUT REGARD FOR ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): I wish to address my question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance. In the light of the disclosure by the Bank of Canada that the chartered banks are rapidly reducing their lending, and that loans were off by $20 million in one week alone, does the government intend to impose this tight money situation on all the regions of Canada equally, regardless of the economic conditions which face them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I believe the Minister of Finance has commented on this aspect and indicated what he hopes the banks will do. He will be in the house tomorrow if the hon. member wishes to ask him a question.

GRAIN

ADDITION TO FUTURE DELIVERIES OF SHORTFALL IN QUOTAS

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): My question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt. Will those grain producers who undoubtedly will not be able to deliver their 5-bushel quotas by July 31 be permitted to add their shortfall to the 1969-70 deliveries?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce has been in constant touch with the Wheat Board and with the railways in connection with deliveries of grain in order that quotas may be equalized, and the latest report is that the Wheat Board is still hopeful that the objective of equalizing delivery quotas at five bushels will be attained. The board has indicated that the railways are co-operating—and the minister himself was given their assurance—to do whatever is physically possible.

PEACE RIVER AREA—BOX CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Would the minister make enquiries of the railroad companies and the Wheat Board to see what

can be done to improve the position of farmers in the Peace River area who have five or six million bushels of feed grain to sell, for which there is a market in Canada but for which no box cars seem likely to be provided at the present time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The indication I gave that the Wheat Board is hopeful of equalizing quotas applies to the Peace River district as well as to other parts of the country.

TRADE

WHEAT—EFFECT ON SALES OF STRIKE OF VANCOUVER LONGSHOREMEN

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Is the threat of a longshoremen's strike at Vancouver having a detrimental effect on wheat sales via the west coast?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): I have no report on any such effect as yet. I think it would not have such an effect at the moment, but I will be glad to look into this question further.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I had a question for the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. In his absence perhaps I can direct it to the Minister of Justice. Would the minister consult his colleague the Solicitor General, and perhaps Your Honour, with a view to making arrangements to supply a protective service of the R.C.M.P. to members of the Press Gallery?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF ADJUDICATION REPORTS ALLEGEDLY SUPPRESSED

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General, Mr. Speaker. Now that the minister, after his Sherlockian search, has obtained a copy of the reports of April 30 and May 15 by Chief Adjudicator Martin, will he take steps to have these documents tabled in this house and will he also give consideration to making a statement on motions concerning the plans he has in mind to improve the department's role in the consultative process?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): The tabling of the documents is not my responsibility, Mr. Speaker, but that of my colleague, the Minister of Supply and Services. With respect to the second part of the question, my officials met this morning in a preliminary meeting with officials of the Letter Carriers Union and meetings will continue. One is already scheduled for next week.

Some hon. Members: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Again, and this is the point at which I deliver my sermon, I feel very sincerely and deeply for hon. members who from the very start of the question period have been rising in an attempt to ask questions. When there are a number of supplementary questions, it becomes difficult for other hon. members to join the fray. The hon. member for Peace River has a supplementary question and perhaps we will allow him to ask it—

Mr. Baldwin: I will forgo it, Mr. Speaker. When I ask the President of the Privy Council about the business of the house I shall be able to introduce it as a related question.

FISHERIES

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.—LICENSING OF FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. In view of the adverse reaction on the part of municipal and port authorities of St. John's to the directive prohibiting the licensing of foreign trawlers on weekends and statutory holidays, will the minister pay regard to the importance of this matter and reconsider the order?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We are reconsidering the order in the sense that we may be granting licences for a longer period of time. I want to assure the hon. member that every consideration is being given to applications made during normal working hours. We are, however, thinking of extending the term of the permit itself.

HALIBUT TREATY—SEIZURE BY U.S. OF CANADIAN VESSEL "SHIRLEY ROSE"

Mr. Tom H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries. Has the Canadian halibut vessel *Shirley Rose* been seized illegally by the United States coast guard off west coast waters, and could the minister advise the house whether this international incident is an indication that the U.S. authorities are

no longer honouring the North Pacific Halibut Treaty?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, there is no question of the U.S. authorities seizing Canadian vessels. Indeed the United States fish and wildlife authorities have reaffirmed that Canadians can fish in U.S. waters, just as Americans can fish in Canadian waters. The U.S. coast guard captain in question today reported that he did not order this vessel to leave the United States 12-mile zone, and this conflicts with the story given by the captain of the *Shirley Rose* that that was indeed the case.

NATIONAL PARKS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—AGREEMENT RESPECTING FIRST PARK ON PACIFIC COAST

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development; he will be relieved to know that it relates to an area of his responsibilities different from that about which he was questioned earlier. I should like to ask whether the department is any closer to establishing the first national park on the Pacific coast of Canada than it was when I asked him about this subject on an earlier occasion.

Mr. Speaker: That question should be placed on the order paper.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

FAILURE TO REPORT DEBATE ON PROCEDURE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Would the hon. gentleman inquire of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation whether it is their policy to ignore the current debate in this chamber?

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED REVISION OF DAIRY POLICY

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put my question yesterday to the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence, I saw fit to wait until today. However, because of his absence and of the importance of the question, since it follows from the motion I moved yesterday for the adjournment of the house, I shall then put it to the Prime Minister.

[Mr. Goode.]

In view of the fact that the net income of dairy producers was 8.7 per cent lower than that of the least prosperous year since 1961, and in view of the urgency of the situation, is the Prime Minister ready to tell us whether he intends to recommend to the Canadian Dairy Commission, through the Minister of Agriculture, to review that policy for the benefit of Canadian and Quebec dairy producers?

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, since that question should have been put to the Minister of Agriculture, with your leave, I shall take it as notice. Then the hon. member for Lotbinière would know that the Minister of Agriculture has a parliamentary secretary.

Before referring this question to the minister, may I ask the hon. mmeber for Lotbinière where he obtained his statistics pertaining to the percentage he has just quoted?

[*English*]

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, although time is running out I did have a question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lotbinière is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have been happy to direct my question to the parliamentary secretary of the Minister of Agriculture but I did not know there was one, since this is the first time that we hear him speak on behalf of the minister.

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED ADDITIONS TO ONTARIO JUDICIARY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Justice. In view of the urgent and very serious situation that is now existing in the province of Ontario as a result of the backlog of civil and divorce cases, I wonder whether the minister is in a position to advise the house when he expects to appoint additional Supreme Court justices to handle the backlog.

An hon. Member: What about Blair?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I regret to tell the hon. member that there are no vacancies at the moment. Any request for new apointments must come from the Attorney General of Ontario. Then of course in the judges bill that appears on the order paper once a year, parliament provides for the salaries and expenses of these judges. But until I receive a request from the Attorney General of Ontario I cannot satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. Alexander: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ANXIETY RESPECTING DELIVERY OF CHRISTMAS MAIL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Communications in his capacity as Postmaster General. In view of the advice that appeared in a Toronto paper a few days ago to the effect that people should mail their Christmas cards now if they want them delivered on time—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): — may I ask the minister whether he will confirm this advice, or is there a danger that by the time Christmas comes we might not have home delivery any more?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

SPORTS

TROTTING RACES—REFUSAL TO LICENSE LADY DRIVERS

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. Would he ask the minister to investigate whether or not Rule 17, section 1, of the Canadian Trotting Association rules and regulations, 1969, is contrary to the Bill of Rights, in that it declares the association's refusal to license lady drivers for extended meets who have not previously held such a licence—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NEWSPRINT—INVESTIGATION INTO PRICING POLICIES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the intended investigation by the United States department of justice into the United States paper industry and the notification that was sent to United States branches of Canadian firms, and also in view of the fact that the investigation may have been set off by a statement by the Canadian companies in connection with an intended newsprint price increase in early 1970, is it the intention of the minister to conduct an investigation into the pricing policies and conduct of these Canadian companies?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member's question refers to the investigation that was launched before the grand jury of New York into the paper industry. We were advised some time ago on a confidential basis, pursuant to the Fulton-Rogers agreement, that this action was being taken. We have been advised that it does not involve any Canadian companies except one, Kamloops Pulp and Paper, which was served with a subpoena in error.

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. The Minister may take it as notice and give a full reply at a later date. Can the minister state whether the government is following a policy of increasing immigration, and what means are being employed to encourage people to come here in greater numbers?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member will agree that what he is inviting the minister to do is to make a statement on motions. Perhaps the minister might like to make a brief reply.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will consider some method of getting the information to the hon. member.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING QUOTA ON CANADIAN EMIGRATION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. My question has to do, not with immigration but with emigration. In the recent talks in Washington last week with the minister's counterparts, was any formal protest made by the Canadian government to the United States government over the quota system imposed by the United States authorities last July which, in effect, through a quota on immigrants from the western hemisphere, militates also against prospective Canadian emigrés to the United States?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we had a long discussion with the United States authorities and the two governments are establishing a committee to examine the best means of improving the situation.

Mr. Nowlan: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that the question period expired some minutes ago. I did allow the hon. member a supplementary, and I tried previously to allow as many members as possible to participate in the question period. This is why I did not permit supplementaries that might have been allowed in other circumstances. Under the circumstances I would think that supplementaries might be asked again tomorrow. I will again attempt tomorrow to give priority to hon. members who did not have the opportunity of being recognized today.

• (3:10 p.m.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I invite the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to outline in some detail the business of the house for the rest of this month and next month. Could he also give some indication of whether the government is to give some effect to the suggestion of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), which was that the report of the chief adjudicator, Mr. Martin, be referred to the appropriate standing committee of the house.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is the government's intention to proceed with government order No. 99. How long that is to be proceeded with will depend of course on how long the hon. member and his colleagues, to use the words of the *Globe and Mail*, maintain the filibuster they have begun. As for the suggestion of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), we have concluded that it will not be particularly helpful to make that reference at this time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has said that the government intends to proceed with item 99 on the order paper, does that mean that it is calling the government motion and that it will not proceed with the motion that is in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair)?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. For once the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is right. Item No. 99 was stood and we shall be proceeding with item No. 100.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, July 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I indicated in the early part of my remarks yesterday that many of us feel available evidence points to the fact that the government has deliberately set out on a course of downgrading parliament and wishes to institute in this country what in effect will be a presidential system of government similar to that of France or the United States. I will support my contention by giving examples in a positive and not in the negative way as is the usual course followed in discussions like this.

One indication that the government seeks to downgrade parliament is to be seen in the enormous increase in the number of assistant secretaries in the Privy Council office and on

the Prime Minister's staff. Apparently they are usurping to a considerable degree the functions of the ministers who are responsible for the administration of the various government departments. This is one of the positive indications pointing to the truth of my contention. In the next few moments I shall deal with some of the more negative aspects of this trend.

There is ample evidence to show that in the year the government has been in office it has embarked on a policy of replacing the parliament of this country by what in effect is tantamount to a form of presidential government. All these innovations intended to downgrade parliament have been introduced as being beneficial and in the interest of updating parliament. These new ideas have been introduced in almost soporific terms, and it is clear that proposed rule 75c is one more nail in the coffin of parliament. Viewed in relation to all the other actions of the government to which I have alluded, it becomes clear that with respect to proposed rule 75c we cannot accept the assurances of the minister or the government.

As the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said a few moments ago, the *Globe and Mail*, one of this country's leading newspapers, has alluded to the fact that a filibuster is going on. That newspaper does not trust the motives of the government or the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). Many of us here do not trust the government or the house leader, especially in view of what has taken place during the last year. Let me give some examples, Mr. Speaker.

First, let us consider the committee system. When the new committee system was set up it was said that it was a great step forward. Members of parliament were going to become specialists in fields they were interested in—agriculture, defence, transport, foreign affairs, health and welfare, and so on. All sorts of latitude was to be given to committees in calling evidence and witnesses. The committees were to be non-partisan and independent; they were to take over certain functions of the house with respect to the study of estimates and consideration of bills. It all sounded very fine and some of us thought the millenium had arrived.

Let us look at what happened, Mr. Speaker. First let us consider what happened with respect to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, it being probably one of the most notorious of our committees at the present time. I need not repeat to hon. members what took place in that committee last fall except to allude to the fact that there are allegations before the house and before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to the effect that the government house leader tampered and meddled with that committee's report by leaving out recommendations made by the majority of that committee. There have been other developments which led to the replacement of the committee chairman by another member of the government party. Only recently it appears that someone on the government side has been playing checkers with the members of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. It seems that some government supporters who apparently did not agree with their colleagues were replaced, apparently without their consent and without being given notice.

Some hon. members may think I am making this up. Only this morning, in a meeting of that committee, one of the government's parliamentary secretaries brought up this matter himself. That is how serious it has become. It will be remembered that at great expense to the public purse that committee, with its staff of translators and others, was sent to the Atlantic provinces for several weeks to study the quite unique transport problems of that part of Canada. I can safely say, Mr. Speaker, that all members of that committee worked hard for long hours. They heard dozens and dozens of long briefs on the subject of transportation difficulties in the Atlantic provinces. The trip had one beneficial effect. It provided a very useful education to those members who went on the trip, albeit a very expensive education from the standpoint of the Canadian taxpayers. That trip certainly accomplished nothing else. Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? Because, having sent the committee to the maritimes to hear representations on matters like the Prince Edward Island causeway, a subject of considerable discussion over the years, and other matters, the government went merrily ahead before the committee had even returned to Ottawa with a decision in this area. In fact, it did so before the committee members had even time to write their report.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nesbitt: Another example is the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I am not a member of that committee but I have discussed this matter with my colleagues the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) and other members of that committee. Appar-

ently the members of that committee travelled all over Canada, making appearances, asking questions and studying important agricultural matters. Again, the members of the committee derived great educational benefits from their travels at the expense of the taxpayers. Apparently the chairman of the committee, a government supporter of course, presented a report which had little relation to anything the members of the committee had been doing.

Then there is the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs which is studying the question of tobacco and the alleged evil effects of smoking, as well as other interesting matters. Now that the minister has made known his determination to dispense with the tobacco industry, perhaps he might apply his attention to other industries whose activites may have an effect on health. Although committee members were studying the subject of tobacco and smoking, the Minister of National Health and Welfare disregarded the opinions of members of that committee and announced what the government intended to do.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence is a thoroughly good example. The government said it wanted to review foreign policy, what Canada's role should be with regard to the United Nations, peace-keeping, and other fields. The 30 members of that committee, with a staff of translators and others, were sent to Cyprus, Germany, Sweden—to find out what the neutrals are doing—Switzerland, Britain and France. You name it—we went there. The committee spent long hours on the road. It spent a long time in drawing up a report and—you have guessed it, Mr. Speaker—the government did not pay the slightest attention to that report. Of course, just because a lot of hard work has gone into the preparation of a report does not mean that the government is obliged to pay attention to it. Nevertheless, after all the talk about participatory democracy and how individual members were going to work and contribute so much toward participatory democracy, this apparently is the result at the end of the first year of the government's term of office. I do not think these actions show that the government is particularly good or particularly convincing, but they certainly show that we cannot put great weight on what government supporters say.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The committees were to be non-partisan. They were to study matters carefully and make independent recommendations. Some of us who have been here a while and know how government parties operate had some misgivings whether that would be done. Despite the fact there was a new leader and many new members, some of us felt that the old tendencies would linger on, and they did.

All committee chairmen except one are government appointees and the government has control of all the committees so far as membership is concerned. That certainly has always been the custom. Under the old parliamentary scheme that was quite proper, but we were going to have a new sort of committee system, openly copied from the United States, with committees having some independence. It has not worked out this way at all. While chairmen of committees are supposed to be analogous to Your Honour, I do not think all the chairmen have the experience and other attributes found in Your Honour.

Sometimes we have had difficulties in getting the work done in committees. On some occasions government members have shown some independence, to their eternal credit. One instance was in the defence committee. There was a lot of arm-twisting in that committee but despite that a great number of government members maintained their independence, with the result that the committee report was ignored. When government members of the transport committee did not agree with their colleagues—I would hesitate to allude to this except that a senior member of the government raised the matter this morning—one would have thought a game of checkers was being played. They were removed from the committee and other members were substituted. One can hardly expect the committee system to operate satisfactorily in this way.

The government made pious pronouncements at the start of the year that the committees were going to be independent and about all they were going to do. Then they treat them in this way. It is no wonder the people have very grave doubts about equally pious statements by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) as to the purpose of rule 75c.

I could spend the balance of my time giving other examples. I cannot help but lack confidence in the promises of the government. Take the roster system, for example. This is one more way to downgrade parliament. Without consulting anyone, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said it would make parliament more efficient. Certain ministers were to

appear only on certain days as they had work to do in their offices and questions were to be asked on the days they were present in the house. This had some logic to it. But what are the parliamentary secretaries for? They should be in the house when the ministers are not. On one occasion when someone wanted to ask a question of a parliamentary secretary, he was told that the parliamentary secretary was to be seen and not heard, just like a bad child. The whole purpose despite the reason given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), was to down-grade parliament and prevent questions being asked.

There are many other matters, one or two of which I have already alluded to. I try not to be repetitious. Having been a member of the house for quite some time, I have noticed various things over the years. In the last few years some ill feeling has been engendered in parliament as a whole. I think hon. members will agree this has certainly prevented the satisfactory working of parliament. You can have all the rules you want, but if people are not disposed to co-operate there are always means of evading the rules. No one knows of these attempts better than Your Honour.

There has to be a feeling of good will and mutual co-operation. Without that parliament simply cannot work. This parliament started off on the right foot. There were a number of new personalities in high places and 100-odd new members untainted by some of the activities and prejudices of the past. The picture looked pretty good. In some of the committees there were many new members from both sides of the house. Unquestionably they tried to get along and to be non-partisan. Their attempts have been frustrated by some of the leaders on the government side.

It is a great pity that the government house leader (Mr. Macdonald), no doubt at the behest of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), is insisting on this rule being passed. Although the minister protests it is not very important, it is important enough to hold up the house for weeks in order to push it through. It is bad enough to attempt to cut off debate. I will not go into that because other members have discussed it on other occasions. But what is almost as bad is the fact that the atmosphere in the house is being soured by the activities of the government house leader (Mr. Macdonald). Once that is done, it cannot be undone. Once the atmosphere has been soured, members constantly eye each other with suspicion and no longer speak to each other in the corridors.

We have had a good many difficulties in making the committee system work, but generally speaking there has been considerable co-operation in the house during the present session, perhaps better than in any other parliament since I have been here. Despite some difficulties in the committees, members try to work on a friendly basis. If the present atmosphere in the house is soured much more, I think it will be a very safe prediction that it will not be easy to conduct the business of the house in the future, and certainly it will be more difficult in committees.

I feel the whole plan of the government is to downgrade this institution and to replace it *de facto* with some form of presidential government. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his two cohorts have indicated this is so. All the activities of the government in the present session of parliament have corroborated this evidence. I hope parliament will see fit to reject the attempt of the government house leader (Mr. Macdonald) to insist on forcing through rule 75c. As I have already said, such a rule would only be one more nail in the coffin of parliament, perhaps the last nail.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss an amendment to the recommendation contained in the report of the committee and, more specifically, to fight proposed rule 75c. We are ready to stay for the days and weeks that may be necessary to win this fight. Quite frankly, it is a matter of some regret to me that hon. members are compelled to stay here during a time when they could be doing something else. It is not quite as inconvenient for me and most of the ministers as it is for other members of the house. I have a home here, as have most of the ministers, but most of the other members do not. This situation is causing them not only a good deal of personal inconvenience but is preventing them from doing other things that urgently require their attention. I regret this, but we are dealing with a matter of the greatest importance and we must be prepared to fight just as long as is necessary.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Spokesmen for the government say that they need 75c in order to get through their legislative program. I say quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that 75c, even if adopted, would not enable or assist the government in getting through its legislative program. The government can get through a substantial legislative program only with the co-operation of the

house based on an allocation of time in turn based on agreement among the parties in the house. If the opposition does not co-operate, then whether 75c is in effect or not the government cannot hope to get through as much legislation in the next session as it did in this session.

It is a very simple thing for the opposition parties to use far more time than was taken this session on many measures that were before the house. I do not need to remind the house of how many opposition days, in the form of budget and other debates, the opposition parties gave up on the assumption that the government house leader (Mr. Macdonald) was acting in good faith and really intended to adjourn on June 26 or 27. We thought we were entitled to rely on his good faith, but I do not think any member of the house will ever do so again, at least on this side of the house.

I emphasize that it is only through co-operation of the parties in the house and allocation of time on that basis that the government can hope to get through a large legislative program. Proposed rule 75c would not enable the government to get through a large legislative program. It is nonsense for the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) or the chairman of the appropriate committee to suggest that it would. I would even go so far as to say it is almost dishonest for any experienced parliamentarian to suggest that 75c would help the government to get through a heavier legislative program than is the case under the existing rules.

It is true that 75c would enable the government to bull through a particular measure, a particular project or a particular bill, but it would not enable the government to get through a substantial program. It would enable it to bull through a particular measure despite the need there might be for debate, despite the need there might be for the country to have adequate time to familiarize itself with the contents of a bill.

Some suggestion has been made, though outside the house, that with modern means of communication there does not need to be as much time as previously for the country to become familiar with the contents of a bill before the house and to consider the measure. Sir, through you may I remind the house that when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) introduced his taxation measure relating to estates, despite the fact that a number of us immediately directed attention on two occasions in the house to the significance of that measure it was really a matter of months, certainly of weeks, before the country at large became aware of its significance, before the backbenchers on the government side became aware of its significance. It was only then that the country, the opposition and backbenchers on the government side persuaded the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to modify very substantially the proposal he was making to the house and therefore to the country. I mention this as an indication of the danger involved in 75c.

Proposed rule 75c will not do what the government suggests it would, even if this were desirable. It will not enable the government to bull through a large legislative program. It will simply enable the government to cut off debate on a particular measure when cutting off that debate would perhaps be the last thing that should happen.

The government now has the means for proposing closure to stop a protracted debate which it considers to have gone on for too long on a particular stage of a measure. It already has the ability and the right to impose closure. What the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is seeking is not power for the government to enact a bigger program but power to restrict the right of the opposition to examine particular projects. Rule 75c will do nothing to make the government more efficient. It will do a great deal to limit criticism when the government wishes to limit criticism and therefore limit freedom.

Rule 75c would not make parliament more efficient in handling the legislative program, but there is no doubt it would make closure more efficient with regard to particular measures. Closure as it now exists is noisy and messy. It is not the sort of thing that is done in Mount Royal today, at least not out in the open. Closure exists to choke off the right of the representatives of the people to express their opinions, and it has been accepted because it is recognized that on certain rare occasions there ought to be this control of parliament. But it has been accepted with a caveat, with the knowledge that a government which adopts such a procedure must be prepared to pay the price for using it. It has always been the case so far that if a government wants to choke off parliament it runs the risk of getting some blood on its hands.

This is what the government wants to change. It wants to make its control of parliament less messy and more automatic. It wants to throttle parliament in a more genteel way. Sir, if members of this government were directors of Murder Incorporated they would

insist on a silencer, just as today they are insisting on a quiet kind of closure, but we will not let them get away with it.

From personal discussions I know that a good many backbenchers on the government side, particularly newer members, are impatient with debate in this chamber. I would like to make three comments about that. Some members on the other side take the attitude that the government was elected in a general election, that it was given power for four years, given the authority of the people of Canada to settle everything and to govern for a period of four years. In their view, therefore, the government goes ahead and governs, and debate in the House of Commons is irrelevant. In effect the members opposite who hold this view—it is not held by all of them but by some—wish to scrap the parliamentary system of responsible government. It is just as simple as that. They may mean well but they are a menace to a free society.

Second, Mr. Speaker, some hon. members opposite are bored with the debates that take place in the house, partly because they cannot take part in them and partly because they feel they have not been involved by the government in any meaningful role in parliament. Therefore they are bored; therefore they are impatient with the time debate takes in the House of Commons. Through you, sir, I want to tell them that parliament was not designed for their convenience, was not really designed to provide entertainment or interest for them. The purpose of parliament, of this house, is to expose the proposals of the government to examination and debate and, where necessary, to criticism, to provide time for the public to become informed and to react to proposals the government is putting forward to be enacted into law.

• (3:40 p.m.)

To hon. members opposite who are impatient with debate in the house I say that proposed rule 75c will not accomplish what they want to be accomplished. Rule 75c will not in fact reduce the average length of debates in the house. It will enable the government to chop off some debates which it may be very important to have continued, but 75c will not enable the government to reduce the average length of debate. Indeed, if the government passes 75c and resorts to it the chances are this will provoke debate in the house on many occasions which would not otherwise be used for such debate. The only way the aim of increasing further the standard of debate in the house can be achieved, and the only way in which the effectiveness of the house can be further increased, is through co-operation and through the adoption of rules which carry the support of the house generally. Such rules were adopted last December.

I say with all sincerity that 75c will not accomplish the purposes of members opposite who are impatient with debate in the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I am afraid some hon. gentlemen opposite have been misled. Rule 75c should not be adopted, first, because it will not achieve the purposes some of the backbenchers have in mind. It will not achieve the purpose the President of the Privy Council says he has in mind of enabling the government to get through a bigger program. I do not think any experienced parliamentarian could really stand up in the house and say that the passage of 75c will in fact effectively enable the government to get through a bigger legislative program. All it will do will be to put the house on a collision course.

Hon. members opposite may have noticed an event which took place in the British House of Commons yesterday as a result of the application of the guillotine. I do not expect to be throwing things at the President of the Privy Council. I have too few things I would want to waste in that way. But this is the sort of thing which is provoked even in one of the most civilized parliaments in the world. Rule 75c will not do what the government is suggesting. It will simply cause a deterioration in the effectiveness of parliament.

Second, in any event the government has not shown the need really for getting more done. It has not shown the need for a drastic reform in this house of parliament in order to get any important program through the house. I would ask any hon. gentleman opposite what important program parliament has held up. One of the great problems in this country today is that of constitutional reform. Has parliament held up the progress of constitutional reform? We all know that parliament has been kept out of the discussions on constitutional reform because of the narrowly partisan attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) toward the question. Discussion has been going on for over a year and a half. What is there to show for it? Now that it appears that the Prime Minister and the government are to be involved in an imminent failure with regard to their consultations in

the constitutional area, there is some indication that parliament might be involved in a parliamentary committee on this subject. But what indication is there that parliament held up constitutional reform in this country? None, sir.

Another great problem is inflation. In what sense has parliament held up the fight, if you can call it a fight, of the government against inflation? I ask again, in what sense, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) took six months to set up a commission which was the only proposal the government had to fight inflation. In what sense has this parliament impeded in any way any measure the government had to attack inflation? None at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: We might take another problem, that of the economic disparity which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and others talk so much about. Has parliament held up the government's attack on economic disparity? It took the government a year to bring in its bill. How long did it take parliament to pass the bill when it was brought forward despite the vast powers the bill gave the minister? Parliament has not held up the government, sir.

Is parliament holding up the development of a sensible oil policy or a sensible agricultural policy? What about the attitude of the government toward Indian affairs? Has parliament held up the government? We were not even able to get a statement from the minister until two weeks ago and now we have no opportunity to debate it.

What about tax reform? I had not been long in the house in the fall of 1967 when the then Minister of Finance, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), solemnly assured the parliament of the day there would be a white paper on tax reform as near as possible to the beginning of 1968—January, 1968. Here we are in 1969. We were promised the white paper before parliament recessed. Now we are promised one some time during the summer. Has parliament held up tax reform?

What about the war against poverty? Well, I do not need to ask any more questions. There is only one answer. Parliament has not held up these things. The truth is that the government has not known what to do in order to adopt valid and effective programs. The government has had no idea how to proceed. It obviously has been abysmally slow in making decisions.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Let us take the prices and incomes commission. I ask whether there is anything in the history of parliament to equal it. Imagine taking six months to appoint a commission like that. Imagine taking a year and a half to produce a white paper on tax reform. They talk about parliament being slow. The evidence is that the government is hopelessly inadequate in making decisions and placing them before the house.

Then we might consider the Woods report on veterans affairs. Where is the white paper in respect of that? Is parliament holding up veterans affairs? Not at all. These fellows opposite are just trying to blame parliament for their own inadequacies. They will not get away with it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I say that this government ought not to be given further authority. It is abusing the rule changes already made to expedite the business of parliament. Formerly the government or a minister would have had to come clean. A minister would have had to give an explanation to the house because if he did not his estimates would never pass. I do not suggest that we go back to those days but at least we did carry out the process of enabling the representatives of the people to get straightforward answers from the minister. We cannot do that any more. These gentlemen are hiding behind the new rules day after day and week after week.

When we try to find out from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), for example, the present status of discussions between the federal government and the provinces with regard to the entrenchment of his bill of rights, a matter which he insisted all along was of the greatest importance to the country, he refuses to make a statement to the house. When that poor devil, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), comes back from a meeting of the NATO ministers and makes a statement in the house, it is clearly a non-statement. He does not say a word. A year ago he would never have had his estimates passed by the house on the basis of that kind of statement. It is very clear that the ministers have taken advantage of the changes which have been made. Just to get his attention and so he will not feel I am overlooking him, I am sure there has never been a more bullheaded government leader in the house than the present one. This is not just a matter of my opinion.

• (3:50 p.m.)

There are many independent observers in Canada who believe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the coterie around him are deliberately trying to downgrade parliament. Here we have the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) going out west and making a public statement about a legislative program relating to minimum wages; yet he had refused to give this information in the house. My colleague the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) asked time after time whether the government proposed to do anything about minimum wages. All we received were evasive answers or no answers at all. The Minister of Labour has shown his contempt for parliament by going out west and making an announcement on what the government proposes to do.

Rule 75c is the crowning glory of the first year of the just society. We must ask ourselves, is it not appropriate that this should be the year, and does it not really sum up brilliantly the style, the content and the record of this government in the first year of the just society? What could be more fitting than that this year should come to an end with those hon. gentlemen in the cabinet who have such a thirst for justice trying to get a firm grip on the throat of a minority parliamentary opposition? What could be more appropriate?

Behold the modern men who were going to make parliament and democracy mean something again, especially to the poor and the disadvantaged—literally millions of people in our Canadian society. Behold the politics of participation. Behold the government that excited the youth of Canada a year ago and has so disillusioned them since. Behold the just society—secretive, intolerant, vengeful, petulant, autocratic and childish.

The government probably feels it has to bring in 75c in the hope that it can blame parliament for its miserable record of accomplishment in its first year, so conspicuous for its under-achievement. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has blamed everybody else for the government's lack of action. He has blamed the provinces, he has hidden behind the constitution and he has whined about his treatment by the newspapers and the press. Indeed, Sir, the first session of Parliament with him as Prime Minister might well be described as being for him "the days of 'whine' and roses"—w-h-i-n-e.

What a dismal end to the first year of the just society—rule 75c! A year ago there were high hopes and expectations throughout this country. Now for a whole year, on some of the most pressing economic, social, political and international issues in face of truly gripping human problems at home and throughout the world, the Prime Minister of Canada has played intellectual games. In answer to questions on urgent human problems, whether posed in this house or elsewhere, he likes to argue about how many angels can stand on the head of a constitutional pin. And the most depressing spectacle of all is that of ministers of the Crown trying to emulate him and in the process performing acrobatics with their intellects and contortions with their principles.

These are grown men, some of whom once had a little fire in their souls and some convictions in their heads and in their voices. Now they are all kept on an intellectual leash by their leader, led into the house three times a week and led out again three days a week.

I am sorry the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) is not here because he comes to mind as a once formidable debater and an experienced parliamentarian. He was one of the most important members of the Pearson government from 1963 to 1968. He has not made a speech in the house on a government measure since last Christmas. Even then he was put up to erect a verbal smokescreen behind which the government quickly withdrew rule 16A. There is a rumour in Nova Scotia that the minister fell down a mineshaft seven months ago and has not been heard from since.

What comes from all this submissiveness and where does it lead to? I commend for the study of all members opposite, in fact all members of the house but especially the backbenchers on the government side, the case of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). I do not think it is putting it too strongly to say that up until Tuesday the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) was willing to use the hon. member and to see him destroyed as chairman of a committee and as a member of the house in order that the minister and the cabinet could get their own way. That is a fact. The minister cared nothing for the integrity, the reputation or even the pride of the chairman of the Committee on Procedure and Organization. Indeed, the handful of members opposite, some of whom waited on the President of the Privy Council, (Mr. Macdonald) perhaps in his office, on Tuesday morning should not think it was their entreaties that changed his mind. What changed his mind was that there was a motion coming from this side of the

house concerning the failure of the committee chairman to move concurrence in his report as he had been instructed to do. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) I am sure knew, or certainly should have anticipated, that such a motion was coming and that we would be prepared to discuss it for some time.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) withdrew the government order. Yes, he withdrew the government order standing in his name only because he wanted to keep 75c before the house, not because he cares one iota for the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) personally or as chairman of a committee, or for the committee system, for that matter. I ask any fair minded member opposite, especially those who saw the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in his office on Tuesday morning, if the government is so casually willing to see one of its prominent backbenchers destroyed and to contribute positively to his destruction. Can anyone blame the members of the opposition for trying to hold on to the few prerogatives we have left in this house? Indeed, can anyone blame the opposition for being very wary of this government when hon. members on the backbenches opposite a few weeks ago had to send in their dear wives to plead with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for fairness and justice?

Rule 75c—what a grim and pathetic thing it is that this should be the triumphant climax to the first year of the just society. I do not for a moment believe that there are any new members, not one of them, who ever thought that the just society would come to this.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Look who is coming out of the mineshaft.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not for a moment believe that hon. members who are fair and objective do not know perfectly well in their own hearts that the government has—

An hon. Member: I think he is going to make another speech.

Mr. Stanfield: I hope so. That will be the first indication that the government is caving in. He will make a strong plea in favour of the government's position and then the government will yield.

Mr. MacEachen: Tell your friends in the New Democratic party.

Mr. Stanfield: Hon. members who are fair and objective know perfectly well in their hearts that the government has not been prevented by the opposition from bringing in the kind of creative and useful legislation that had been hoped for, and if any such legislation is ready we should be discussing it now.

Hon. members, especially the new members on the other side, know in their own hearts that it is not parliament that is destroying the reputation of the government and the governing party. Hon. members know from talking to their own constituents and their own friends who are not in politics how it happened that the just society, so-called, is becoming a term of derision, indeed a term of contempt.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Hees: All they have to do is read the Gallup polls. That tells them.

Mr. Stanfield: It is our duty to fight. I point out to hon. members that the fight has already had considerable success because the retreat of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald)—I hope he will bring himself to listen to this because he may learn something—

Mr. Harkness: That is not likely.

Mr. Stanfield: —was not just a procedural retreat. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) was forced to withdraw his motion; he was forced to change his method of proceeding. There was a procedural change in that sense. But the change that took place when the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) yielded was not just a procedural change, because what we are now being asked to accept in the form of the adoption of the committee's report is substantially different from the proposal the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) put before the house.

Hon. members will remember that the committee's report contains three separate recommendations, 75A, 75B and 75C. Proposed Standing Order 75A provides for the allocation of time under a house order when there is unanimous consent among the representatives of all parties in the house. Proposed Standing Order 75B provides, in the motion we are now considering, for cases when there is agreement among the majority of the representatives of the parties. The chairman of the committee argued that this did not mean that the opposition parties, by agreeing, could compel an allocation of time. He argued, and probably properly, that there is no way of compelling a minister to come into the house and act on the agreement reached by the representatives of the opposition parties. That is probably a sound position.

However, it is necessary to consider 75B in relation to 75C. What is the effect? When can 75C be invoked by a minister of the crown? Proposed Standing Order 75C provides:

A minister of the Crown who from his place in the house at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings—

And so on. The minister can then move a motion. He has to state in the house that agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B. Let us suppose there is a meeting and the representatives of the opposition parties all agree as to the time to be allocated to a certain proceeding and the President of the Privy Council does not agree; he does not accept it. He does not have to act on that agreement; he can come into the house and invoke 75C. Can he then come into the house and say there has been no agreement under the provisions of 75A or 75B? What is the opinion of the chairman of the committee on that one? Clearly he could do that under the motion presented by the President of the Privy Council, because that motion changed 75B and provided that there could be no agreement under 75B unless the representative of the government party was a party to the agreement. There is no doubt that had the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) been allowed to go ahead with his motion, he or a representative of the government could have invoked 75C, if adopted, every time the government did not agree with the opposition parties.

But can he do so under the report we are now being asked to adopt? It seems to me pretty clear that a representative of the government could not invoke 75C unless he is able to stand in his place and say there has been no agreement under 75A or 75B. In other words, he cannot invoke 75C with regard to the allocation of time on a particular measure if the representatives of the opposition parties are in agreement upon some other time allocation. I suggest that this is so. If my interpretation is right, the President of the Privy Council or anybody else speaking for the government in the house can make no use of 75C as long as the representatives of the opposition parties are in agreement among themselves as to how much time is to be allocated for a certain proposal before the house. If my interpretation is correct, the representatives of the opposition parties will control the allocation of time in the house as long as they are in agreement.

I would suppose that as far as the rest of the life of this parliament is concerned, in view of the lessons the opposition parties have learned in dealing with the government the representatives of the opposition parties will have very little difficult reaching agreement among themselves in order to protect themselves against the government. It may very well be argued that 75C can be used. A minister could say that no agreement had been reached under 75A. I do not believe this is so, but the President of the Privy Council, the chairman of the committee or somebody else may argue it. If the argument is put forward, it will depend upon the ruling of the Speaker at the time. The Speaker will have to decide what 75C means as it is drafted. Does the government intend to push this rule through the house if, in fact, 75C can be invoked only when the opposition parties disagree within the meaning of 75B? Do backbenchers on the other side of the house understand that all the fighting now going on is to get a 75C that the government could use only in those cases when the representatives of the opposition parties could not agree among themselves? Whose tail is in the trap?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hello.

Some hon. Members: Hurrah!

Mr. MacEachen: If that is the interpretation the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) is making and he is taking that view, what is the purpose of the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman's house leader?

Mr. Stanfield: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, if my friend would be patient.

Mr. MacEachen: There is more than one tail in the trap.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister just came into the house and he can be patient for a few minutes. I shall not keep him too long.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The P.M. is allowing you to say something again, Allan, is he?

Mr. Stanfield: I assume from what has been said by hon. members opposite, and emphasized from time to time, that the government will not allow itself to be controlled by the opposition parties in regard to the allocation of time. Therefore, I assume the government

says that my interpretation is wrong. The most they can argue is that I am wrong and they are right. The most they can argue is that the Speaker would at some time in the future have to determine this question. We do not even know who the Speaker would be. I am not casting reflections on anybody, but we do not know who would be in the chair at the time the government put this up for decision. It is very clear, however, that the house should not be asked to consider ambiguous rules.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member acknowledges that there is ambiguity, then?

Mr. Stanfield: I will argue that when the time comes. But I assume the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) will argue the other way. I assume he will argue that he can bypass 75B. I do not think members of this house should be asked to consider seriously a rule about which there will be serious argument as to what it means. I think it is an absurdity for the government to insist that we consider 75C in relation to 75B.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? If he feels it is absurd to consider it in its ambiguous state, would he be agreeable to considering the motion in my name, in which the ambiguity is not present?

Mr. Stanfield: No, Mr. Speaker, because the minister's motion was altogether improper. It involved trampling on the committee system, and he has withdrawn it in any event.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stanfield: I am glad to see the government is listening to me now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) should not mislead the house by saying that my motion was withdrawn. If he looks at page six of the order paper he will see that it still stands.

Mr. Stanfield: We should not be asked to consider adopting a rule which is ambiguous. I do not think anyone on the other side will argue that it is clearly what they say it means. It is clearly ambiguous. Clearly, it ought not to be proceeded with. Clearly, it is an affront to the house, and clearly it should be withdrawn. I emphasize that I do not accept 75C even on my interpretation, even putting aside those who say they agree with what the house leader said about its meaning. It would not be satisfactory on that basis. It would not be satisfactory on the basis that it would only be used when the representatives of the opposition parties could not agree among themselves as to allocation of time.

I cannot accept 75C because in the first place the government has not shown that anything of this kind is necessary. The failure has been in its own policy and in the development of its own policy. It has not been a failure of parliament. Second, the adoption of 75C would not help the government to get through a larger legislative program; it would simply enable the government to cut off debate from time to time. So I cannot accept it on either of those two counts. Furthermore, I repeat that the government is not to be trusted with any more authority, as has been very clearly demonstrated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: In addition, I do not think this house should consider 75C or anything like it in any form without a more adequate provision relating to the time during which bills are before the house for consideration. It is absurd, in its present form, that any bill could be passed in ten days, for example. There will be many occasions on which the public would not have any idea of the implications of a bill in this context.

Second, I do not think it would be proper to consider anything like 75C even if someone could satisfy me—it has not been done so far and I do not think it can be done—that it would enable the government to get through more business, and that it is parliament which is holding up legislation rather than the government. There would have to be, for example some structural safeguards with regard to 75B concerning the kind of meetings which would take place, the kind of effort to reach agreement among representatives of the opposition with regard to the allocation of time, and so on. There would have to be minutes kept. The group would have to be presided over by someone a good deal more conciliatory than the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), who is probably the last man in Canada likely to achieve agreement.

Rule 75B should be strengthened at this stage. This is what we should be doing now. We should be strengthening 75B so that it relates to a more formalized structure, so that the meeting is presided over by somebody

with a more independent and conciliatory point of view. And we should be sure that a real effort is made to achieve agreement. We do not want to take any chances on the President of the Privy Council calling some kind of meeting, saying that the leaders of the opposition parties cannot agree, and coming to the house immediately to announce that he cannot get agreement under 75B. What we should do is strengthen 75B and make it a useful instrument for the allocation of time in the house. Until we provide some safeguards there, we are not prepared to consider anything like 75C.

In other words, the house should send this report back. The house should accept the amendment of my hon. friend the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). The leader of the house has not only made a fool of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) but of all the backbenchers on the other side, according to my interpretation of what is being done. In any event, placing 75C before the house with all its ambiguity, while there is a lack of proper safeguards in 75B, amounts to wasting everybody's time, including the house leader's. He had better agree now to send the report back to the committee. Let him accept the amendment and let us get on with the business of the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the concluding remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), particularly those in connection with the motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). I think the hon. gentleman unconsciously stumbled on the reason for the presentation of that motion. It was presented, of course, in order to clear up the ambiguity in 75B. If anybody wishes to compare the report presented by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) with the motion appearing in today's order paper, he will find there are two significant differences. The first is in rule 75B. I will read it as amended:

> When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the house, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a private bill, he may propose a motion, without notice—

• (4:20 p.m.)

The significant change is "including that of the government". That would eliminate the ambiguity to which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) properly drew attention. The reason for it is that there is a difference of opinion between the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the members of the New Democratic party. For proof of that one need only go to *Hansard* for July 8, page 10965, and a question asked by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The question is:

> Through you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member in respect of 75B whether he agrees with the submission of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the representatives of the opposition parties could constitute a majority, not including the representative of the government party?
>
> Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think that is a nice little point on which one could spend time and not have time to deal with other matters.

Then after one or two interruptions the hon. member went on:

> If I could have the time to deal with it I would be quite happy to do so. I do not think the amendment the President of the Privy Council wanted to put into 75B was necessary at all. I think that the wording in 75B which says that the government house leader "may move a motion under 75B" does not require him to move it and therefore 75B does not operate unless one of the majority is the government representative. Concerning what would happen to 75C if it was argued that 75B had not been fully brought into play, that is one of the fine procedural arguments we could have if 75C comes into play. I suggest this is highly hypothetical because surely debate in this parliament is still effective, surely we are still concerned about the procedural rules of parliament, and before this is all over we will not have a 75C.

That was the hon. member's reply, and it is the reason the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) moved government order No. 99.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When he is discussing the wording of 75B, will he distinguish between the question whether 75B requires clarification for its own sake and what would happen when 75C is called? I quite agree with the view taken on the other side of the house that 75B does not need clarification for its own sake but, as I said the other day, the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) with regard to 75C is another matter.

Mr. Reid: My response to the hon. member is that I tend to the view that 75B for its own sake does not require further clarification. I

also accept that if that is accepted in the first case it also applies equally well to the second case, which is the application to 75c.

My feeling is that there does have to be some clarification of the two rules taken together. I fully appreciate and support the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition in that, before the order is adopted, there must be some clarification in respect of 75B, as well as 75c, to which an amendment has been moved. The problem would be to work out some appropriate method of dealing with the question.

Mr. Crouse: Then let us send the report back to the committee.

Mr. Reid: I think we will have to have some form of motion moved during this debate to send the matter back to committee, with specific instructions to clear up this ambiguity.

Mr. McGrath: Then do it now.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the hon. member permit a question? If I am prepared to alter my amendment to so provide, would the hon. member be prepared to second it?

Mr. Reid: I do not think I could accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) because of its effect to 75c. But if the hon. member moved a motion to send 75B back to the committee for amendment, I would certainly support it. I would go even further and say that I would be prepared to support an amendment to 75B that would recognize the position of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), as an officer of this house, so that in implementing 75B any majority would have to have the support not only of the government party but also that of the official opposition. I think that is a perfectly reasonable position to take.

I should like to deal with one argument that has been raised in respect of the proposed rules 75A, 75B and 75c with regard to elapsed time. How much time would it to take to impose 75c during the course of the passage of a bill? We have had a number of estimates and I have made one of my own which is made up of a day to day schedule.

On day one you would have first reading of the bill. On day two you begin debate on second reading, with notice being given of 75c. On day three you would have the two-hour debate and the order approved. On day four you would have a one-day debate on second reading with referral to committee. On day five you would have the commencement of the committee proceedings, plus the motion giving notice of 75c in the house. On day six you would have the two-hour debate under 75c; the committee could sit while this was going on. On day seven you would have a full day's sitting in committee, as provided for under Standing Order 75c. On day eight you would have the report of the committee to the House of Commons. On day nine you would have the delay in proceeding imposed by standing order 75, which is the provision of 48 hours' notice. On day ten you would have commencement of the report stage and the moving of Standing Order 75c. On day 11 you would have the two-hour debate under 75c. On day 12 you would have one full sitting day on the report stage. On day 13 you would have a full sitting day for third reading of the bill. That amounts to 13 days of sittings, which is two and a half weeks of sitting time.

In addition, when dealing with the question of elapsed time we have also to consider that no matter how you slice it you still have two weekends intervening. This means the amount of elapsed time is increased from 13 days to a total of 17 days. I need hardly remind hon. gentlemen that it is on weekends that some of us make our political impact, particularly on the available electronic media such as television—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't be so modest.

Mr. Reid: —which greatly assist the dissemination of news and events for the edification of the voters. The major television public affairs programs are aired over the weekend.

I do not feel that the proposed 75c is the threat to democracy that it is made out to be. May I indicate what the mother of parliaments has done in regard to implementing closure. I should like to read into the record their Standing Order 31 which deals with closure of debate, and also the business committee formed under standing order 43. Standing order 31 reads:

> After a question has been proposed a member rising in his place may claim to move, "That the question be now put," and unless it shall appear to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the rules of the House, or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question, "That the question be now put," shall be put forthwith, and decided without amendment or debate.
>
> 2. When a question "That the question be now put" has been decided in the affirmative, and the question consequent thereon has been decided, a member may claim that any further question be put which may be requisite to bring to a decision any question already proposed from the Chair, and

if the assent of the Chair, as aforesaid, be not withheld, any question so claimed shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

3. When a clause or schedule is under consideration, a motion may be made that the question, that certain words of the clause or schedule defined in the motion stand part of the clause or schedule or "That the clause (or the clause as amended) stand part of the bill", or "That this schedule (or, this schedule as amended) be the schedule to the bill", or "That the clause or schedule be added to the bill", be now put and if the assent of the Chair, as aforesaid, be not withheld, the question on that motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

4. This order shall be put in force only when Mr. Speaker or, in committee, the Chairman of Ways and Means or Deputy Chairman is in the chair; except that,

(a) during any proceedings on or in relation to the business of supply, and

(b) during proceedings upon consideration of the report of a bill,

the order may be put in force when Mr. Deputy Speaker is in the chair.

Standing order 32 reads:

If a division be held upon a question for the closure of debate under Standing Order 31 (closure of debate) that question shall not be decided in the affirmative unless it appears by the numbers declared from the Chair, that not less than one hundred members voted in the majority in support of the motion.

• (4:30 p.m.)

That is the effective rule under which the British parliament operates as a matter of course.

Mr. Crouse: Will the hon. member permit a question? Is he aware that these rules precipitated a major row in the British House of Commons in which nearly 500 members mounted a clamour of insults over a decision by government leader, Fred Peart, to impose a guillotine on a controversial bill, and that in this row members hurled books and paper missiles at each other? The row was unlike anything the United Kingdom house has seen for a very long time. Is he aware of this?

Mr. Reid: If the hon. member wishes to refer to the overseas edition of the *Times* he will find in there a full report of the debate. He will be interested to learn that the row broke out over the provisions of the United Kingdom redistribution of boundaries act. It seems that the Socialists were trying to gerrymander electoral boundaries and so prevent the Tories from winning the next election.

Mr. McGrath: But that is not a federal parliament.

Mr. Reid: I should like to continue by reading British standing order No. 43, some aspects of which, incidentally, have not been effective because they have not been generally accepted by the people directed to perform certain duties, namely the chairman's panel. I quote rule 43:

There shall be a committee, to be designated the Business Committee, consisting of the members of the Chairmen's Panel together with not more than five other members to be nominated by Mr. Speaker in respect of each bill to which subparagraph (b) of this order applies. The quorum of the committee shall be seven. The committee—

(a) shall, in the case of any bill in respect of which an order has been made by the House, allotting a specified number of days or portions of days to the consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House or on report, divide the bill into such parts as they may see fit and allot to each part so many days or portions of a day so allotted as they may consider appropriate;

(b) may, if they think fit, do the like in respect of any bill to the consideration of which in committee of the whole House or on report a specified number of days or portions of days has been allotted by general agreement notified orally to the House by a Minister of the Crown; and

(c) shall report their resolution (or resolutions) to the House, and on a motion being made for the consideration of such report, the question thereon shall be put forthwith and on consideration of the said report the question "That this House both agree with the committee in the said resolution (or resolutions)" shall be put forthwith and, if agreed to, shall have effect as if it were an order of the House.

Proceedings in pursuance of this subparagraph, though opposed, may be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business.

I have quoted some of the rules under which the British parliament operates and I find it difficult to believe that these rules, much more onerous than proposed rule 75c, could be regarded by opposition members as being destructive of democracy. In any event, it appears that the opposition in the United Kingdom has performed under those closure rules to such good effect that it seems very likely the Tories will win the next election. And those rules are far more Draconian than proposed Standing Order 75c. The opposition's argument that democracy is going to collapse because of these new rules just does not make sense.

We must ask ourselves, who really is to run parliament?

An hon. Member: Who is to be master?

Mr. Reid: Precisely. Someone must be master. We can go a long way if there is co-operation and good feeling, and I expect that this will be the main way in which we

will proceed. But to judge from our experience over the last eight or nine years, we know that we do not necessarily proceed that way. We must therefore provide some means for the government, which is responsible to the people, to bring matters to a head. A decision has to be made and it seems to me that the residual responsibility for the conduct of business in the House of Commons must belong to the government party, that party which has been given responsibility for the conduct of the nation's business by the Canadian electorate. The residual responsibility must therefore rest with the governing party. An article in today's *Globe and Mail* by Mr. George Bain makes that clear. I wish to read one small part of his argument since it illustrates clearly the position in which we find ourselves:

> It would be in any government's own interest to try to get agreement on a time allocation—why provoke howls of outrage needlessly?—but, if there is to be a time allocation procedure at all, the power to propose must rest somewhere to be used on those occasions when agreement proves impossible.

I suggest that the government, in its proposals, wishes to accept that responsibility. In cases when no compromise is possible, when honest consultation has failed, the government feels that it must use its majority. It has the power to use its majority, and that majority ought to be made use of by the government. For the opposition to say that responsibility for action in this field rests with it is a travesty of democracy. The opposition is not elected to govern. It is elected to oppose.

An hon. Member: That is just what we are doing.

Mr. Reid: It has a duty to point out what it considers weaknesses and shortcomings in the government's program. Once it has done that its responsibility is discharged. The government, on the other hand, has its responsibilities to discharge and it will stand or fall during the next election on how it has discharged those responsibilities.

Mr. Dinsdale: The tyranny of the majority.

Mr. Reid: The opposition seems to imply that the moment proposed rule 75c is incorporated into the Standing Orders of the house, the world will end. I do not think it will. This rule is merely a modification and extension of changes that were introduced last December. In any event, I suggest to hon. members of the opposition that the House of Commons is not the only democratic institution in this country. Parliament includes the Senate, and in the past the Senate has applied a brake to the activities of the House of Commons.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Shame.

Mr. Reid: I thought my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would appreciate my remark.

Mr. Alexander: I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question. Would he mind reverting to the earlier part of his notes and explain in detail what he meant when he said that he would consider seriously sending this report back to the committee? His remarks were somewhat ambiguous and for the edification of the house perhaps he would not mind elaborating on what he meant.

Mr. Reid: I am sorry if I was not clear. What I said was that under proposed rule 75B the Leader of the Official Opposition ought to be recognized. The two minority opposition parties should not be in a position of forcing their decisions on this house, along with the government, on the official opposition. The Leader of the Official Opposition, being a responsible officer of this house, should have an important role to play under this proposed rule. I point out that here I do not speak for the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) or the government.

Mr. Alexander: We are aware of that.

Mr. Reid: That is the position I have taken, and I think it quite defensible.

It is important to remember that under the new rules bills will be before the house for a period of 13 days of elapsed time plus two weekends, or a total of 17 days, long enough for people to be made aware of the substance of bills. Although the House of Commons is the most important institution in our democratic system, it is not the be-all and end-all of democracy, being merely an institution which reflects in its make-up and membership the wishes of electors who have elected their members to parliament in order to carry out a certain program. The government has certain time at its disposal to carry out that program. It is when debates take far longer than they should, when they continue long past the day when a decision ought to have been taken, that the very institution of parliament is held in odium. The whole concept of democracy suffers then because people ask how we can govern them if we cannot govern

ourselves. I feel that this has been one of the factors in the public's disenchantment with parliament and the democratic process in general.

• (4:40 p.m.)

It is important to realize that in years gone by it may have been necessary to take four, five or six months for an issue to percolate across the country. But the electronic media have changed this.

I, like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), wish to give examples to indicate how radically our whole political system has been transformed by the growth and effectiveness of the electronic medium. Slightly over 90 per cent of the country is now covered by television. When the Pearson government was defeated in February, 1968, the battle over the defeat of the government respecting a money bill was fought not so much in this chamber but over the television air-waves and in the rotunda of this building. It was fought through interviews on television with the Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, and with leading spokesmen of the opposition. When we received the feedback and when the public had made their decision, opposition ceased and the government was sustained in power.

The second point I want to make is that government issues are not brought down to the floor of the House of Commons out of the blue. There usually is a long debate in the body politic before that issue arises in the form of a government motion or bill. It is important to realize this because we have opted for a system of consensus politics in Canada. There are very few issues that have not been vetted before the public first and that have not been the subject of debate in election campaigns prior to coming before parliament.

As an example of this, I wish to refer to the report of the Carter Commission on tax reform. This indicates some of the studies and the amount of public debate that have been carried on in consequence. First of all there was debate in the house and across the country which led to the appointment of the royal commission. Then there was debate on the terms of reference of that commission. Then there were the public hearings when submissions were made to that commission. Then followed the report of the commission and public debate on the report. Now there is to be a white paper. There will be public debate respecting the white paper. There will be public debate with regard to that white paper when it is sent to committee. There will be committee hearings, a committee report, a government bill and finally it will begin its way through the House of Commons.

This will probably be one of the most important bills we will deal with in this House of Commons. The policies of the government will probably be acceptable to most of the Canadian population. We will concern ourselves in this House of Commons with the details and application of those policies. I suggest it is not necessary to take innumerable months of time to discuss this bill intelligently.

Mr. Barnett: Will the hon. member permit a question? I wish to ask the hon. member on what grounds he speaks with such confidence that the government proposals in the tax reform bill when it is introduced in parliament will be generally accepted by the Canadian people? How does the hon. member know that now?

Mr. Reid: The only way I know that is because of how the Canadian political system operates. Very seldom do the extremists get into power, as I am sure the hon. member and the party of the other extreme realize. Normally items introduced by a government have a great deal of public support because political parties tend to aim for the middle of the political spectrum. That is where the majority is. You can be sure the government will introduce measures which are generally acceptable. There are minor exceptions. We all admit that. Generally speaking, though on a matter of importance there can be absolutely no doubt that the government will do what it thinks the majority of the electors wants it to do.

Another example is the genesis of the national Broadcasting Act which followed almost that same pattern. You can look at the public debate which was initiated and to a large extent sponsored by the government—

Mr. Paproski: What about 75c?

Mr. Reid: That was vetted before. We had about six reports from the committee on procedure. There was a good debate on rule 16A last December. The matter has been raised before. I suggest to the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) that this is an item on which the public is fully informed. I suggest 75c will find general approval among the electors of Canada.

The last aspect I wish to deal with is the type of government we have in Canada which

can be described as not only democratic but responsible. The government is responsible for its actions. In the United States they have a system of government in which there is no responsibility when something goes wrong. If there is runaway inflation do you blame the President, the House of Representatives, the Senate or the Judiciary? You can almost blame all three branches equally at times simply because they do not work in concert. When something goes wrong in the Canadian system, the people have a very good idea where they should point the finger namely, at the government in power.

If this is the way our system is to operate, the government must have the power to control the business of the House of Commons because it is responsible to the electors and to the House of Commons. All members of the governing party are members of the House of Commons and they ought to be considered equally with all other members. It is not a question of parties having individual or equal status, but of parties having certain support in the House of Commons and being permitted to go ahead and determine the conduct of business as they see fit according to that support given to each party by the Canadian people.

Mr. Barnett: Will the hon. member permit a further question?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Barnett: The hon. member in almost the same breath said that the government should control parliament and then said that the government is responsible to parliament. How does the hon. member reconcile those two statements?

An hon. Member: Because he is a Liberal.

Mr. Reid: The government does two things. The government carries on the administration of the country through the members of the Privy Council. The ministry has members in the house to support it. As long as the ministry has the support of the backbenchers in the party it remains in power if it is, of course, in a majority position. In a minority parliament it depends on the support of a majority of the house. If it loses that support, it goes out of power. I do not see any contradiction in what I said.

On the grounds of responsibility it is far better for the responsibility for the conduct of business of the House of Commons to rest with the government and not with the opposition parties or the minor parties. I think rule 75c is a reasonable compromise. I myself think that 75c is not sufficient because it does not go far enough. I would have preferred to see something more along the lines of the British system. I recognize this is an evolving system in Canada. We have not yet come to the state where we can discipline ourselves in order to deal with our workload. Therefore we must approach this over a period of time, taking it step by step.

Most of the reasons for opposition to 75c are not justifiable. I commend rules 75A, 75B and 75c to the house. I suspect that in three, four or five years after 75c is adopted we will be back looking for a much more effective system.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the hon. member permit a question? In view of the reference the hon. member made to the nature of our system, will he answer this question? When the people of Canada go to the polls, do they elect a government or a parliament? Perhaps when he is answering that question he might also answer this one: Is the government responsible to parliament or does it go over the head of parliament to the people?

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Reid: That is a very interesting question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to think I was elected to the House of Commons as an individual to represent my constituents. Coming from a rural riding this may perhaps be true, but I rather suspect that the majority of the members here were elected to this house because they belonged to a particular political party with a particular political program. Therefore my answer would be that the majority of the members owe their presence here to a political party with a program. There is another group here because of tradition or who, if you wish, have pocket boroughs, or who came here on individual merit.

I would say we now elect a government and an opposition. I do not think we come here as individuals. I think that once the democratic system or parliamentary system evolved into a mass democracy, and evoked a system in which parties were responsible to the electors, we came here as members of political parties. I suggest to the hon. member that this point is recognized for the first time in proposed Standing Orders 75A, 75B and 75C, and I think the greatest break with tradition is 75A in which we have said that the parties shall have the responsibility for determining the business of the house, and that the mavericks who exist in all parties, and the

independents who come here from time to time, shall no longer have a voice by refusing unanimous consent and enforcing their veto in that way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member try again to answer my second question? Is it not a fact that under our system the government is responsible to parliament?

Mr. Reid: Yes, the government is responsible to parliament as long as it maintains the support of the House of Commons, which in practical terms in the House of Commons means the support of its own backbenchers if it be a majority, and the support of members in opposition if it be a minority. But as I said I do not think we were elected as individual members of parliament. The brutal fact is that we came here as members of political parties, and we shall live or die on the hustings as our parties perform.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office Department—Vancouver—Dissatisfaction of letter carriers with five day delivery; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—Unemployment Insurance—government policy respecting modification of operation; the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner)—Water Resources—diversion of waters from Hudson and James Bays.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

EXTENSION OF POWERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a question of order, Mr. Speaker, and before the next member rises to his feet I wonder if we could have permission to revert to motions to attempt to pass the order again which has been so much desired by members of all parties serving on the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments?

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, this motion was proposed yesterday by the minister and we did not agree merely because we did not have time for consultation and had not been notified. There is no objection at this time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There is no objection here, either. This is another of those examples of what can be done by consultation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as to the question of non-notification I would point out that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) insisted that this order be moved yesterday, and again today. If there is general agreement perhaps the following could be made an order of the house:

That the powers of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, appointed by order of the house on September 30, 1968, be extended by adding the following powers:

To consider and, from time to time, to report on the adequacy of existing statutory authority for the making and publication of statutory instruments and on the adequacy of existing procedures for the drafting, scrutiny, and operational review of such instruments, and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and on the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, which in my opinion centres around rule 75c, I find it most easy to support the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the report be referred back to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I believe all reasonable and intelligent members realize that if there is to be a reasonable attempt at co-operation in the house this report must be referred back to the committee, particularly since debate has centred around one portion of it. Having referred it back, surely reasonable men could reasonably

discuss the problem and bring about a solution that would avoid a long drawn-out debate.

It amazed me that the last speaker in this debate, the Liberal-Labour member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), spoke about the residual responsibility having been given to the governing party by the electorate. In fact it surprises me very much that he runs under the name Liberal-Labour. I am certain that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) at this particular time, and wherever he may be in his travels, must find small chills going up his spine when he hears of the Liberal-Labour member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) talking about residual rights.

Labour has well documented its case that it does not believe in the managerial prerogative. I suggest that what the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) advocated in his speech was managerial prerogative to the worst degree possible, because proposed rule 75c is recognized as nothing but managerial prerogative. I suggest that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) has made it very clear that he does not believe in the theory of residual right or authority but believes in the rights of individuals, whether in management or labour, to express themselves as they see fit. In fact he does not believe in such a thing as a managerial prerogative or labour prerogative and recognizes that there must be co-operation.

The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River is now suggesting something that is heartily disliked by those people who possibly supported him because he ran under a partly labour banner. I hope that he will have an opportunity later this month, or next month, to speak on another amendment to the motion and clarify his position in this regard.

When speaking of proposed rule 75c I think we should at this time assess the responsibility of the person introducing this proposal. Somehow or other I find it difficult to think that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) introduced it, but I find it quite easy to suggest and think that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) issued the running order to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and that he had no alternative but to follow those directions. May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills, public bills.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the items that are listed under this heading hon. members will be aware of the fact that the first four are in the name of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), and that they are similar in the papers that they seek. My colleague has suggested, and I put it forward on his behalf, that the house might be willing to deal with all four in one motion or one debate. In other words, if there is to be debate we would accept the one hour and 40 minute limit to cover all of them, and if there is a vote we would accept the one vote to cover all four.

If hon. members will look at them they will see that we are not trying to pull a trick of any kind. It is a straightforward matter. It is a case of dealing with these four motions in a way that will make more time available for some of the other notices of motions for the production of papers that are on the order paper. This could be done by having the debate on the first one and when it is disposed of we could consider that the other three have been disposed of, or there could be unanimous consent to consider the four of them as one motion.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I can say that we have no objection to the four motions being discussed as one. We have no objection to the procedure outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Further, Mr. Speaker, if there is a vote, one vote will suffice and the time limit of one hour and 40 minutes will apply to the one debate on all four.

Mr. Forest: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, before you call the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) I wonder whether we might have the unanimous consent of the house to call notice of motion No. 63. At the time the motion was made the agreement referred to

in the motion had not been finalized. It has now been finalized. If we had consent we could file the information requested by the hon. member and clear the motion from the order paper.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. gentleman is now offering to table the correspondence without any reservation, which was the intention of my original motion. If this is the case I shall be very happy to accept the order.

Mr. Honey: Mr. Speaker, there was the question of finalizing the correspondence and obtaining the consent of the province. This has now been done. I think we could make the information available to the house.

Mr. Dinsdale: I will accept the order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It could be agreed, Mr. Speaker, that order No. 63 be now passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We might first have the motion and it could be agreed to in the normal procedure.

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION ACT

TRANSFER OF PART OF COST TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris) moved:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all documents and correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba with respect to transferring part of the cost of Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act projects from Ottawa to the provincial governments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

MANPOWER

STUDY BY BELANGER, OUELLETTE AND ASSOCIATES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study done for the Department of Manpower and Immigration by Belanger, Ouellette and Associates Inc., Montreal, Quebec.

Study on Manpower

He said: Mr. Speaker, the four motions which were moved on February 12, 1969 arose out of questions which I asked with reference to the studies done by these companies for the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Question No. 1042 asked about a study done by Belanger, Ouellette and Associates Inc., for which the department agreed to pay $50,000. Question 1043 dealt with an arrangement made by the department with Operations Research Incorporated under which the department agreed to pay $165,000 for the study. Question No. 1044 dealt with an agreement made by the department with Kates, Peat, Marwick and Company under which the department agreed to pay that company $24,000. Question 1045 dealt with an agreement made with Operations Research Industries under which the department agreed to pay just over $98,000 for some research.

These are just four small examples of a practice with which we are being faced more and more. I refer to the practice of government departments hiring outside consultants to do specific studies. I should like to make certain observations about these studies. This practice is continuing and accelerating at a time when the government, pleading poverty and the need for caution, has put a freeze or a semi-freeze on the hiring of public servants. The government has directed the public service not to increase its staff on the one hand and on the other hand has encouraged the public service to expand and increase expenditures to a very great extent through the hiring of private consultants.

In the summary of estimates for the year 1969-70 prepared by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) or under his direction members can see that the amount of money allocated for professional services—I presume the hiring of consultants is included in this figure—is $396 million, an increase from $329 million last year, or an increase of $67 million. This is a rather sharp increase at a time when supposedly the government wants the public service to be cautious.

Not only is this increase of 20 per cent very sharp but it also goes against every basic principle under which we are supposedly operating. When the government wants services or wants to purchase supplies or equipment the usual practice is for it to call for public tenders so that the people who are qualified to provide the equipment or anything else which the government wants can make a public tender indicating that they will do the job for such and such an amount.

Members need simply look at the answers to questions in the orders for returns filed for my colleague the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) to see how in case after case the government has given the contract for such studies to some company without calling for a public tender.

I do not know what particular qualifications these companies and individuals have but I am suspicious enough and have been in politics long enough to be reasonably certain that none of these people are antagonistic to the Liberal party or to the Liberal government. As a citizen of Canada and as a member of parliament I resent these substantial amounts of money being paid to people partly at least because of political patronage. I say it is not only wrong but immoral for this to be done.

Let us look at how these things are done. Let us take, for example, the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department, to say the least, is in a mess. Never in my years of public service which now go back almost 25 years have I seen a report made by an impartial person so critical of a department as the three reports made by the adjudicator about the workings of the Post Office Department. Mr. Martin's reports are a real condemnation of the operation of the Post Office Department. The department is in a mess. Hon. members have been trying to tell the minister that since he undertook this job. What has happened since the minister has taken over the department? He has hired three or four consulting firms to prepare studies. Who lays out the terms of reference for these firms? Who tells them what to study and look at? The officials of the Post Office Department who permitted the department to get in the mess it is in. So it is those who have made the mess who instruct the consultants to undertake studies which will of course gloss over, because they know what ought not to be looked at, the mess which exists.

Then we have the final indignity. We are told repeatedly that these studies which are done for the government and which are paid for by the people of Canada who may or may not be Liberals—and more than 50 per cent of them did not vote Liberal in the last election—are private and confidential and belong to the minister and can only be tabled and made public if the minister so desires. It is my experience with Liberal ministers that they do not usually desire that these studies be made public, so they become essentially the private property of the government and

the minister. I say that this is wrong in principle and that it involves a principle which the people of Canada increasingly will refuse to support.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Let me again direct the attention of this government and its ministers to the election which took place just a few days ago in the province of Manitoba. One of the important issues in that election was a large power development project on the Nelson river being financed jointly by the federal and provincial governments.

One of the problems which the hydroelectric system of Manitoba and the government faced involved the relocation of some 600 Indian and Métis people. It was proposed to move them from where they had been living quite well at South Indian Lake. The government of Manitoba and the hydro system commissioned a large number of studies into all aspects of what this move would mean in financial costs, social problems and so on. Despite all the requests by not only members of the legislature of all parties but by a university professor and other people concerned, the government of Manitoba refused completely to make public the studies that had been made.

The leader of the provincial New Democratic party will be the premier of Manitoba next week. He promised and has reiterated his promise since the election that all these studies will be made public so the people of Manitoba can know what were the findings and the recommendations, not the expurgated version which the former government of Manitoba tried to foist on them. That was a very important factor in the election campaign and in the election of our party as the government.

I suggest to the government of Canada that it get off its high horse and stop thinking it has some God-given right to be the government. It should stop thinking it will always be the government of Canada. There will come a time—I do not know whether it will be next week, three years from now or even eight years—when the Liberal party will no longer be the government. This happened in 1957. They will again be in the opposition and when that time comes I presume they will have the same desire as those of us now in the opposition to look at the documents which are prepared for the government in relation to problems such as those facing the people of Manitoba. I suggest to the government that it

stop being so arrogant and start realizing that democracy, if it means anything, means that all the people of Canada and all Members of Parliament have a right to be given as much information as possible.

I know there are some government documents that deal with personnel matters which cannot and ought not to be made public. I am not suggesting at this time—

Mr. Knowles (Winnpeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there are only 14 or 15 members present in the house. If that is the case there is no quorum and the house should be adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): According to the rules I will have to ask the Clerk to count the members in the house.

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that there are at least half a dozen members behind the curtains and they are all looking into the chamber.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges-C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, to my mind, the hon. member is mistaken.

Come in, gentlemen of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the hon. member who spoke a few moments ago has now taken refuge behind the curtains.

[*English*]

Mr. Haidasz: There are six over there.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Read the rules.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who just put the question, is not even in the house. Under those circumstances, the request is not in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I should like to point out that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who asked that the members be counted, is not even present. To my mind, this is against the rules.

I should also like to point out that the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) is the only Progressive Conservative member present in this house.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is citation 60. You should read the rules.

Mr. Haidasz: Why don't you come in and read it for us?

Mr. Pilon: You can stay out now; we don't need you at all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I draw to the attention of the house citation 60 in Beauchesne's fourth edition which states in part:

> Any member may direct the Speaker's attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present. The Speaker will proceed at once to count the house, and if there are not twenty members present, including himself, the clerk will take down the names, and the speaker will then adjourn the house without question first put until the usual hour on the next sitting day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

If you add up the number of hon. members present, you will see that we have a quorum.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I would like to point out that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who asked that the hon. members be counted, is not even in the house.

Mr. Boulanger: I ask that the hon. members be counted, Mr. Speaker. You will find that we have a quorum.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have just had a conversation with the Clerk Assistant who is busy taking the names down. Hon. members will be advised in a few moments of the names of those members who are present at this time. If there are more than 20 then the motion cannot be accepted.

Mr. Pilon: We don't need their names now. They can stay out.

Mr. Haidasz: Stay out and stick to your principles.

• (5:20 p.m.)

On the count being made, 26 members were declared to be present.

Mr. Speaker: The advice received from the Clerk Assistant is that the list taken of members present indicates 26 members in the House of Commons.

Study on Manpower

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): For the benefit of hon. members who seem to get a great deal of satisfaction out of the fact that I called attention to there not being a quorum and then went behind the curtain myself, I would refer to paragraph 60 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which is to be found at page 48. We are now being told that we are going to play it according to the rules, and if hon. members will look at page 49 of Beauchesne they will find these words:

An honourable member need not remain in the house after giving notice that a quorum is not present.

Therefore, what I did was in accordance with the rules. The rule provides:

Any member may direct the Speaker's attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present. The Speaker will proceed at once to count the house—

I repeat, sir, "at once".

—and if there are not 20 members present, including himself, the Clerk will take down the names, and the Speaker will then adjourn the house without question first put until the usual hour on the next sitting day.

I submit that when the Clerk Assistant counted the names after I had drawn attention to the fact that there was not a quorum in the house, many of the members who are now here were not present at that time. What counts is the number of members present at the time the question is raised.

An hon. Member: You were not present.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was, and then I went out. I exercised my right under the rules. You want new rules around this place, and if you want to work to rules, that is what we shall do. The Chair waited five or seven minutes until more members came in, and then there was a list of 26 members. But when I raised the point of order there were, on a liberal count, 14 members in the house, perhaps even fewer than 14. I submit that the rule has not been complied with, namely, that there has to be a count at once. A count five minutes later does not meet the rule.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) will have noticed that I was not in the house when he raised the point of order. The point having been raised, I was called back to the house, as the Speaker is in such circumstances, and when I returned to the chair I was advised by the Clerk Assistant that he did follow the instructions in the citation referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), that there was some confusion when he made the count immediately because some hon. members were coming into the house and others were leaving.

The hon. member will realize that I was not here and I did not make the count. I have to go by the count which is given to me by the Clerk Assistant. The Clerk Assistant asures me that it was difficult, if not impossible, at that moment to determine exactly how many members were in the house. If I had been in the chair and it had been evident to me when the count was made that there were fewer than 20 members present, I would have had no hesitation in applying the rule contained in citation 60 of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

I wonder whether I have any alternative but to accept the suggestion that a count was made and that this was followed by the usual taking down of names, which indicated there were more than 20 members present. I am placed in a difficult position; I have to accept the count which was taken by the table and about which I have been advised. I wonder whether the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would not agree that I have no alternative but to follow this suggestion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You have no alternative, sir, but to accept the statement that was made to you by the Clerk Assistant when Your Honour reached the chair. That would be a report on the number of members then present. But I submit that we have the right to know—

Mr. Pilon: You are still on western rules.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —what report the Clerk Assistant made to the Acting Speaker who was in the chair at the time this matter was raised. There is no doubt about this. We were behind the curtain; there wasn't a quorum before we went out, but when we went out the attendance dropped to about seven or eight. There was a total of only 14 members present when I raised the point.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am satisfied that when the Clerk Assistant

made the first count and reported to the Acting Speaker who was in the chair, he must have reported fewer than 20. What counts for the purpose of the rules is what happened then, not what happened later. I submit that stalling in this way is violating our traditions and the principles of citation 60. I submit that if we are to have the kind of rules this government wants, we had better comply with them to the letter.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) should have quoted the paragraph in Beauchesne's fourth edition which precedes the one he read. That paragraph provides:

> While the house is being counted the doors remain open and members can come in during the whole time occupied by the counting.

That is what happened.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Forest: While hon. members were running out, others were running in. I would ask hon. members to note that of the 26 members in the house at the time, one was a Conservative, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), one a Créditiste, and 24 were Liberals.

Mr. Stanfield: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to become involved in this matter, but I have no hesitation in saying that when I was in the house there were not 20 members present when the count was taken. As an observer I can say that there were not 20 members here—I do not make anything of it—including any who came in.

Mr. Haidasz: Name them.

Mr. Stanfield: I just say that, Mr. Speaker. There is no question about it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there can be only one Speaker at a time, and when the Acting Speaker was in the chair and this point was raised there were not 20 members present. With the coming and going during the first count made by the Clerk Assistant, it did not produce 20 members. We were here; we saw what was going on. There were only 14, or 15 at most. Only when the second count was taken, ten minutes later, were there 26 members present. I submit that in terms of the count made when the Acting Speaker was in the chair, which was reported to him by the Clerk Assistant, there could not have been 20 members present.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I note that under paragraph 3, which is not often used in such circumstances, the task of making the count of hon. members in order to see if there is a quorum does not rest with the clerk but with the Speaker himself.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have just learned something new.

I find it strange that responsible people like the members of parliament refuse to recognize an accomplished fact. I was here a while ago when the problem was raised. I was writing, but I was listening just the same to the proceedings of the house and I did see that there were fewer than 20 members in the house. Now, I feel that this will never occur again. I hope so at least, because if we do not comply with the rules that exist, why should we waste our time discussing sections 75A, 75B and 75C to try to improve conditions. The standing orders exist, but they are not enforced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members on both sides of the house are trying to interpret the standing orders but if I understand the circumstances, I admit that when Your Honour took the chair again there were more members in the house, but when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicated to the Acting Speaker there was no quorum, of course it was so.

Mr. Boulanger: Because the members had gone out.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Of course, if they had not gone out, there would have been enough members in the house. That is precisely why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is objecting, because quite a few members are not in the house.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the point of order is justified.

An hon. Member: How many Créditistes are there?

Study on Manpower

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): There are 14 Créditistes and nearly 160 Liberals. I am the only one representing my party. Of course, the ratio happens to be quite good.

An hon. Member: Quality matters more than quantity.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): You are right. That is why there are only 14 of us.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I should add to the consideration of this point of order a comment about the conduct of the Chair—the occupant was not yourself—during the time the original question relating to the quorum was raised and a count was taken. The submission has been made that it is the counting by the Clerk at that time which should apply. In substantiation of the conclusion to which the Clerk came at that time, we have the statement of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who is highly regarded and highly respected as a man of great integrity. He was sitting in the house. He rose in his place a moment ago and said that by his count there were fewer than 20 members present. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) who was also in his place at the time the Clerk took the count, also said there were fewer than 20 members in the house. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who was behind the curtain as it was his right to be, also counted, and I too counted. We both counted 14.

Hon. members can cast reflections on my count if they like, but certainly not on that of my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The other party in the house was the Liberal party. Not one of them has said, nor can he say because it would not be true, that there were more than 20 members in the house at the time the Clerk made the count after the point of order had been raised in the first instance. It was only subsequent to that time that hon. gentlemen opposite were able to find enough of their members skulking around in the corridors to make up the 20 or so members whose names were taken down officially.

I submit that the only thing to which Your Honour can pay regard is the original count by the Clerk and the declarations by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), who have indicated what conclusion they reached, in the absence of any declarations to the contrary on behalf of the government.

Mr. Honey: On the point of order raised by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) it might be of some assistance to Your Honour if I could ask him a question in line with his argument as to the point at which the count should have been taken. When he says "immediately", does he mean immediately before the N.D.P. members left or immediately after they left?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The hon. member knows the rule as well as I do. If he does not, he should have paid attention when it was read. No matter how you try to distort it you cannot distort the fact that the Clerk made a count of members, and this is the count which the Chair should take into consideration. He reported the result of that count to The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard) when he was in the chair, and this is the count which should apply. I submit there is no alternative but to rely on the situation which existed immediately prior to Your Honour taking the chair. There can only be one Speaker in the chair at a time, of course, even though the situation may change. It is the situation which confronted the Acting Speaker when he occupied the chair and when the report was made to him which should count.

Mr. Speaker: We have a very difficult situation here. Whether there were 14, 16, 18 or 20 members present when the count was made is not easy to say. I have taken into consideration what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and others to the effect that when the count was made originally there were only 14 members present in the house. The fact that some members left the house caused some difficulty for the Acting Speaker and for the Clerk Assistant; they were counting people who were coming in and people who were going out.

At the same time I feel I have to consider that there were probably not 20 members in the house when the first count was made. When the Clerk Assistant on instructions from the Acting Speaker took the names down—he has a list which is now inscribed in the records of the house—there were more than 20, but I think that for the purposes of citation 60 it cannot be the number of names

inscribed in the record which is decisive but the number of members present at the time the original count was made.

It is very unfortunate, but I cannot see how I can reach any other conclusion than to apply the provisions of citation 60 and say that when the count was originally made there were fewer than 20 members in the house. If that is the situation, it seems to me I have no alternative but to declare the adjournment of the house and invite hon. members to return in large numbers at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I regret I have to reach this conclusion but I cannot see how I could expect continuing respect for the Chair without doing so.

At 5.38 p.m. the house adjourned.

29180—701

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 11, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE

TABLING OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT ON POLYETHYLENE

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have tabled today copies in English and in French of the report of the Tariff Board, the reference number being No. 143, Polyethylene, together with a transcript of the evidence presented to the board in public hearings. I assure the house that the Tariff Board's recommendations will receive most careful consideration by the government. Interested parties who wish to comment on this report should do so as soon as possible.

MOTIONS TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

TRANSPORT

NEWFOUNDLAND—EMBARGO AFFECTING LABRADOR CITY-WABUSH AREA

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the rail embargo imposed on shipments of gasoline, automobiles, domestic heating and cooking fuels and other necessary supplies via the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway between the province of Quebec and the towns of Labrador City and Wabush, Newfoundland, which is now causing serious shortages and severe hardship to residents of these two towns because of the depletion of fuel supplies and the unseasonably low temperatures being experienced in the area. There is need for emergency action by the Minister of Transport to avoid the impending crisis.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador has brought to the attention of the house a matter which undoubtedly and clearly is of considerable urgency. The determination which must be made by the Chair is whether the house should be adjourned for the purpose of debating the situation mentioned in the hon. member's proposed motion. After much thought, I am inclined to the view that debate at this time could hardly be expected to relieve the hardships to which the hon. member refers. It should also be remembered that in order for there to be an adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 parliament should be faced with a genuine emergency which might be termed national in character. Having considered all the aspects of the very important matter referred to by the hon. member, I do not think that the motion ought to be put to the house at this time.

• (11:10 a.m.)

GRAIN

SHORTAGE OF BOX CARS AT PRAIRIE POINTS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the dire shortage of railway box cars at grain shipping points in western Canada and the fast approaching deadline of the end of the crop year on July 31.

With the government's announcement of an equalized five bushel quota over western Canada by the end of the crop year, it will be absolutely impossible to meet this commitment unless emergency measures are established by setting up a transport co-ordinator and by extending the end of the crop year to August 31.

As there will be no opportunity for parliament to debate this national emergency, it is vitally urgent that there be a full and comprehensive discussion of this matter in the House of Commons at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I think in the circumstances it is incumbent on the Chair to bring to the attention of the hon. member the provisions of subsection 16(d) of Standing Order 26 which has reference to a motion under the terms of the standing order:

(d) the motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session pursuant to the provisions of this standing order;

My understanding of the hon. member's motion is that it is substantially the same as one which was discussed under the provisions of Standing Order 26 on January 22 last when a similar motion moved by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) was accepted by the Chair. I think the provisions of the standing order are clear. It would not be possible even under the circumstances outlined by the hon. member to allow the adjournment of the house at the present time for the purpose of discussing the hon. member's motion.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO CONSULT NATIVE PEOPLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that this is the second day in a row that I am moving a motion. I am trying to pay careful attention to Your Honour's ruling of yesterday.

I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the current discussions which the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is having with the premiers of provinces and with Indian people and the turbulence and fury which is arising therefrom.

An hon. member is saying that I am out of my mind.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has given the Chair notice of the proposed motion. I have to admit that this is one of four motions submitted earlier today, or yesterday, for the consideration of the Chair and which has given me very serious difficulties. I sincerely think it is a borderline case and I have been wondering whether the motion of the hon. member might be allowed in the present circumstances.

[Mr. Southam.]

Even as I stand before hon. members now, I am not sure that this motion ought not to be granted. The matter raised by the hon. member is certainly one of urgency. It might appeal to hon. members to debate it in the sense that, as the hon. member has suggested, the proposed debate would have reference to discussions which the minister is having at the present time with the Indian people and with provincial authorities.

It may be that hon. members might want to have an opportunity to express to the house and to the government their views in connection with these discussions. In view of the fact that I have had these serious doubts I would think that they should be resolved in favour of the motion.

Some hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members will take into account that actually such an adjournment debate may take place only later today and that only one hour—I was going to say of government time but that would be incorrect; it would be House of Commons time—would be involved. In view of this I think hon. members would not mind giving up one hour of discussion in the debate now before the house, for the purpose of considering this important matter.

I would add one word of caution at the present time, and remind hon. members that the staff of the house has been under pressure lately. I would hope some arrangement would be arrived at between hon. members to limit the length and number of speeches during the adjournment debate later this day, so that the staff could be given an opportunity to leave the premises at a reasonable hour, and not late at night as has happened in the case of two or three of the previous debates embarked upon by the house under standing order 26. This is a suggestion I am making to hon. members, and the house leaders may want to have discussion on this point later.

In view of what I have said, the motion will be put. Has the hon. member leave to proceed with the motion pursuant to Standing Order 26?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 26 the debate will take place from three o'clock this afternoon.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ALLEGED UNDUE INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING INDEX

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26, either today or on Monday, for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the serious increase in the consumer price index—the cost of living—by one full point during the past month, which is a yearly rate of increase of 10 per cent a year, and is the culmination of the steady rise in the cost of living which has been taking place for the past several years brought about by the failure of the government to take steps to deal with this serious situation.

I bring this motion forward at this time because the time table announced by the government house leader—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot argue the urgency of debate. He must rely on the Chair. I am sure the hon. member appreciates that only one such motion can be granted per day. The Chair has already ruled in favour of the previous motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). However I will not wait until Monday to rule on the hon. member's proposed motion. I would tell him that after much consideration I would have to rule along the lines of the previous decisions made when similar motions were proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) and, I believe, by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), when it was indicated that these types of motions based on such circumstances are not normally accepted by the Chair, or by the house.

I refer the hon. member to the ruling which was made by the Chair on May 8 last when the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings proposed a motion under Standing Order 26 in connection with the consumer price index. I suggest to him and to other hon. members that the ruling made at that time would apply in the present situation, and so I regret that the motion of the hon. member should not be put to the house.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, with great deference may I rise on a point of order to remind Your Honour that at that time you ruled there would be an opportunity in the next few days to discuss the important matter I brought up, namely, during the debate on the budget, and I accepted your ruling—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member refers to Standing Order 26 he will see it is not possible to argue either before or after the decision or the ruling of the Chair. This is the very purpose of the new Standing Orders, to try to save the house from the difficulties of the interminable arguments we had in previous years as to whether the Chair ought to, or ought not to accept these motions.

• (11:20 a.m.)

The hon. member has made a motion and I assure him I have given the matter much consideration. I might say in passing that the decision reached before was not based entirely on the point he has just raised. If he will read the decision which was made then and on other similar occasions, in particular when the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) sought to adjourn the house in similar circumstances, I would think the hon. member would realize that the ruling which applied then would apply also in the present circumstances.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT STEPS TO CURTAIL INCREASING COST OF LIVING

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, in view of the increase in the cost of living disclosed today and referred to by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, whether the government has any special plans not yet disclosed to help bring relief immediately to ease the burden and to prevent the burden from increasing, particularly for those who are aged, those who are poor and those who live on fixed incomes.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Of course, Mr. Speaker, the government is always concerned about the people on fixed incomes, and indeed the policy we have enunciated, which I hope the opposition will support, to fight inflation is the only way to overcome this difficulty. The major cause of the increase in the cost of living in the month of June by .8 per cent was a 12.7 per cent increase in the price of beef.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the fact that the increase of nearly 3 per cent already in this calendar year would amount to something approaching an emergency, I wonder whether the minister is prepared to review the methods he has adopted and enunciated to date, and consider mobilizing the country to adopt some kind of guideline policy to meet this grave situation.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I certainly intend to continue to review vigorously the policy of the government in this regard, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would join with me in urging all Canadians to be modest in their demands on the economy, and not take more out of it than is being put in through increased productivity.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, as the cost of living now is increasing at a rate of 10 per cent per year, would the minister not agree that the policy which he put forward in his budget is completely ineffective in curtailing inflation, and that he should accept the suggestions put forward by members of the opposition and get something done about inflation.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member will agree that his supplementary is argumentative.

[*Later:*]

EXPEDITION IN PRESENTING ECONOMIC COUNCIL REPORT ON COMBINES AND PRICES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that posed by the Leader of the Opposition to the Prime Minister. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would bring his considerable influence to bear on the Economic Council of Canada to expedite the report on combines and prices, in view of the seriousness of the increase in the cost of living index.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I thank the hon. member for assuming I have considerable influence on the Economic Council of Canada, but I do not have all that much influence.

GRAIN

BOX CARS REQUIRED FOR DELIVERY OF QUOTA

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether any special arrangements have been worked out with the railways, particularly the C.P.R., so that extra box cars may be provided on C.P.R. lines to move grain, since many of the points are on a quota of two bushels and less and it is impossible to visualize how they can possibly meet the five bushel quota by the end of this month.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was in Winnipeg earlier this week and held some discussions with regard to the transportation problem. I have also been in touch with the presidents of both railways and propose to invite them to Ottawa after the weekend for further discussions, to see whether we can do something along the lines the hon. member outlined.

RESEARCH

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF SCIENCE POLICY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether, in view of the fact the house will be sitting next week, he will make a statement on government science policy which he indicated a few days ago he might make if the house was still in session.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know that it would be a good idea to interrupt for this purpose the interesting debate that is going on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether the government is giving consideration to the recommendations of the O.E.C.D., that the government appoint a minister responsible for all aspects of science policy priorities?

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED REVISION OF MILK POLICY

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, following my question yesterday, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture said he wished to check on the figures I quoted, which I have sent to him. I should like today to put to him the following question.

In the light of the date supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, would the

parliamentary secretary be ready to recommend to the Minister of Agriculture to review the policy being carried out by the Canadian Dairy Commission in order to help dairy producers?

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Lotbinière for having passed on to me the statistical data he had, since I was wondering whether they were accurate or whether the hon. member was finding it somewhat difficult to understand them. As a matter of fact, if he had read the whole bulletin, he would have seen that instead of a decrease, it is actually an increase for 1968 in comparison with 1967, and that with regard to the 1963-67 average, it is an increase of 14.8 per cent.

It seems to be exactly the opposite of what the hon. member said, and the misunderstanding comes from the fact he does not understand the figures.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the Parliamentary Secretary be ready, with all the vicious honesty for which he is known, to go and explain those figures to the farmers in Quebec?

An hon. Member: Think before you speak!

[*English*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEWFOUNDLAND—AGREEMENT ON PROGRAM —MEETING WITH PREMIER

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wished to direct my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. Will he advise whether the federal government is about to sign an agreement with the province of Newfoundland in respect of a regional development program?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, similar questions have been asked within the last month or five weeks and I think the minister's answer is on record. If there are any recent developments I will advise the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport? Is he in a position to disclose to me and to the house the results of a meeting held yesterday with the premier of Newfoundland in respect of a regional development program?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I have to intervene in this regard because I doubt whether the Minister of Transport is the minister who should reply to that particular question.

Mr. Marshall: Perhaps I could direct it to the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could direct the hon. member's question to the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Go ahead.

Mr. McGrath: Did the Prime Minister meet with the premier of Newfoundland in the last few days to discuss a regional development program for that province?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

INCOME TAX

INCREASED EXEMPTIONS FOR PENSIONERS AND SUPERANNUATES

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance which is related to questions asked a few minutes ago in respect of the further increase in the cost of living, as it affects pensioners. In view of the situation will the minister consider increasing the income tax exemptions for pensioners and superannuates?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, although I will consider any suggestion made by the hon. member, I cannot undertake that I will consider this in the immediate future.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO ALLEGED DELAY IN RECEIPT OF REPORT BY STAFF RELATIONS BOARD —REQUEST FOR TABLING

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services in reference to a report of the chief adjudicator to the Public Service Staff Relations Board, in respect of which he replied on Wednesday last.

I now ask whether he has investigated the considerable gap between the date of the decision, namely April 30, and the date the report was received by the Public Service

Staff Relations Board, namely June 16. If he has, will he say what was the cause of this lengthy delay and whether such delays are to be considered normal, to use his adjective?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the explanation is that Mr. Martin's appointment as chief adjudicator ended on April 30, 1969. Some drafting and editing of the report was necessary after that date, but it was thought he should sign the report on April 30 to correspond with his term of office.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the minister understands the time sequence that I have in mind. I am interested in what happened between April 30 and June 16.

Mr. Richardson: I can only answer for the Public Service Staff Relations Board. As I explained to the house recently, the board received the chief adjudicator's report on June 16 and made a distribution of the report on July 4. I have explained that this is a normal period of time. I cannot go beyond my responsibility, which is to explain the action of the board.

Mr. Macquarrie: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister see that the report is tabled so that the members of the house who have been denied the chance to discuss it may at least have the privilege of reading it?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I believe the President of the Privy Council has been considering that question, which was asked recently.

Mr. Fairweather: Then we will never see it.

Mr. Richardson: If there is to be a tabling of the report, it will be announced in due course.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): On a point of order, may I with your permission, Mr. Speaker, point out to the minister that the document is a public document. The hon. member for Hillsborough asked that the minister be kind enough to put a copy on the table so that everyone may see it. It is not within the government's ambit to withhold the report; it is a public document which anyone can obtain by going to the Public Service Staff Relations Board. The minister is being asked to give us an opportunity to read the report.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was referring to the suggestion that there be a motion for the subject matter to be referred to the committee. I will undertake to get copies and table them.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

WATER RESOURCES

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM HUDSON AND JAMES BAYS

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Is it the policy of this government to proceed with certain plans and proposals for the extensive exporting of fresh water to the United States, particularly into the Great Lakes basin, by means of a northern Ontario water diversion scheme?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question asked by the hon. member is of such wide scope that it should be replied to by way of a statement on motions. If the hon. member thinks this matter should be discussed earlier, I would be pleased to see that the question is given priority for consideration at the time of adjournment.

FINANCE

IMPOSITION OF RESTRICTIONS WITHOUT REGARD FOR ECONOMIC CONDITIONS—CREDIT IN SLOW GROWTH AREAS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, in light of the disclosure by the Bank of Canada that chartered banks are rapidly reducing their lending, and that loans were off $20 million in one week alone, does the government intend to impose this tight money situation on all regions of the country equally, regardless of their economic condition?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered this question yesterday. Both the Governor of the Bank of Canada and I have—

Mr. Crouse: You weren't here yesterday.

Mr. Benson: I am sorry, the day before yesterday. Both the Governor of the Bank of Canada and I urged the banks, which have to ration credit, not to do so in areas of high unemployment or areas of development in Canada, and also not, where possible, to small businesses which depend almost entirely on bank borrowings for their working capital.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask

the Minister of Finance a question supplementary to the question directed to him by the hon. member for South Shore. Will the minister tell the house whether he received any indications from the banks as to whether they would accept the recommendation made by himself and the Governor of the Bank of Canada with regard to the non-rationing of credit in areas of slow growth?

Mr. Benson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in my conversation with the chief general managers of the banks they indicated this was the policy they were following.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. In his recommendation, did the Minister of Finance suggest that particularly the prairie regions be not restricted in their credit, even though the high interest rates may add to their difficulties later on?

Mr. Benson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Could the minister tell the house whether he deems it advisable to intervene in order to reduce the interest rates, since their increase has been of no avail and the government is taking other steps to restrict credit?

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the question of interest rates is not one that the Minister of Finance can determine by simply saying interest rates should be lower. As I indicated yesterday, the government of Canada would of course like to see lower interest rates. I would again refer the hon. member to the very learned statement in this regard by the Governor of the Bank of Canada, made before a committee of the house last week.

POSITION OF GOVERNMENT ON INTEREST RATES—CREDIT CONTROL DISCUSSIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Governor of the Bank of Canada informed the committee that in the present circumstances a high interest rate was desirable in order to slow down the economy, would the minister explain exactly what he means by the government being in favour of lower interest rates at this time?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I did not say "at this time", Mr. Speaker, I think interest rates—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you mean ten years from now?

Mr. Benson: —at the present level are necessary at this time in order to protect the Canadian economy in the long run. When my hon. friend has co-operated with the government in its attempt to fight inflation, and when people such as him become conscious of the problem we really are facing, then we will have lower interest rates.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: You are fighting the poor of Canada, not inflation.

Mr. Barney Danson (York-North): A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the governor of the Bank of Canada did not say that high interest rates are desirable, but quite the reverse, and in view of the fact that he related this to inflationary pressures, would the minister consider semi-emergency measures such as meeting with the provinces to discuss credit controls, the possible imposition of forced savings and the delay of some major government programs?

Mr. Benson: This is a very complicated question, Mr. Speaker. To answer the third part of the question first, the government has taken steps toward curtailing and reducing expenditures where it is at all possible. With respect to meeting with the provinces regarding credit controls, I have no immediate intention of doing this.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY AS TO METHOD OF SETTING INTEREST RATE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): I should like to put a supplementary question Mr. Speaker.

Since the Minister of Finance has stated that it is not the government which sets the interest rates and since the governor of the Bank of Canada said himself yesterday at a sitting of the committee that he did not do it either, could the minister tell us who does?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are now reaching the area of debate and I would not think the matter should be pursued further.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like, in a non-debating way,

to ask the Minister of Finance if he would re-read the Auditor General's report over the weekend.

Mr. Benson (Minister of Finance): I have read the Auditor General's report, Mr. Speaker. I hope my hon. friend has read Mr. Rasminsky's statement.

HARBOURS

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. On May 20 the minister answered yes when I asked if he would make a statement on motions at his earliest convenience concerning the administration of small boat harbours on the Pacific coast of British Columbia. I wonder whether his earliest convenience means that the minister can make a statement within the next few days on this important and urgent matter.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will do my best, Mr. Speaker. This is a complex matter. The representations made have been noted. There is a good deal of logic in what hon. members have said, and I am trying to work out something imaginative.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADIAN FORCES BASES REORGANIZATION PROGRAM

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister be making an announcement with respect to the reorganization program for Canadian forces bases before the adjournment of the session or at least before the end of July?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can make an announcement before the end of this session, because I cannot foresee when it is going to end. As far as the end of July is concerned, I had a target date which was August 1. The subject is very complicated. Many departments of government are getting involved in the study of the implications of base closure. I still hope that I can meet that target date of August 1, but I am not quite so sure now.

Mr. Dinsdale: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can I take it from the minister's observations that because of the serious economic implications which this may have on certain regions in Canada, the whole matter has been or will be thoroughly processed with respect to the impact on regional disparity?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is what I indicated when I referred to the different government departments involved in the study of each base.

CANADIAN LEGION REPRESENTATIONS ON NEWFOUNDLAND BASE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence. Would he advise the house whether he has studied a brief from the Newfoundland command of the Canadian Legion to establish a military base in Newfoundland, and if he has made a decision—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is not a supplementary question.

GRAIN

SHORTAGE OF BOX CARS AT PRAIRIE POINTS—EXTENDED GRAIN YEAR

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): My question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister and it is related to the one put a few moments ago by the hon. member for Mackenzie and addressed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the dire shortage of box cars to be used in the emergency in trying to meet the deadline of July 31 in the crop year, will the Prime Minister confer with his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on his return from Washington regarding an extension of the crop year for at least several weeks so that this emergency can be met?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will consider the matter.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): I should like to preface my remarks by saying that it is very nice to see so many Liberals here today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Explain.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was recognized for the purpose of asking a question. May I point out that we are running short of time.

Mr. Gilbert: My question is directed to the minister responsible for housing. In view of the fact that the minister has promised on different occasions to make a statement on the policy on urban development and public housing, will he fulfil that promise by making a statement on motions next week setting forth the government's policy in these matters?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as sometimes occurs, there is a slight distortion in the premise on which the hon. member's question is based. I made no commitment to make a full statement on the policy regarding urban development and public housing at any given time. What I said was that I would be meeting the officials of the provinces to establish new criteria for public housing, and that I would do my best to deal with the urban renewal projects as soon as possible. That date of decision is getting closer every day that goes by.

INDUSTRY

DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I wish to ask him whether he and his government endorse the compulsory retirement at the age of 60 of Devco employees?

Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Prime Minister. I do not wish to rush him but I want to ask him whether he cares to carry out the promise which he made on April 14 to answer the question which I put to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked his question and, as he knows, if there is no reply given to it or if he is unsatisfied with the reply, there is not much that he or the Chair can do about it.

Mr. MacInnis: I wish to give the Prime Minister one more chance, and ask him whether he accepts the remarks made by his own Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in which he admits there is discrimination by Devco against Cape Breton miners? What is he going to do about it in his "just society"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

FREEZE IN TRACKER AIRCRAFT OVERHAUL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Macdonald has to go.

An hon. Member: Tell them to shut up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): There is lots of time. Keep it up.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I do not know what the fuss is all about. I have not yet said a word.

Mr. Aiken: Yes, but they know what you are going to say.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. As he knows, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants and I have been asking questions about a stop work order affecting Fairey Aviation of Canada. We have been told that the Minister of National Defence has a reply. Can he give it now?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the question was to the effect that we had imposed a freeze on the repair of the Tracker aircraft by Fairey Aviation of Canada. The answer to the question is that there is no freeze, and that the work in hand is continuing. It is true that we have reviewed the future contract programs, but this is normal practice.

WATER RESOURCES

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM HUDSON AND JAMES BAYS—AGREEMENT WITH ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR REPORTS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of resources (Mr. Lang) and it relates to a question asked previously by the hon. member for Thunder Bay concerning the diversion of waters in northern Ontario. Has the government entered into any agreement with the province of Ontario on this particular matter or has the government made any decision since the question was raised in the Committee on Resources in the month of May?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): There is no question of any decision on either diversion or export of water, as the hon. member mentioned in his question, and as has been mentioned in previous questions. There is co-ordinated activity between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario in the matter of studying the water available in the northern area of Ontario, studies which are wide in scope and which may take another year to complete. They may be the base of some future action at some future time but are certainly not determining action at this time. I may add that the studies were originally inspired by a recommendation on the International Joint Commission at a time when the water in the Great Lakes was very low.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister responsible for energy and water resources undertake to table in this house a report which is entitled "A Proposed Water Diversion Program out of North Western Ontario into Lake Superior" dated June 25, 1964, and six progress reports which have followed it?

Mr. Lang: I will give consideration to this request. The reports are of an interim nature and I will certainly look at the question of whether it would be appropriate to table them at this stage.

Mr. Aiken: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could answer the specific question I asked as to whether there has been any change in the situation since the matter was raised in the Committee on Resources earlier this year, or whether this is a continuation of the policy then explained and which has been carried out since 1964?

Mr. Lang: I am not sure of the date referred to by the hon. member, but I do not know of any change made recently.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I have a question for the Prime Minister. May I ask the right hon. gentleman, in view of the difficulties experienced by the government in this chamber yesterday afternoon, whether he is giving consideration to the appointment of a new house leader?

An hon. Member: Where were you?

[Mr. Aiken.]

TRANSPORT

NEWFOUNDLAND—EMBARGO AFFECTING LABRADOR CITY-WABUSH AREA

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): My question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that some 2,000 private automobiles at Wabush and Labrador city are inoperable because there is no gasoline, and stocks of domestic fuel are depleted at a time when these towns are experiencing unseasonably low temperatures, will the minister advise what action his department is taking with regard to the removal of a rail embargo on gasoline and fuel oils?

Hon. Donald Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I should make it clear that the embargo referred to by the hon. member is imposed by union representatives who are refusing to load such cargo, except under restrictions which make it impossible for the railway to complete deliveries. As of this morning the railways indicated to me that they are prepared to carry fuel into the area, provided they get agreement with the unions involved.

Secondly, I have asked the Canadian Transport Commission to send a representative into all four areas to check on the situation.

Thirdly, I am advised that the discussion with regard to settlement of the strike is progressing favourably, and hopefully it will be over within a very short time.

INCOME TAX

RETURN OF REFUNDS

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. Arising from the assurances given by the minister to this house on June 6 to the effect that there is no delay in processing income tax returns, and in view of the fact that some 700,000 returns have still to be processed, what special efforts will now be made in the organization of the minister's department to ensure that those who are entitled to refunds receive them before Christmas?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, we have already processed 200,000—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not in order and should be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Paproski: May I address a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Will the minister assure the house that the government is not improperly retaining these funds to bolster its revenue position?

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister and ask the right hon. gentleman whether he can confirm that his planned trip to the west will commence on July 12, or is he going to reconsider the date in view of the fact that it is Orangemen's day?

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

PARTICIPATION OF PRIME MINISTER IN DEBATE

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister inform the house whether he intends to be here next week to participate in the debate, or is he carrying forward his plans to visit the west?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the west is more important than listening to a stupid filibuster.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is a rule in our book—it is one of the standing orders—which provides that answers to questions should give information, and should not be such as to provoke debate. There is also a tradition in this house that the Prime Minister is the leader of the house and as the principal member must lead the house in the maintenance of respect for parliament.

Mr. Crouse: They have no respect for anything over there.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): What a joke, this P.M.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I submit that the answer of the Prime Minister is contrary to the rule relating to answers to questions, and is uncalled for. The house is debating a very serious matter, namely the rules of this House of Commons, and I submit that if the Prime Minister has a modicum of respect for this place he will withdraw his remark.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think any impartial observer of the question period in this house would say that about 80 per cent of the questions are not to elicit information, are not of a serious nature. I think my only qualification of the hon. member's point of order is that it is sheer hypocrisy.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has the floor.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister wishes to compound the situation by his further remark, then that is, of course, his privilege. However I draw to Your Honour's attention that the previous statement, the one to which I objected, did not refer to the question period but to what he called a filibuster, a debate that is taking place. The Prime Minister cannot escape his responsibility for the untoward remark that he made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I see several hon. members seeking to rise, either on supplementary questions or supplementary points of order, but I doubt whether anything can be gained by continuing the point of order.

The initial point of order was raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who suggested that referring to a debate as a filibuster—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As a "stupid" filibuster.

Mr. Speaker: I would have to consult the precedents to determine whether that word is unparliamentary. It seems to me that in my short years in parliament I have often heard a debate called a filibuster by members on either one side of the house or the other. No suggestion was made at those times that that term was unparliamentary, and I would not think that it is. Whether an adjective describing that word makes it less or more unparlia-

mentary, I am not sure. I would not think the word was unparliamentary to the extent that if a member used the word he ought to be required to withdraw it. I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would agree that my expression of opinion in this regard is probably supported by the precedents.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I submit—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is indicating, I think, perhaps not that he is dissatisfied with my ruling but that—

Mr. Nowlan: I rise on another point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In order to make clear what I said, may I—

Some hon. Members: No, sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I was unable to hear all of the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre owing to the catcalls and noise from hon. members across the way, but aside from the question concerning an adjective placed before a noun in describing a debate in this chamber, the Prime Minister went on in all his honest glory to use the word "hypocrisy".

I have always taken the stand that sticks and stones may break my bones but words will never hurt me. However I suggest that the word "hypocrisy" does impute motives. We have had a lot of catcalls from many of the members across the way while we have been discussing a serious subject, though the Prime Minister has not set an example in maintaining the decorum of this chamber.

I am coming to the point that one is not allowed to impute motives. I am not so much worried about whether the Prime Minister thinks in his mind—whatever is in his mind—that the debate is a stupid filibuster; that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the point of view raised by the hon. member, but it is a basic rule of parliamentary debate

[Mr. Speaker.]

that no hon. member may impute motives. If the hon. member suggests the Prime Minister, in referring to the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, was imputing motives, I am sure that the Prime Minister will want to say that he was not imputing motives.

Mr. Lewis: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: I am going to stand still, Mr. Speaker, until hon. members opposite have the dignity and decency to shut up.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I can indulge in a wordless filibuster until there is silence, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly proceed with his point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to suggest seriously to Your Honour that the issue is not merely an issue of whether any hon. member said a certain word or took a certain attitude towards a debate in this house. The issue before this house and Your Honour is the position of the Prime Minister of Canada in this house. The issue is whether the Prime Minister of this country can act in such a way as to induce every hon. member of this house, particularly on his side, to make a shambles of this parliament, as it is his intention to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Is this not imputing motives?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me we are not making much progress. It is now the hon. member for York South who is imputing motives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I ask hon. members whether they seriously think this house should continue much longer in this way. I have some serious reservations. A moment ago I suggested, and I believe I was right in my suggestion, that attributing hyprocrisy to another hon. member is imputing motives and to that extent I suggest that that word is unparliamentary. The Chair has intervened in similar circumstances before. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley suggested that I should

intervene now, and that is precisely what I am doing. We will not make much progress, certainly, in the consideration of the affairs of the House of Commons if hon. members one after another rise on points of order and take it upon themselves to impute motives to other hon. members. I wonder where that will lead to?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to Your Honour that although there are other things I might say, and I may say them on another occasion, I will obey your wish. May I suggest to Your Honour that, despite your suggestion that that word be withdrawn, the Prime Minister has not made any gesture of rising to his feet. That is why I have risen to my feet. If the Prime Minister will be decent enough, man enough and Prime Minister enough to withdraw, I will be glad to sit down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the same point of order.

We feel that the Prime Minister of Canada is imputing to us motives we do not have. As for us, we can remind him of certain facts. Indeed, he never participates in any debate on procedure in this house.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if this intervention is useful.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, after the second slight occurred I rose in my place, because I wanted the Prime Minister to withdraw what he said. He has not done so. Your Honour pointed out that imputation of motives is contrary to the rules. Unfortunately the hon. member for York South has fallen into the trap of seeming to impute motives. Imputation of motives can undermine our whole system of debate in this house and I say that I will not stay quiet unless the Prime Minister withdraws.

Mr. Speaker: My ruling was not that the Prime Minister should withdraw his remark but that he should indicate to the house that he was not imputing motives. That is the difference. I should like the Prime Minister to say that to the Chair and to all hon. members. I have not suggested, nor do I suggest now, that he should withdraw the word he used; but he knows as well as I do that we can neither impute motives, nor say we are imputing motives. I invite the Prime Minister to agree with me.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, although that word used may describe the seriousness of questions asked by the opposition, I certainly wish to obey your ruling, sir, and I do so.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, does that cover—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —Your Honour's suggestion that it would be imputing motives to say that the point of order raised was tantamount to hypocrisy, and that the Prime Minister is withdrawing that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have already made my ruling on the first point of order raised by the hon. member. I told the hon. member I did not think it was unparliamentary to refer to a debate in this house as a filibuster because I think, if we are to rationalize the situation, that this is imputing collective motives. I wonder if that is unparliamentary. Perhaps it is not. In any event I should not like to renew the argument which started 15 minutes ago. I have made my ruling indicating that it is my view that saying that debate is a filibuster is not in itself unparliamentary. I asked whether the qualifications which have been added have made the situation worse. I have some doubts, but I do not think so. I have made my ruling and the hon. gentleman agreed with me. I think, so far as that aspect of the matter is concerned, that is the end of it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I raised the original point of order inasmuch as it was my question that brought on this furore.

Mr. Trudeau: Nobody even noticed.

Mr. Thompson: I do not know whether the Prime Minister considers that 80 per cent of the questions coming from this side of the house are hypocritical or that 80 per cent of us are hypocrites.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I ask for the co-operation of hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary question to ask and I think it is most important to clear this matter up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member will kindly resume his seat I will

recognize him and give him the opportunity to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is this. First, will the Prime Minister inform us whether he expects the debate in this house to continue on the subject we are presently debating; under whose leadership will it continue in view of difficulties this house faced last night. Second, will he please advise the people of western Canada, and I consider it a dubious honour for them to be told, whether they are more important than his problems with the House of Commons are. Would he also say what his program and itinerary is to be?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Thursday, July 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster! Filibuster!

Some hon. Members: Leaky Deaky! Leaky Deaky!

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest hon. members should forget the question period and give the hon. member an opportunity to make a speech.

Some hon. Members: Filibuster! Filibuster!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think hon. members ought to know that I have no intention of ruling that using the word "filibuster" is unparliamentary. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Bell: He is a real hypocrite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are obviously getting into more difficulty. The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster might perhaps use other words that are not unparliamentary.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The suggestion I made when that word was used earlier was that we cannot impute motives. I am sure the hon. member did not want to impute motives.

Mr. Bell: With a great deal of respect, I did exactly the same as the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now that we have established that there were no motives imputed on either side of the house, we shall go on with the business of the house.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a private member has the opportunity to be welcomed with such fervour in the house in rising to intervene in a debate—

An hon. Member: You had better check your dictionary.

Mr. Deachman: I must say I welcome the opportunity of intervening for a short time this morning, especially as the house is in such a light and jocular mood when discussing such a serious topic.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deachman: Before I come to the remarks I want to make, there is one point which I would like to straighten out for the purpose of the record. On the C.B.C. program, "The World At Eight", this morning the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) claimed that the lack of a quorum yesterday demonstrated the lack of interest by Liberal M.P.'s in the rules debate.

An hon. Member: We have you all here this morning.

Mr. Deachman: I know the hon. member wants to have it straight on the record because he has great pride in parliament and its procedures. I think he would want to have it on the record that the private members'

hour was under way at that time. I think he would also want it to be known that debate on government business does not take place during that hour.

Mr. Baldwin: Speak on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Stop your filibustering.

Mr. Speaker: I trust the hon. member will keep to the subject matter of the debate.

An hon. Member: Tell the truth.

Mr. Deachman: I believe the point I am making affects all of us who are interested and are taking part in this debate. While it is a matter which might have been raised as a question of personal privilege, I think it can be straightened out on the record by saying that according to long-standing custom we really do not look for a quorum during private members' hour. With respect to hon. members, this is not done.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members are not helping the Chair, and I find the situation most unbecoming. Hon. members are not assisting the Chair at all by conducting themselves in this way. I invite the house—

An hon. Member: Adjourn the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I invite hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and I invite the hon. member who has the floor to limit his remarks to the subject now under consideration.

Mr. Deachman: I do not want to embarrass the hon. gentleman or his party further; therefore I will address myself to the subject of the debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You should have been here yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Deachman: The amendment to the motion before us seeks to return the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to the committee with instructions to delete proposed Standing Order 75c. This would mean, of course, that we would have to give up the idea that the House of Commons can come to agreement with regard to the programming of its work when it is agreed by a majority of the members of the house that a particular legislative measure should be programmed. The effect of the amendment would be that we would have to give this up.

This was not the sense of the committee report. The committee report recommended a way in which we would move logically forward step by step to the point where, failing to reach party agreement, at least the majority of members of the House of Commons could vote to determine whether time should be allocated for any step of the legislative procedure. The sense of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) yesterday does not really meet the sense of the report of the committee as it was made to the house. If the report is to be sent back to the committee for revision I think it is desirable that this be done in the form of a resolution enabling the majority of members of the house to allocate the time for a legislative stage, and not send it back to the committee with instructions from the house to negate the report of the committtee by striking out 75c. If the report is sent back to the committee it must be made clear that a majority under 75B would always include the representative of the government party which has the responsibility for legislation and represents a majority and the will of the people who have sent us to this house. In fact, it should include not only the representative of the government but also the representative of the official opposition.

• (12:20 p.m.)

This idea was put forward yesterday in the remarks of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid). It flows from a suggestion made by the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell). I want to refer to the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) when he said:

> I am sorry if I was not clear. What I said was that under proposed rule 75B the Leader of the Official Opposition ought to be recognized. The two minority opposition parties should not be in a position of forcing their decisions on this house, along with the government, on the Official Opposition. The Leader of the Official Opposition, being a responsible officer of this house, should have an important role to play under this proposed rule. I point out that here I do not speak for the President of the Privy Council or the government.

Following upon that suggestion I wish to introduce in a moment an amendment to the

amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the house leader of the Official Opposition. But before doing so I wish to speak of how essential it is, with our growing responsibilities, that each member of the house should be aware of the necessity to program the work of the house in such a way as to afford members time to get back to their constituencies and to go into other matters than those which are debated here on Parliament Hill week after week and month after month throughout the year. I think we all feel that we spend too much time here, that we spend so much time here that our life in the House of Commons becomes unrealistic and, like people living in a monastery or a boy's boarding school, we begin to look upon it as the centre of the world or the centre of the nation when in fact the centres of the nation may be in many other places.

I believe all of us would welcome the opportunity to know the sort of schedule we were going to operate on throughout the year, to know when we could expect with certainty to visit our constituencies to reacquaint ourselves with our electors, refresh our memories about our own regions, their economic and social problems, and thus become better members of the house. With the evolution of the committee system which has blossomed within a year or two into a very formidable structure, absorbing an enormous amount of the time of members, I think we all realize that unless we can bring about a proper allocation of our time between the work of the committees and the work of this chamber, we cannot possibly discharge our duties as honest, elected members of this house.

All of us, whether we are in the opposition or on this side of the house, know we have a duty to the nation in respect of legislation, a duty that involves more than the obstruction of legislation which we may oppose. We have a duty to understand legislation, to understand it by contact with our constituents outside the house, to understand it through time for reflection, to understand it by contact with experts through the committee system, and then to apply our minds to expressing our ideas in the house, voting on the issues, and moving on to the next subject. If we cannot find a way of almost totally programming our work, then as our duties become heavier and heavier our efficiency and capability to deal with legislation will suffer and the people of the nation will suffer because of our inability to cope with our own problems and our own programming.

[Mr. Deachman.]

In the situation in which we find ourselves now, as the summer disappears and as we struggle with the job of programming our work, the first proposition to be made must concern good will. Most of the things that we do in this house are done on a basis of good will. For the greater part of the year we find we do not need to avail ourselves of the rules, to come to grips with one rule in particular to bring a procedure or process to an end. Even though as members of parliament we may be dogmatically opposed on matters of policy we find we must act here in the interests of the nation, and that we must come to a settlement among ourselves as to how a matter is to be disposed of. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, may I say we also know there are instances throughout the year when negotiation breaks down, when lines become hardened, when members spend more time in cat-calling and banter. In fact on occasion I find myself—and I regret it—indulging in such things under tense circumstances, as do other hon. members. But I do not think we leave the chamber feeling any great pride after doing so.

To revert to my theme, we do get into situations where negotiation will not solve the impasse. Therefore we have to move one step beyond that to a rule that will break the jam, not because we want to throttle parliament, not because we want to put a bridle on the opposition, not because we want to bull or ram something through parliament, as suggested yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), but because we are compelled to act by the fact that we are elected representatives, by the fact that we come here to serve our constituencies and the nation. And the way we can act is to program a legislative timetable, irrespective of whether this party sits on this side of the house or whether some other party sits on this side of the house. We must not continue unprogrammed, heading into the year without knowing how we are going to bring it to an end. We must find ways of breaking the deadlocks that sometimes occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to make a suggestion, stemming from the suggestion of the hon. member for Peel South as expressed yesterday by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, in the form of an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River, which would add at the end thereof the following words:

—and in substitution therefor to recommend to the house a proposed standing order by which an allocation of time motion may be proposed to the

house by a Minister of the Crown in the event that no agreement could be obtained pursuant to the provisions of proposed Standing Order 75A, or when the representatives of the government and of the Official Opposition were not included in the majority of the representatives of the several parties referred to in proposed Standing Order 75B and to report back the proposed Standing Orders to the next sitting of the house.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I have copies here—

[*Translation*]

—and I have copies in French and in English.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we might wait a minute or two to give hon. members an opportunity to look closely at the proposed subamendment.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to give consideration to the validity of the subamendment on the basic principle that it seeks to introduce a completely new principle to the amendment which I offered to the house in respect of the main motion. The amendment I introduced was a very simple one involving the deletion of rule 75c, in respect of which I expressed some very considerable dislike. I was supported in that stand by a great many other hon. members from this part of the house and to my left. That was the reason I moved the amendment. There will be, of course, an opportunity for those hon. members who disagree to express their view by voting against the amendment. But surely the subamendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra seeks to introduce a completely new departure or new principle.

For this reason I submit that on the very basic and elementary principle governing amendments Your Honour should not allow the subamendment at this time. If in due course the amendment I have offered comes before the house by way of a question and the house comes to a decision on it and if it should happen that my reasoning and that of those who support me does not move members to support my amendment, my friend could offer his amendment at a later time, but I submit he cannot do it by tacking it on as a subamendment at this time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to a number of citations in Beauchesne's fourth edition, in particular citation 202(13) which reads as follows:

An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

Again, I should like to refer to citation 203(3) in Beauchesne:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main—

I beg your pardon. I have the wrong citation.

An hon. Member: Read on. It sounds fine.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):

A subamendment which proposed an alternative to the original amendment is in order provided it is relevant to the question.

I pick up the last phrase first and suggest, of course, that the actual terminology used is entirely relevant to the question of whether or not 75c as such should be adopted by the house. The purpose of providing the opportunity for amendment—and as Mr. Speaker knows there are quite a few precedents in this regard—is to give an opportunity to those who might find the proposition acceptable under a slightly different form to move alternative or substantial propositions which would enable them to support the original amendment. I think it might be helpful if I referred to a ruling of Mr. Speaker to be found in volume 63 of the *Journals* of the House of Commons for 1926. The ruling begins at page 468 but I should like to refer particularly to the terminology of the Speaker at the top of page 469 where he points out in general terms:

The object of an amendment is to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or—

Here the Speaker makes reference to the then current edition of May.

—to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question.

The effect of making an amendment is for the time being to link the amendment with the main motion so that the subject matter of both is thereby placed under the consideration of the House.

Then the Speaker went on to say that bearing this principle in mind there could be little question in that instance that both the amendment and the subamendment referred to the particular subject matter there. I suggest there can be little doubt in this case that

the subamendment moved by my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra relates both to the subject matter of allocation of time and the Standing Orders of the house and relates in particular to the proceedings conducted under proposed Standing Order 75c.

The argument commonly posed against an amendment of this type is that it amounts in effect to an expanded negative. That is to say, it involves a more complicated way of saying no to the amendment when preferably one might simply move against it. I suggest that in these circumstances it is not just an expanded negative. It is an alternative or substitutive proposition to that introduced in the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River, and for this reason it would be in order for the Chair to accept the subamendment of my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and the debate should continue on this point.

I would submit, therefore, that for the purpose of giving hon. members an opportunity to pass judgment on this alternative or substitutive principle, which is relevant to the main principle involved in the original motion and is relevant to the amendment itself, it would be in order to accept the subamendment of my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra does raise some interesting procedural points, not to mention the interesting points of substance which are also involved and with which we shall deal later, if necessary. It seems to me that all the citations referred to Your Honour by the President of the Privy Council fall to the ground because they relate to motions of substance, to general motions that are placed before the house. What we have to consider is that what is now before the house is a motion to adopt a report of a committtee. There is a clear rule of parliament stated in citation 323(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows:

> A report from a committee cannot be amended by the House, but it must be referred back to the committee.

It seems to me that any amendment to the motion that is before the house must pay full regard to that provision, namely, that a committee's report cannot be amended on the floor of the house. It may be argued that in effect the hon. member for Peace River is seeking to do this indirectly because his motion, while it seeks to refer the report back to the committee, does suggest a change that ought to be made. However, I draw to your attention this fact. The change suggested in the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River is a change in respect of a subject matter related to the way of doing things which is before us. Rule 75c is in front of us in cold print, and the proposal is that 75c be deleted by the committee. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, while he is employing the device of helping to send the report back to the committee, introduces a whole new proposition. He does not talk just in respect of 75c; he wants a new 75c put into it with a new principle which happens to be one he would not expect some of us to go along with, but we must not get into the substance.

• (12:40 p.m.)

In that connection may I draw Your Honour's attention to one of the subparagraphs of citation 203, namely subparagraph (5) which says:

> An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

I submit that if this was a general resolution in itself which we were dealing with, and it was in the terms the President of the Privy Council tried to put forward under order 100 or 99—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Under 99.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are even now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Fair enough.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Even under those terms this amendment would have to be called into question because it raises a new question which can only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

When you put the two things together, the fact that it is clearly a brand new question plus the fact that it is in violation of the proposition that a report from a committee cannot be amended on the floor of the house, there are very serious procedural questions about the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in my humble submission for Your Honour's consideration in respect of the proposed subamendment, may I say first of all it is in my mind a form of an expanded negative. In actual fact the amendment is that the report of the committee be returned to

the committee to delete a particular section. That is all it seeks to do. But the subamendment adds something else which is quite new. Within the terms of the subamendment there is an entirely new principle involving what should be considered under 75B. The fact is that it seeks to amend 75B. It does not make any mention whatsoever of 75B, but rule 75B would be amended as a result of the acceptance of the subamendment. One must amend 75B to carry out part of the purport of the subamendment by defining what shall be a majority. That is where it must be done. It cannot be done in 75C. If that is the purpose then I say the subamendment is deficient. If that is not the purpose I suggest to Your Honour that the whole subamendment is meaningless.

There arises a further procedural difficulty in respect of reporting back the proposed Standing Orders at the next sitting of the house. The subamendment is definite and clear that the committee must report back at the next sitting of the house. If the subamendment were accepted by Your Honour it might ultimately be voted on at ten o'clock some night. When it refers to the next sitting does that mean the committee would report back at the next sitting, or does it mean that this is something to be thought about during the summer adjournment in order that the committee may come back with a new 75C, or a new proposed Standing Order regarding the allocation of time? That is what it really says. It would involve a proposed new Standing Order for the allocation of time. Would that be for the next session of the house? If that is the purpose of the subamendment, it does not say so.

I put it to you that this is impossible and that no one in the house would seriously suggest that if the subamendment were accepted at ten o'clock on a Thursday night the standing committee would come back with an appropriate Standing Order by 11 o'clock on Friday morning, or at least until an appropriate report had been posted. In this way it is quite wrong. It refers to the next sitting of the house. That does not mean anything else but the next sitting because this is all the business now before us.

Therefore I put it to you that the subamendment is out of order in that it is clearly an expanded negative. Second, it introduces an extraneous and new principle. Any amendment under the circumstances would have to refer to 75B if the purport of the amendment is as I have indicated. Third, it is indefinite and impossible to carry out from a logical and administrative point of view in the way it is now worded.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit to you that the subamendment is in order. The committee, under its original terms of instruction from the House, dealt with the problem of allocation of time and reported on three phases of that problem, namely, 75A dealing with one set of circumstances, 75B dealing with another set, and 75C purporting to deal with still another set of circumstances.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River attempts to give instructions from the house to the committee to delete one phase in respect of a matter on which the committee has now reported. It is abundantly clear that the committee can only do what it is instructed to do by the house. I should like to refer to citation 220 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. Citation 220(1) states:

> An instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings and extends or restricts the order of reference according to the discretion of the house.

The argument I put to you, Mr. Speaker, is that if the committee were bound purely by the amendment in the terms offered by the hon. member for Peace River it would be unduly restricted in discharging its responsibility under the instructions which have been given it by the house. Citation 220(2) states:

> "On May 5, 1893, the Speaker of the Commons of the United Kingdom laid down the following rulings with reference to the instructions: The principles which guide a limit in the system of instructions on going into committee may be thus stated: First, an instruction must empower the committee to do something which the committee is not otherwise empowered to do. Secondly, the purpose of the instruction must be supplementary and ancillary to the purpose of the bill"—

I would argue that the committee report in this case is not to be distinguished from a bill and must, generally speaking, fall within the framework of a bill. The citation then states:

> "Thirdly, it is irregular to introduce into a bill, by an instruction to the committee, a subject which should properly form the substance of a distinct measure, having regard to usage and the general practice of enacting distinct statutes for distinct branches of law."

• (12:50 p.m.)

In discharging its instructions and responsibilities to the house the committee brought forward three recommendations in the form of 75A, 75B and 75C. If the committee were

to follow the instructions contained in the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River it would in effect be inhibited and restricted in discharging its responsibilities under the instructions given to it. The subamendment put forward by my colleague a short while ago would permit the committee to deal with this question in a way that has not been dealt with in the discussion regarding the report dealing with the allocation of time in the house. Nothing in the subamendment is in any way inconsistent or negatives the instructions given to the committee.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have had only a brief opportunity to examine the wording of the subamendment, but it seems to me it is an effort to amend proposed rule 75B indirectly rather than dealing with 75c and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River. In other words, I think the subamendment, if accepted, would not amend 75c but 75B. To that extent it is not in any way related to the amendment we are now considering, which proposes to delete 75c. For that reason alone I submit that the subamendment is out of order. I do not think we can go this far beyond the scope of what is proposed in the amendment by trying to amend a proposed Standing Order which is not dealt with at all in the original amendment.

Mr. Stanfield: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the subamendment, which I too have had only a brief opportunity to examine, clearly contradicts and negatives the amendment. What the hon. member for Ottawa West said might be relevant if there were no amendment before the house. He directed his remarks to instructions to the committee, and that sort of thing. I suggest that the hon. member's remarks were irrelevant in the circumstances and were not directed to one of the major points Your Honour has to consider.

Clearly, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River involves the deletion of proposed Standing Order 75c. Equally clearly, it seems to me that the subamendment is the exact opposite of that and its effect is that 75c be retained. It is in direct contradiction of the amendment. I am not addressing myself to the question whether an amendment such as this would be in order if it were proposed to the house after the amendment is dealt with. That is an entirely different question.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others have put forward perfectly valid objections. Clearly, the subamendment is directly opposed to the amendment and therefore is out of order. If at some future time after the amendment is disposed of a motion like this were presented as an amendment, that would be an entirely different question. I suggest that the subamendment is clearly out of order because it negatives and is directly contradictory of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thank hon. members for their learned contribution to the debate on the procedural point. There is some difficulty in determining whether the amendment can be accepted at this time. Some hon. members who took part in the debate indicated that the only matter we have to decide is whether the amendment is an amendment to the main motion or a subamendment. I assume that in practice it does not make very much difference. At the same time, the procedural point has been raised and I think it should be resolved.

Hon. members have referred to a number of citations and precedents. In view of the fact that it is one o'clock, hon. members might want to wait with bated breath until two o'clock, when I will deliver a learned opinion on the point of order raised by hon. members.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

[*Translation*]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wish to thank the hon. members who were kind enough this morning to provide some assistance to the Chair in connection with the interesting point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

During the lunch hour, I have considered that point of order very seriously. Following my own inquiries as well as the advice and opinions that were generously supplied to me, I am now in a position to give a decision.

[*English*]

Hon. members will realize, of course, that what the Chair is concerned with especially is the relevancy and scope of the subamendment. I am worried particularly by the description of the amendment included in the subamendment. I refer to the fact that the mover of the subamendment suggests that the subamendment is presented as a substitution for the original amendment. I am wondering

whether this in itself is not an indication that the amendment cannot be accepted on the basis of relevancy.

In the course of the procedural debate hon. members mentioned the fact that we are dealing with an amendment which is limited in scope in that it suggests that the report be referred back to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c. It seems to me that the amendment which the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra proposed to the house this morning does go beyond the scope of this very limited amendment. In my view and in my interpretation of the subamendment, it seeks to do many other things, one of them being to correct proposed standing order 75B. Because of that I have very serious reservations about the procedural acceptability of the subamendment.

Hon. members know that the role of the Chair essentially is to see that discussion is relevant to the matter before the house and that amendments be relevant to the questions before the house. If the Speaker has a role to perform that is particularly significant, it is precisely to see that the rule of relevancy, to some extent at least, is respected. It is not all that easy to ensure that it is respected in the course of debate. It is not easy either to see that it is accepted and respected in connection with amendments proposed by hon. members.

After much serious thought I have come to the conclusion that the subamendment proposed by the hon. member enlarges the scope of the amendment which, as I said, is limited in nature being restricted exclusively to a reconsideration of proposed Standing Order 75c. I indicated before one o'clock, and I reiterate now, that perhaps the method by which the proposition advanced by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra might be considered by the house is in the form of an amendment to the main motion. I cannot rule in anticipation but it would appear to me to be the reasonable way in which to consider the hon. member's amendment.

For this reason and in the hope that we can ensure respect for and acceptance by all hon. members of the rule of relevancy, I suggest that the subamendment be not considered now and that we proceed for the time being with the consideration of the amendment itself.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I say that I feel the discussion today, the question period this morning and the incident of the lack of a quorum yesterday afternoon are direct consequences of the introduction of and insistence by the government on this type of amendment which tries to ram closure—I do not know what else to call it since it is closure—down our throats when the house will not accept that. It must be remembered, and I have indicated this before on previous occasions when we were speaking on points of order, that the rules of the house are the rules by general acceptance of the house. They are no more the prerogative of the government than they are the prerogative of the Chair. The Chair does not make the rules. Neither are they the prerogative of the opposition.

Why this government at the present time should feel that they have become the anointed to impose their version of the rules and the version of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the house is not obvious to anyone. If some of the new members would look back on the traditions and customs of this house they would see that June 25, 1968, was not the date of the second coming of Christ and was not the dawning of a new parliamentary system. It was a continuation of our parliamentary system of government.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Prior to my coming to the house in 1957 many rule changes were made. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) was in the house at that time and so was the hon. member for LaSalle (Mr. Lessard). The hon. member for LaSalle will agree that the changes made in 1954-55 received the consensus of the house. Lest some of the neophytes think that many of the changes brought in then were not of a major nature, let them refer to the committee report and to *Votes and Proceedings*, of the day when they will discover that that was the time when limitations were first imposed on the debate on the speech from the throne and the debate on the budget. Other limitations were also imposed which were for the benefit of the executive.

Mr. Winch: And by agreement.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Yes, by agreement. Subsequently other changes were brought in during the 1960-61 administration which modified our daily proceedings.

Mr. Goyer: What about the debate on the flag?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): What about the debate on the defence production bill and on the trans-Canada pipe line?

Mr. Goyer: But what about the flag?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I have no shame in that connection. I place no stricture whatever on the debate on the flag.

[*Translation*]

I shall only say that even if one was not born in Montreal, one is not compelled to share the views which are popular there.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about protracted debate, let us recall the pipe-line debate which although more violent than the flag debate lasted as long.

[*English*]

The hon. member would not even know what the government tried to do with the Defence Production Act of 1955. It was a bad law. As a result of opposition to it public opinion was mobilized, and the then prime minister, Mr. St. Laurent, had to send Mr. Howe fishing so that the offensive clauses upon which Mr. Howe was insisting could be removed from the bill.

This is why we in this house must have the power to oppose if necessary. As a member of the committee on procedure I opposed many of the changes that were brought in by consent last December. My stand on this proposal today is absolutely clear: I think it is wrong.

With all due respect to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the ruling the Chair made in regard to acceptance of the motion moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) was also wrong. There is no rule that says I cannot disagree with a finding of the Chair. Although I accept the ruling made by the Chair I do not think it is correct. It is wrong because the motion that appeared on the order paper was in clear defiance of an order of the house.

The only member who had a right to bring forward a motion in regard to the procedure of the house was the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) as chairman of a committee that had been instructed by the house to study a certain matter and report. He, in turn, had been instructed by the committee to seek concurrence in the committee report. A government minister had no prerogative to bring forward an amended version of the motion. That action was totally and irretrievably wrong.

If that ruling is to persist and rule 75c is approved, the house will have been delivered bound hand and foot, with a gag ready to be placed in the mouths of its members, right on the doorstep of the government as it wants.

Under 75c, which deals with legislation and not with estimates, if a committee brings in a report to the house that is in any way critical of the government the government will tell a supine chairman of that committee—many of them have been supine chairmen or have behaved as such—

Mr. Drury: Shame.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I say shame on the government for its actions in regard to the chairman of the transport committee, the man the government put in hospital. The government is also guilty of shameless conduct in regard to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. He was put under intolerable pressure. He was put in an impossible position, his committee having decided in its wisdom to bring in a certain report.

A great deal has been said about the merits of our new committee system. It was going to be the beginning of the dawning of a new era.

Mr. Crouse: The cornerstone of the just society.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Yes. All members were going to participate. They would be able to question witnesses and to express their opinions. They would be able to bring forward the reports they wished.

We must remember that committees consist of a majority of government members. In this regard I could say something about government members who express a degree of independence. As a result of the new method of appointing members to committees, government members are being yanked off without their consent or consultation. An example of this took place in the transport committee last week.

Mr. Lessard (LaSalle): It was done in your time too.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No, it was not.

Mr. Peters: They had to come to the house first.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Let me ask the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) or the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) whether they were consulted about being pulled off the transport committee. Did they consent to that?

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary South is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Under what guise is the hon. member attempting to speak?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary South is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I was taken off the transport committee at my own request because I was going to be necessarily absent from Ottawa. I returned to the committee immediately I came back to the house.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It is nice to have the record clear on that point, but I should like to know why it was said otherwise in the committee. In any event, as long as the government has the power to remove members from committees, as it has, we will see independent-minded committee members suddenly taken off committees. No motion in this house is necessary. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Lind) last year suddenly found himself involuntarily taken off a committee, though at that time the government had to make a motion in the house before it could do so.

If the government does not like the report of a committee it can prepare a government motion to excise the portions of the report in question. Then it will claim the right of precedence simply by instructing the chairman not to move the motion for concurrence. On top of this we have allocation of time. As I have said, the house would be bound hand and foot, with a gag less than an inch from the mouths of its members, always at the ready, if 75c were approved.

[*Translation*]

If we want to consider closure, I will tell you that it is provided for implicitly in the Standing Orders.

Hon. Members: Give examples.

Mr. Lambert: Of closure? I am willing to tell you how it can work.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and others have indicated that in the future there could be a change of government. We must remember that these proposed rules are not temporary but will be in force until the house decides otherwise, and the examples put forward by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands related to matters about which there would be a great deal of controversy in the house. Let us assume that old age security is made—

• (2:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Go home.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is all right, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is new here and a member of that arrogant majority. Let us assume that the government is going to amend the Old Age Security Act by imposing a means test.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not that.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am only assuming that this would be the proposal. Let us say that the government of the day says, "We are going to allow one day for second reading," and that at the end of that one day's debate the motion is put, after which the bill is sent to a committee of the house. Let us say that it is to be in committee for two days.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): For one and a half hours each day.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Yes. The committee could be allocated one period a day in a committee room. It is all too easy to have 15 or 17 committees programmed for a day. Committees are fairly simple to schedule, although they do not always go ahead. At any rate, there is discussion in a committee primarily composed of government supporters for two days, and then the committee has to report. When the bill comes to the house at the report stage an allocation order is made and there is a further two days' debate at the report stage, followed by third reading. But, Mr. Speaker, there will be debate at the report stage only if there are amendments; if no amendments are put forward at that stage there will be no debate. So there might be two days of debate followed by third reading. That is all that would be allowed.

I know the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) said he thought that allowing one member from the front bench and one backbench member from each party to speak would be a sufficient expression of opinion. Isn't that cosy, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The backbenchers over there have as much respect for parliament as the Prime Minister has.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): You know, Mr. Speaker, if some of our neophyte members had had a chance of serving in the opposition as well as on the government side, and my experience is about evenly divided between both sides of the house so I ought to know what I am talking about, it would be much better for them. There must be ample opportunities for discussion. And who shall say on a particular bill affecting constituencies from one end of the country to another that such and such a frontbencher who represents his constituents and such and such a backbencher or private member who represents his constituents shall be the only ones to speak? Who is going to arrogate unto himself the role of God in saying, "You, from the province of Nova Scotia, on this particular subject, you cannot be heard; and you, from Ontario, on this subject, you will not be heard." Hon. members forget that in this house we are equals and have equal rights to speak. But no, only the exalted 27 or 28 in this house are to be given the opportunity to speak extensively.

This situation applies to the government backbenchers, if only they knew it. At present it makes no difference to them because they are not allowed to speak and will not be allowed to speak. Talk about participatory government! Here we have a government in which the front benches have lost contact with the back benches. We have all heard good stories going around of the yards and yards of ministerial skin that were scraped off walls following complaints at the Liberal love-in. Government backbenchers are overheard talking in coffee shops and elevators. They gripe and their gripes are heard by others so that they become public knowledge.

I now wish to deal with some other matters, Mr. Speaker. I am participating in this debate at this time because, as vice-chairman of the committee, I can say that the chairman who presided over the committee's sessions last year and this year, without exception, did an excellent job, and no member of that committee can point a finger at him for being partial or for not having the committee under good control. It was because he was being hamstrung and humiliated by the government that I have insisted on taking part in this debate. I am taking part to protect the position of the chairman of the committee because I feared he was going to be destroyed. But that, of course, did not seem to affect the conscience of the government house leader.

I wish to place on record as vice-chairman of the committee, and I think I speak for all members of the committee, that I appreciate the services performed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). I put my remarks in those terms. I have no words of condemnation in my vocabulary that are strong enough to condemn the government's attitude in this connection. May I also say that the Leader of the Opposition indicated that there was a rumour, and he was quite right, that a motion might be brought in order to vindicate the conduct and position of the chairman. I was prepared to bring in a motion of privilege on behalf of the committee in order to protect the chairman.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We were ready, too.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): We just could not allow this matter to pass without making the strongest representations. Members of other committees will have to take the same steps in order to protect the position of chairmen. We have developed a committee system that will fail if we do not have strong, impartial chairmen. And, Mr. Speaker, we want our chairmen to be as free from pressure and as impartial with members of the committee as Your Honour is in the House of Commons.

In many ways our committee chairmen must be carbon copies of Mr. Speaker and display an impartiality of conduct and a knowledge of how committee meetings ought to be conducted. Otherwise our committees may become arenas for hatchet games in which government instructions will be carried out to the letter. After all, have we not heard that the government house leader has indicated to government members that their function in the committee system is not primarily to amend legislation and alter estimates, but to protect the government. They are part of the government's team and they are to act as such. Well, Mr. Speaker, the natural consequence of that is, as I said a moment ago, that the committees will become arenas for hatchet games. The whole of the process is spurious if it is felt that the committees are not going to be a forum for discussing and examining legislation and estimates and/or going into questions that the government has put before them.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Some people do not have much hope for the committee system. I do not share that pessimism. I will be personal again and say that the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs had developed a spirit of co-operation. Its members work with the chairman who understands their aspirations and is quite prepared to work along with them. We get along fine in that committee. That type of committee produces good results. It may be one of the exceptions.

I have great hopes for the committee system, but it will have to work differently from the way in which it has been working. The committee will have to work with much less influence from the government. The chairman cannot be either the chief protector of the government or the hatchetman. He must always bear foremost in mind the interests of the committee. It must be remembered that committees are composed of members from all parties in the house just as the house is composed of members of different political persuasions. Your Honour must protect the interests of all members, not just those of the government supporters. The chairman of a committee must represent the interests of all members of that committee.

I hope we will see some consequential changes. I hope we will have a panel of chairmen who will occupy a position in the house much greater than at present. If the government wants to do something about hatchetmen or chief defenders, why do they not employ some of their parliamentary secretaries who are terribly under-employed at the present time in that position?

All the changes that have been made over the years have been for the benefit of the executive. I suppose it is a case of always bowing before the altar or burning incense at the altar of super-efficiency, or supposed efficiency. We are now told that the Privy Council office is going to become an empire of technocrats. We are going to see what will happen to the office of the Privy Council, with parliamentary secretaries going over the heads of deputy ministers and around ministers. These stories get out, Mr. Speaker. What is being set up? An empire for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). A presidential system is being put together. Parliament? It is only an institution that must be tolerated for the time being, but too much attention should not be paid to it.

For example, there are regional desks. Hon. members need not be listened to. Somewhere in the field there is a man reporting to the Prime Minister. Recent negotiations in the field of external affairs have not been carried out by the officials of that department. Special emissaries not connected with the department are being sent out who report directly to the Prime Minister. The Department of External Affairs does not know what is going on in connection with these negotiations.

While all this is happening, hon. members on the government side sit back and say: Everything is fine, what are you talking about? They say that these are mere rule changes which are being introduced. They have been brought in under the aegis of the Prime Minister, and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is merely the instrument with regard to them. He is the chief executive officer in this abolition of the rights of parliamentarians.

Hon. members opposite are no different than I. They represent their constituencies in the same manner and have the same rights as do I. Somehow they should realize our rights are being trampled upon and we are being muzzled. What do they think is happening to them? Is their parliament going to be every Wednesday morning in caucus where, because of their numbers, each man may be limited to two minutes? What rights have they got to speak? How are they going to speak on behalf of their constituents when the power is given to the President of the Privy Council who cares not a fig for the interests of private members? An example of this is what happened to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. The cabinet did not care a fig for him and were quite prepared to offer him up on the altar of expediency.

Mr. Goyer: Do you prefer a two-leader system?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I challenge the hon. member for Dollard to make an intelligent speech on the subject of the rules.

An hon. Member: It is not possible.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member should stand up and represent his constituents as he has an obligation to do.

Mr. Barnett: He does not know anything about it.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member gets a lot of information, doesn't he? He gets it, all right! The only time he rises is when some minister or parliamentary secretary says: "Why don't you rise and ask this or

that question? I happen to have my music with me and you can ask a question today." That is the only time government backbenchers are tolerated. That is the only time they are heard. The only time the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works has spoken is when he says he will take something as notice. The hon. member is a great one to speak from his seat.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) spoke this morning in exculpation of the attendance of members yesterday afternoon. The hon. member does not realize it, but from approximately 3.15 p.m. yesterday afternoon the same move could have been made as was made at 5.05 p.m. I was in the house until just before five o'clock and at least half a dozen times I counted the number of government members present. When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking they had the effrontery to be absent, while the opposition had over 30 members.

An hon. Member: Instead of leaving it—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Will the hon. member please let me speak.

Some hon. Members: Sit down!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton West has the floor.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking at no time were there more than eight members on the government side in their seats.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There were no more than eight.

An hon. Member: There was only one of your members here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. I ask hon. gentlemen to maintain some decorum and allow the hon. member for Edmonton West to complete his remarks. If the hon. member has a question, he may request permission from the Chair to ask it.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member keeps insisting there was only one member here. He does not even know he had been sucked in.

Mr. Deachman: It is recorded.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That may be at 5.05 p.m. but, as I said, the same action was quite possible from 3.15 onward. You do not know how many times you were counted in your lobby to see how many members you had there. It was clearly understood. This pattern had been apparent for quite some time, and it is very simple to do it. I do not have to explain, but it could have happened at 4.30 just as well as at five minutes after five o'clock, and the day before as well.

Let us be clear about it. The hon. member will not go on television tonight hollering "filibuster, filibuster." Why, to him two speeches in a row constitute a filibuster. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, when he speaks we consider that a filibuster on the part of the government. He makes only the one speech.

I wish to say a few things now about 75B and 75C. I oppose 75B, but not at all on the basis of the majority question. I feel, again in anticipation of the worth of the committee system, that no government house leader, and this includes my own party's house leader, can be well enough advised as to agree with the other house leaders that the committee proceedings on this or that bill shall take so many days, say, five days. For one thing there is already a committee on allocation of space and facilities. The house leaders would be competing against other requirements. In committees we are short of space and of staff. We do not know what witnesses are going to come before us and what priority we will have with regard to the printing of the transcript. This is important to the administration of committees. Committee members must have quick reproduction of the testimony given in a committee if they are to make intelligent comments.

As a classic example I cite the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs which has been discussing high interest rates with the governor of the Bank of Canada. The governor brought in a very complex statement of 29 typewritten pages which took over a committee session to read. There were questions. The problems are difficult. The governor gave very lengthy, reasoned answers. But who on earth could sit there and make a complete note of them, particularly those members who signified their intention to ask further questions? How can they keep all of this in their heads from Tuesday to Thursday or from Thursday to Tuesday, or from one session to another if sessions are more numerous than that. We need the transcripts but as yet there is no established priority for them. There is no indication that we are going to get them.

Then there is the question of how long a witness is going to take. I can give many examples during the past winter of very erudite, very learned witnesses, where a 30-second question prompted a 19-minute answer. This meant that a member with a 20-minute allocation of time during a round of questions got in one question, or perhaps two, and the answers took up the balance of his time allocation. How is the house leader going to deal with that? I say that the house leaders, with respect to bills over which there is controversy and with respect to lengthy bills, have no business imposing a time limit in committee. They do not know, except within very wide parameters, how long it is going to take. During the past winter we did not have any allocation of time in committees, but no one can point a finger at even one bill that was held up in committee.

On top of that, is it the intention of the government house leader to say that a committee shall sit morning, afternoon and evening? He may think so, but what about the staff? I have seen such decisions made on the spur of the moment, decisions like, "Oh, let us sit tonight," but there was no thought of checking with the staff about it. And remember, Mr. Speaker, every committee, for example the finance committee, takes between 30 and 40 people to attend to its needs. These include translators, transcribers, the electronic equipment operators and all of the other people involved. As I say, it takes a staff of between 30 and 40. Are you going to tell them on just the spur of the moment, "We are going to sit in the evening", or make an offhand decision that results in evening sittings?

The next thing we are going to meet is that these very competent and willing staffs are going to take the whole business and say, "Here, you get on with it. We quit."

An hon. Member: They are now.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Even now when we are still sitting in committees some have been delayed. Why? Because several of the staff have had to be given holidays in order to work off the great accumulations of overtime they have had built up to their credit. Yet this is what this proposal would load on to them. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough in condemnation of 75B in so far as it deals with the committee system.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In so far as 75c is concerned, as I said before it is nothing but an assault on parliament, completely and utterly, by the executive, not by the government backbenchers because they are frightened, unwilling and ignorant victims of what they propose to support through the allocation of time. Parliament as such is being delivered, tied hand and foot, with a gag already half way over its mouth.

How do you expect you are going to get voluntary agreement when the government house leader sits with 75c as a club behind his back and says, "Gentlemen, can we agree on this particular bill? If not, you know I have got 75c here. My proposal is that we are going to take it two days at a time, and that is it." Is this how one gets general agreement?

We are going to work to rule in this house, if and when 75c comes in. You will see the house work to rule, and the Lord only knows how slow that is going to be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Will there be accommodation? Will the house leaders and committee chairmen go to see ministers or opposite members to discuss these matters and say, "Well, bring on that particular bill tonight because we have agreed among ourselves that it will take an hour to get it through this particular stage." Nothing doing, Mr. Speaker. All that will be said to the government will be, "Go back to 75c and do your damnedest because we will see you freeze in Hades before we agree voluntarily.

This house gets along and has got along well on good, personal relations. It has gotten on pretty well this year, better than I have seen it for some years. But this proposed rule having been brought in by the government we saw an incident yesterday afternoon which would never have been even thought of under any circumstances during the period when we were getting on well together. And this morning we had a snap and snarl question session and we saw the petulant behavior of the Prime Minister even though, mind you, it was mild compared with what many of us have seen in the house in years past. Under these circumstances people become very concerned.

What do you think happened in the British house the other night when closure was brought on? Nobody has thrown order papers in this house; nobody has seen such a tumult. It does not matter about the subject matter, it is the attitude that is important. Closure and the guillotine, unless agreed upon, will never result in any greater volume of work going

through. I plead with hon. members, particularly with government backbenchers. If they think we of the opposition are being gagged, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the gag is being put on them too, and they are assisting in putting it on themselves. It could conceivably be that they will be sitting over here and they may also want time—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. Possibly I might ask the house whether there is unanimous consent for him to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): All right; fine. I know where the no is from. This is a bad motion, Mr. Speaker, to adopt the committee report.

• (2:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in the debate this afternoon, that is why I shall be very brief, but I cannot let pass unnoticed the allegations and suspicions voiced by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) in this house.

The hon. member for Edmonton West has insisted that the government, and in particular the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), intended to muzzle the opposition and prevent the free exercise of democracy in this house. In addition, he made vague accusations which, when he defined them, were refuted flatly. The hon. member for Edmonton West gave the impression that the Liberal party and its members were muzzled, no less, by the government and by the Prime Minister.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): It is obvious.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, once again, those allegations are vague, especially because they are not based on facts.

How strange to see a member of the opposition complain about the government, and in particular about the Prime Minister, saying that he interferes with hon. members' participation in the debate, that he intends to deprive the opposition of their rights and prerogatives when, just recently, those same parties and specially their leaders received supplementary credits from the government to enable them to fulfil their role adequately in the house, to do some research and prepare sensible speeches instead of merely making accusations which have nothing to do with the matter now under study.

How strange to see an opposition, that is better equipped today than it has ever been, complain about being muzzled and being ostracized. There's no mistake about it: those who receive are biting the hand that gives to them.

As for us, we have but to congratulate ourselves on the action of the government and on our greater participation not only in committees, or in this house but also in the Liberal party's caucus.

The Prime Minister has taken steps recently that enable us in our caucus to participate much more actively than before in the elaboration of bills and discussion of principles that are to be brought forward in this house.

Moreover, the committees operate better than they used to. They are now provided with better research facilities, especially the committee on external affairs and national defence, which has at its disposal a staff of experts to assist committee members in their work. Here is a move which, far from hindering participation in debates, will help those who wish to contribute in an intelligent way to the business of the house.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): What happens to the committee reports? Are they shelved?

Mr. Goyer: Perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton West could say how many reports tabled in the house were concurred in instead of always being over-critical and seeking the exceptional cases.

The object of the measure before us is to modernize the workings of our parliamentary institutions. Of course, in days gone by, it was difficult to let the people what was going on since the mass media were not as they are today.

Filibusters had to be accepted in the past, so that people would know about the legislation that was being considered.

Today, when television, radio and newspapers are always present, when journalists give a daily account of what is going on in the house and in the committees every minute, it is normal for the government to want an efficient tool to allow it to expedite the business of the house without for all that keeping the people in the dark.

Needless to say that if two weeks, three weeks or a month were, in the past, necessary to inform the people about the business of the house, today it is a matter of days and the citizens who want to be well-informed, who want to participate and to give their opinion on what we are doing in the house, can do it far more easily.

Mr. Speaker, participation also means that hon. members can and must be present in their ridings to meet their constituents and to listen to what they have to say about what is going on in the house. However, since the sessions, these last few years, have been very long, even endless, that pleases only those who enjoy dealing with legal and procedural technicalities while preventing citizens and hon. members from participating in the democratic process.

Therefore we must find some means of shortening the sessions so that hon. members may have some time available to visit their ridings and to live with the people they represent. The purpose of this legislation is precisely to speed up the business of the house. There is no question of putting a gag over anyone's mouth but rather to make it possible for hon. members to work in a more orderly fashion.

Mr. Speaker, it has become a matter of mental health to bear with endless and repetitious debates which contribute nothing of any positive nature.

Therefore, it is not surprising that serious-minded members are not always in the house listening to the same rubbish and rehashed nonsense.

I think that it is normal for hon. members to do some work outside this house while still serving the people they represent, and Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being three o'clock I do now interrupt the debate in order that the house may consider a motion by the hon. member for Skeena pursuant to Standing Order 26.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, before the debate commences may I explain to the house and the hon. member in particular that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) is returning from Halifax where he was in consultation with Indian representatives this morning. He will be in the house within the next 20 minutes, I hope, to participate in the debate.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO CONSULT NATIVE PEOPLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) moved the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank the government house leader for the information that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) will be here later to participate in this debate. In light of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said yesterday about the refusal on the part of the government to change its policy in this regard, the only hope and expectation is that the minister will have a change of heart and will be able to enunciate to the house, and consequently to the Indian people of this country, something really meaningful and worth while in terms of the government's desires as to its relationship with the Indian people.

The views I wish to express at the outset are not exclusively mine. In fact, on all occasions when we have had an opportunity to express ideas about Indian affairs here I have always tried, as have the members of the New Democratic party who have spoken on the subject, to make my speeches reflect the views of the Indian people and, in other words, to assist in making a presentation to parliament on behalf of the native Indian people of this nation.

• (3:00 p.m.)

We never did feel at any time that it devolved upon a member of parliament, and particularly a government official, to substitute his views for those of the people affected. As was expressed earlier, I do not think there is a great deal of disagreement about the general principle of equality before the law, or that there is a desire on the part of people, Indians or otherwise, that government services should not be made available on an equitable basis. We mentioned this principle as well on June 25. Such things, and I only enumerate these as examples, as health, access to hospitals, social welfare programs, roads, electricity and similar services should be made available without discrimination on the basis of race or colour.

Where the disagreement occurs is in respect of the policy statement of the minister, and I submit these involve two items. There

was not at any time any indication whatsoever that there would be any constitutional protection for the hereditary, statutory and committed rights of the native Indian peoples. These were ignored. The matter of Indian lands and the inheritance of Indian people in respect of resources, which should have been enshrined in our constitutional law has been ignored so far by the government. This is one of the reasons for disagreement and resentment on the part of the Indian people.

The other reason, generally speaking, is the lack of consultation in the social preparation and the development of the policy declared by the minister on June 25. It is true that there was consultation of a sort prior to that time, and it might be worth while to trace a little bit of the history of this so-called consultation process to indicate why the native people feel they have been cheated and deceived in this regard.

When Mr. Tremblay was the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in a previous government, he announced that the government was going to develop a program involving advisory boards and councils. As a consequence there was established provincial and national councils or advisory boards in respect of Indian affairs. These boards met on numerous occasions and worked out, so far as I know with the minister and subsequent ministers, a program relating to Indian affairs revolving around the Indian Act. This also involved what should be done about historic rights.

The present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing), when he was the minister of Indian affairs, not longer ago than December of 1967, announced in this house that as a result of these advisory boards and council meetings he had almost completed a draft of Indian Act changes. I submit this was done with an eye to the then expected federal election of 1968. There was a change of course; almost a disregard of the advisory board and council meetings. The minister then embarked upon a program which he called "consultation", designed to begin just prior to the then expected 1968 election.

It seemed to many of the Indian people who had attended these advisory council and board meetings and worked with the minister in preparing something in which they thought they were participating, that their ideas had been scuttled. The Indian people accepted the concept because they wanted consultative meetings. They agreed to start all over again, to put to the minister what they had been saying for years. This culminated in a meeting in Ottawa at the end of April and during the first of May at a national level. The minister went to that meeting and listened, but made no declaration whatsoever except that in respect of the development of ideas and policy that he would make a statement sometime before the end of June. He did so, but at that stage the consultation stopped.

There was no consultation whatsoever with native Indian people about the actual preparation of the document the minister tabled in this house on June 25 of this year, a few weeks ago. Consultation ended when it should have reached its peak; when the crunch was put on and when the real guts of the situation was to be developed. The minister secluded himself with his advisors in whatever private offices he has and developed a policy and program in isolation from the native people, without regard to their feelings or to consultation. The minister has subsequently said the Indian people do not know what they want in this regard; that their opinion is divided.

On April 29 the National Indian Brotherhood, in consort with delegates who were elected to attend that national conference, made a statement to the government of Canada. I will not bother to read it in its entirety, but I want to say they expressed doubts about the course of consultation meetings, and specifically said:

> It has been made abundantly clear, both by the consultations to date and through Indian meetings throughout the land, that the principal concerns of Indian people center around;—

They then list four principles as follows:

> Recognition of the treaties and the obligations imposed by same;
>
> Recognition of aboriginal rights;
>
> Reconciliation of injustices done by the imposition of restrictions on Indian hunting through the ratification of the migratory birds convention and subsequent federal and provincial legislation;
>
> Claims commission—It is our opinion that before meaningful consultation on amendments to the Indian Act can take place these four items must be dealt with and a position of mutual understanding and commitment reached.

Those are exactly the points the government seems to have missed or ignored. The manner of implementing these programs is also bringing a halt to a great deal of the development which should have taken place and was expected among the Indian people on the Indian reserves. These Indian people are now reluctant to participate in programs of development under the department in respect of such matters as housing, welfare and grants to assist in the economic development

of these areas because these people are fearful of what may happen to these programs if the government proceeds blindly, as has been the case.

Let me refer to the example of the Eel River Bar Reserve in New Brunswick. The Indian band there made an application for $125,000 to the Indian affairs branch of the department, and put up $40,000 of its own money plus additional collateral in the form of $13,000 per year expected revenue the band would receive. The band has now dropped that program for economic development of that reserve because it does not know what will flow from the present conversation the minister is having with the province, or from the direction which has been outlined. Consequently, they feel they have been cheated; that they have been exploited and that the government and the minister have chosen to ignore the fundamentals involved in an Indian affairs policy.

Many Indian people feel that the government went into the consultation process with its mind made up. They feel the government went there to listen but not to heed. The government has consulted but has not heeded, and these native people feel there may have been a basic misunderstanding or a lack of knowledge on the part of the minister and the government as to Indian affairs.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The minister gave an interview to *Time* magazine following the introduction of the policy statement in this house. In the issue of July 4 we find these words of the minister:

> The more I thought, I realized that the Indians come to the federal government for one reason; because of the colour of their skins.

That is a ridiculously ignorant statement. We are involved here with the rights of people. We are involved here with something that should not have attached to it a condescending remark like that, semi-racist in nature. Surely, the minister knows that the Indian people do not come to the federal government because of the colour of their skin, hair or eyes. They come to the federal government because of our constitution. They come here because the federal government has sole, exclusive jurisdiction over Indians and lands reserved for Indians. That is what the British North America Act says. They come here because of the proclamation of King George III which respected their rights and which successive federal governments have ignored. They come here because the agency representing the government of Canada at that time signed the treaties. They come to the federal government because it has a legal, moral and ethical obligation to deal with their affairs. They do not come here on the basis of the colour of their skin. If that is truly what the minister and the government think, it is the cause of the difficulties and misunderstanding. Part of the program enunciated by the minister is already in effect and is the cause of resentment by the Indian people. The program has been announced and put into effect.

A cause of wonderment on the part of the native Indian people is the fact that we in this house tried to obtain a document headed "Local government on Indian reserves", and were unable to do so. This document was prepared in secret and hidden from the native people. I tried to obtain it in this house. The house made a decision on it by voting. I am not casting any reflection on the decision. I am not entitled, under the rules, to do that in any event. The minister said: Local government on Indian reserves is not my policy. If it is not his policy, why is it in effect? Who is running the department, the minister or the mandarins who work in it? If it is not the government's policy, why is it there? There is also the implementation of the program under the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of Indian Affairs. They are starting to put into effect the policy announced on June 25.

The Indian people are very much concerned about the declaration that the government will respect what it calls the legal rights of Indians. They look at the Jay treaty and say: We have certain rights, but the Supreme Court of Canada has said the Jay treaty does not apply because the parliament of Canada never endorsed it. Is that the legal right the minister is prepared to accept, that the treaty is invalid? The native Indian people look at the Migratory Birds Convention Act, which they thought preserved their rights, and find that the courts have overruled them. The minister is prepared to endorse the ruling of the courts which has wiped out treaties in a number of instances across this country, treaties concerning health, the medicine chest treaty in the prairies and fishing rights in New Brunswick.

When the minister was asked about the Jay treaty in this house, Mr. Speaker, he said that the people who thought they were covered by that treaty could go to court. Is that the way he intends to respect what the native Indian

people believe to be their rights? These matters have caused a great deal of concern among the native Indian people. John MacDonald, Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs, circulated a letter to the employees of the department on June 25, the same day the minister announced his policy. I notice that Mr. MacDonald is sitting in the gallery today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I do not know why hon. members applaud him. In that letter Mr. MacDonald told his employees that they were going to embark upon a new policy. He set out in the letter what the government intended to do. Let me read part of it:

> The government therefore proposes to negotiate with the provinces and arrange with other federal departments for the early transfer of programs and services carried on by this department for the benefit of the Indian people.

The letter refers also to the steps necessary to protect the job positions of the people working in the department, and special steps to deal with the problems of career development. In other words, the program the Minister announced is already being implemented, namely, transferring the programs and services carried on by the department for the benefit of the Indian people. These people have been making life miserable for the Indian people for many years, and now they are being transferred to other departments.

Is this part of the consultation process? The minister has just come back from Nova Scotia where he had meetings, with whom I do not know. Presumably those meetings were to talk about the policy the minister had announced and, hopefully, to change his ideas if they were rejected. At the same time he is doing that he is putting into effect a program which the native Indian people look upon with suspicion. It is fundamental to the whole problem—we have said this innumerable times—in the field of Indian affairs that any program or policy for the Indian people has to be commensurate with their needs and desires. A program or policy should not be developed within the sanctity of the minister's office or by the people working in the department, and imposed from above.

There has been almost universal rejection of this policy by the native Indian people in Alberta, Ontario, New Brunswick and parts of Manitoba; for all I know, perhaps all of Manitoba. In the face of this rejection, the minister still goes blindly on his way like a man compelled by a hidden force, unable to see, unwilling to hear. Let me read what the Indian Association of Alberta said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the house give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are having only one hour of debate, as far as I know, and if not I consent.

Mr. Danforth: Oh, no. It is unlimited.

Mr. Lewis: We are having at least three hours.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the house give the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Gilbert: Christian charity!

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that at least five of the hon. member's colleagues remained in the chamber this afternoon to hear the debate on this matter of public importance. It is refreshing to see the New Democratic party so concerned about this matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Where have you been?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I would remind the hon. member that that matter has been settled.

Mr. Perrault: I made the point simply to indicate that this is a very important question, and I am shocked to find so few members of the New Democratic party present for the debate.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I would ask the co-operation of hon. members. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) has the floor.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has risen on a question of privilege.

Mr. Brewin: The hon. member has put on the record of the house the fact that there are five members of our party in the chamber at this time. I regret to say that his eyesight must be defective because there have been eight, nine or ten members at all times.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Speaker, we are perfectly capable of counting. If they were skulking behind the curtain and are now present, then I must withdraw my original statement that only five members were listening.

We heard from the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) who, in a rare act of verbal contortionism, has completely reversed the position he adopted on June 25. His party has now incorporated into the list of 5BX exercises the "Skeena flipflop". That is the only way to describe it. Now, we have the hon. member for Skeena posing as the fierce defender of the view that the government has acted precipitately in the matter of revising its policy toward our first citizens, that there has been inadequate consultation, and that the policy is defective.

I think we must remind ourselves that according to *Hansard* of June 25, at page 10584, the following words were used by the hon. member for Skeena with regard to the announcement made by the minister:

> The hon. member for Peace River and I had the opportunity in 1959, 1960 and 1961 of participating in the joint Senate and House of Commons Committee on Indian Affairs... the report of which committee contained the same ideas and concepts that the minister has now outlined. Even though it has taken some period of time to get a cabinet minister to agree with those concepts, it is still welcomed.

Those were the words which he used. Then, he went on to say that many of his comments must necessarily be vague. Certainly they must necessarily be vague—they had not been worked out. The hon. member said:

> Many of his comments must necessarily be vague, as he is not dealing with this matter in a unilateral sense but in an area of conversation and discussions with the native people and with the provinces.

Now, we hear that there have been inadequate discussions. On June 25, the hon. member said that of course there will be discussions, and there must be discussions. He acknowledged this fact, and he said that naturally the minister cannot have any predetermined position to outline to them. The words which he employs today are at total variance with the statement with which he greeted the announcement of the minister last June 25. At that time he said, as recorded at page 10585 of *Hansard:*

> The policy statement is a step in the right direction,

He went on to say:

> I think the success of this program depends on two factors: It depends upon the continued acceptance by the government of the views of the native Indian people themselves because they are of primary importance; it also depends upon the speed with which the government puts into effect those accepted views.

I suggest that this was a responsible statement, and I hope the hon. member will come out from behind the curtain before we are finished this afternoon.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): May I say, for the information of the hon. member, that I have been requested to answer the telephone.

Mr. Perrault: He said there had been inadequate consultation. He said that the minister had callously disregarded the views of the Indian people. This must mark the most dramatic conversion since St. Paul was converted on the road to Damascus. On June 25 this hon. member who was speaking for his party sought eagerly to attach himself to very concept advanced in the report on Indian policy, claiming paternity for the child. Today it is different; he rejects the infant and he would abandon it to its fate because he sees some sort of shoddy political advantage. Anybody who goes around the country making statements of the kind he made is irresponsible.

I will quote again from page 10951 of *Hansard* in which he predicts that there is going to be tribal warfare, turbulence and fury—these are the words he employed. It would be wrong to question the motives of any member in this house, but one can only wonder why the attitude of the hon. member of June 25 has deteriorated into the position he takes today. On July 10, he spoke about a matter of urgent public importance, referring to the almost universal rejection of the policy statement of the minister. He spoke of the manner in which the government has treated the Indians, and the refusal of the government so

far to indicate that it is prepared to enshrine in the constitution their aboriginal and hereditary rights. He went on to speak about turbulence, fury, tribal warfare, and the rest. This is not a responsible statement by a member of the House of Commons, regardless of his party. The only word which would apply to this remarkable flipflop, to these verbal pyrotechnics, is disreputable.

What have the members of the New Democratic party been advocating these past few weeks? I have before me some of the words which they have uttered in this house. On September 19, 1968, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) called for self-determination. He said:

> It is about time they were given the right to make more of the decisions affecting their own lives—

On September 23, the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) said:

> —Indian people have the right of self-determination. The implications of this principle are that not only does it give Indian people the full right of integration into the community and society as we know it, but also that it gives them the right to live their own existence as they wish to live it—

Then, we heard from the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) on October 28, 1968. He was attacking the idea of paternalism and centralization, saying that more decisions should be made by the Indian people themselves.

Then, on December 17, 1968, we heard the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose), again attacking paternalism. He said:

> —in spite of repeated proposals from the natives that they take part in the decisions which affect them.

Then, we heard once again on January 14, 1969 from the hon. member for Winnipeg North who spoke about self-determination. He said:

> —one thing which the Indians want more than anything else is their right as citizens of Canada, and surely they are the original citizens of Canada, to direct and manage their own affairs,—

This is the consistent N.D.P. demand.

Then, we heard from the hon. member for Skeena who has spoken many times on the subject of Indians. On March 6, 1969 he said:

> The Indian Act gave birth in 1867 to a system of paternalism which has been like a fungus growth that unfortunately is still with us today and still growing—
>
> As long as we have an Indian Act, a special law relating to people with a different cultural inheritance from everybody else, and as long as we have a separate department, we will have discrimination and denials of fundamental human rights.

The hon. member called for the abolition of the Indian Act. He said:

> We in this party have suggested for a long time that the objective of the government and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development must be self-destruction of the department and the minister's position.

These are the statements which have been placed on the record by a party which today sponsors a resolution questioning the motives of the minister and questioning the report which he brought to the house. I ask the house whether or not this is a responsible attitude.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the contradiction?

Mr. Perrault: I can go on and on.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member says we have been questioning the motives of the minister. The hon. member may be questioning the motives of the minister, but at no time have we suggested that we question his motives. Quite the reverse.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: I am pleased to hear at least a partial return to a responsible attitude by the party to our left.

These are the suggestions made in the report on Indian policy:

> —this is the right time to change long-standing policies. The Indian people have shown their determination that present conditions shall not persist—
>
> This government believes in equality. It believes that all men and women have equal rights. It is determined that all shall be treated fairly and that not one shall be shut out of Canadian life, and especially that no one shall be shut out because of his race.

Then, a new policy is advanced in the report, which reads:

> The government would be prepared to take the following steps to create this framework.

It does not say that the government is determined arbitrarily and unilaterally, without consultation, to impose this policy. There is an offer from this government. The government says that this is what they are prepared to do and the report states very explicitly that the measures for implementation of the

policy are straightforward. They require discussion, consultation and negotiation with the Indian people, individuals, bands and associations and with provincial governments.

This is a statement by a responsible government, earnestly seeking solutions to a problem which has plagued this nation ever since confederation. Today there has been an attempt, and I suggest it is a very shoddy and disreputable attempt, to create the impression that there is some sort of deliberate policy on the part of this government and those who support it, not to work toward the best interests of the Indian people.

Then, we see in the report, under the heading "The Immediate Steps", the following:

> Some changes could take place quickly. Others would take longer. It is expected that within five years the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development would cease to operate in the field of Indian affairs; the new laws would be in effect and existing programs would have been devolved. The Indian lands would require special attention for some time.

These are only approximate targets, and may I remind the house once again that the government has said it would be prepared to hold discussions. This is not the time, I suggest, for any political party in Canada to muddy the waters by suggesting less than worthy motives on the part of the government or anybody else. I suggest that the party sponsoring this resolution should not yield to the temptation to till the fields of misunderstanding. It is easy to say that one does not blame the Indians for going on the warpath in the hope that a few more gains will be made, but time would be better invested working constructively with the Indian people and providing them with full equality in Canadian society. This means reassuring them that there are enough responsible people in this parliament who will ensure that their rights will not be flushed down the drain.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It is incumbent upon a responsible opposition to see to it that the Indian people are told this. In view of all the meetings held with Conservatives, Liberals and others in this house not one member of the house could claim that another member is not interested in the problems of the Indian people. It is unfair and unworthy to suggest that somehow some of the members of this house are trying to get rid of a responsibility that is justly and legally theirs.

Having talked with my associates in the Liberal party, I see in the proposed program possibility for great advances by the Indian people, but only after full consultation as spelled out by the minister in his original statement. The rights that they possess at the present time should, I believe, in no way diminish; and I believe that view is held by every member of the House of Commons.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to make a few comments this afternoon because I was not able to be present in the house when the minister made his statement. However, I did read it with some degree of optimism, though with a number of reservations, and I should like to put these forward in a constructive way.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): I have some reservations too.

Mr. Stanfield: I am glad to find a more lively group across the way than was the case yesterday, Mr. Speaker. However, since I am limited to 20 minutes I should like to use my time as constructively as possible.

The contentious part of the minister's proposals concerned the relationships with the government and other groups; on the one hand, relations with the provincial governments, and principally, of course, relations with the Indian people. With regard to relations with the provincial governments, the proposal seems to amount to a transfer of what must be some very expensive functions that are now being performed by Ottawa, functions that it must be the hope of the minister will be improved. However, there is no guarantee that this will in fact happen, because there is no guarantee that a transfer of adequate revenues commensurate with the responsibilities that the minister contemplates handing out to the provinces will be made.

Indeed, the statement made by the minister specifically suggested that the financial contributions of the government over a time will diminish, and then disappear. Such a statement is not likely to be very encouraging to responsible provincial ministers, and consequently not very encouraging to the Indian people.

This, of course, is the same government that promised there would be no more medicare, meaning there would be no more of these unilaterally dictated arrangements with the provinces. Yet clearly this proposal appears to be another announcement of an imposition on the provinces that involves potentially as much expense, and unfortunately as little consultation with the prov-

inces, as was the case with the medicare program.

With regard to the Indian people themselves, the statement of the government very nearly treats as irrelevant the issue of treaty and aboriginal rights which the Indian people consider paramount. The government takes the position that the issue concerns which level of government is to deal with the Indian people. This seems to be the fundamental concern of the government. To the Indian people themselves, one very hot and important issue concerns the rights that they will be able to enjoy as a result of treaties, traditions and other settlements. This matter is one to which there is no easy answer. However, it cannot be ignored, and it is clear that the Indians are very concerned that the government may be trying to ignore it.

In passing, may I say that it has been reported that the proposed trip west to be made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) does not include a visit among the Indian people, which I think is not exactly reassuring to them. If that report is correct, then I hope the oversight will be corrected.

Here again the government's procedures seem to be very much at fault. There has been a long process of consultation with the Indian people, but in many ways the real question is how much effective consultation was had. Certainly, there is a suspicion among representatives of the Indian people that the government had decided upon its course before the consultation began, and proceeded on that course regardless of what was proposed by the representatives of the Indian people.

Frequently throughout the consultations the question of treaty and aboriginal rights was raised. It was raised again dramatically at the final consultative meeting that was held in Ottawa this spring. No government that is seriously concerned with knowing what the Indian people want could have conducted those consultations and then have produced a report in this form. As well as appearing to ignore the matter upon which the Indian people placed emphasis—perhaps it was not exactly ignored, I do not want to exaggerate the position, but I think it was downgraded—the government focused its atttention on a matter that was raised seldom, if at all, in the nationwide series of consultation meetings. I refer to the proposed transfer of responsibility to the provincial governments.

I want to emphasize my concern about the position in which the Indian people would find themselves if the responsibility for their future welfare and development were transferred to the provinces without a continuing responsibility of some sort being accepted by the government of Canada. We all recognize that many of our Indian peoples have very serious social and economic problems which will require a highly integrated program to overcome, calling not only for co-operation from the Indians themselves but also for a highly co-operative effort on the part of various governments in this country.

In terms of talking about equality and justice, it seems to me a vast oversimplification to assume that total responsibility for the Indians can be turned over to the provinces, particularly without any real assurance of adequate financial support from the federal government. While some of the provinces might be capable of discharging this responsibility, there is no particular reason to believe at this point that all provinces would be capable of discharging it.

The minister's method of introducing policy changes may seem to involve the abolition of the Indian Affairs branch, which as a goal I gather has general approval. I do not hesitate to accept this to the degree that it is capable of achievement, but there is some real doubt that other arrangements will be made that will be adequate. The objections of the Indian people are one indication of the difficulty. As the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) said on June 25, as reported at page 10583 of *Hansard*:

> • (3:40 p.m.)
>
> While the Indian Act and the federal authority have been unpopular, they have also been familiar. Their proposed removal will raise questions and concern about Indian lands and other rights. In some cases the Indian people may not welcome the prospect of having to rely upon provincial authorities.

The predictable reluctance of the provinces to assume responsibilities they feel they cannot afford, and with respect to which the federal government has not made adequate arrangements, constitutes another difficulty. Of course, I appreciate that the Hawthorne report recommended, after extensive study of Indian matters, that the Indian affairs branch should continue in some form. One of my motives in speaking this afternoon is to urge on the federal government the idea that it must continue to accept responsibility and involvement in this area. If the minister accepts that position then I, in turn, cannot accept a program which involves the complete

transfer of all responsibilities in these areas to the provinces. I cannot accept the idea that there will be no continuing responsibility of any kind on the part of the federal government and that it will not even ensure that the provinces are dealing adequately with the Indian people.

Yet the minister has proposed, virtually unilaterally, to do away with the Indian Affairs Branch; and we must all face this question, Mr. Speaker. What will the minister do if he cannot make the necessary arrangements and do away with the branch? His statement in this house has virtually destroyed the effectiveness of the Indian affairs branch. There are reports that personnel of the branch, particularly in western Canada, are seeking new employment. There is no doubt that if the branch survives it will bear a stigma which will make it unattractive to potential employees. I suggest that unless the minister in future proves to be a better negotiator than he has been in the past—in fact, unless the government proves to be better at negotiating than in the past—he will find himself in the position of having destroyed the effectiveness of the department without having set up any satisfactory entity to carry on its work. He will not have made any effective, continuing arrangements, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the government's methods of dealing with the provinces have been full of faults. The minister proposes to transfer jurisdiction to the provinces; yet it is becoming increasingly clear that the first official word the provinces heard of this proposal was when they read the white paper. I do not think that is a satisfactory way to launch a program like this, and I do not think it is a satisfactory way to conduct federal-provincial relations. All this makes me wonder, sir, just how successful the minister is going to be in implementing his program.

An attempt is being made to wrap this proposal in a progressive aura and to make it seem a kind of Magna Carta for the Indian people. It is far from being that. This debate will serve a most important function if it reveals the fact that this statement was made in the knowledge that it would probably be unacceptable to the Indian people, and if it reveals that no effort was made to determine whether it would be acceptable to the provinces. In those circumstances, it is no wonder that the document has proved far more popular with the press than with the people and provinces it affects directly.

It would be most unfortunate if an attempt were made to cast the Indian people who protest this document today in the role of those who speak merely in defence of a special interest or to suggest that they are merely protesting the disappearance of special rights and privileges they have enjoyed to date. Such accusations would be unjust and inaccurate. We cannot belittle or dismiss the seriousness of the protest of the Indian people. Reference has been made to threats of violence, and I do not make light of those. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we must face the fact that there has never existed an atmosphere of trust between the Department of Indian Affairs and the people it ought to serve. That atmosphere of distrust was intensified when the government's white paper contained proposals about which consultation did not occur, in effect dismissing representations about treaty and aboriginal rights. We must be honest with each other. I believe there are few more vexing problems in this country than the problem concerning treaty and aboriginal rights which could involve heavy federal expenditures. These are difficult questions of justice and equity which we must consider.

The central concern of the Indian people, and it ought to be our central concern, is that the effect of the minister's statement seems to be to downgrade the importance of this question. I hope the minister will take this opportunity of putting this matter into proper perspective before saying publicly that it has been misinterpreted. The Indian people themselves have made it clear that they are not prepared to discuss the matter with the minister until they have ample opportunity to prepare themselves. I gather the minister is prepared to give an assurance adequate time and resources will be provided to enable them to prepare themselves. I hope the minister will give the necessary assurances in the house this afternoon.

The point of this debate is not to condemn this government for what it has done, although it does seem to have been guilty of trying sleights of hand. The point of this debate is that we want to prevent the government from continuing to take steps which will create a serious atmosphere of suspicion and, perhaps, of disruption. The proposal to achieve equality for the Indian people is not at issue. This is a goal everyone shares. But you do not create equality, Mr. Speaker, by writing on a piece of paper or by making an announcement. You do not create equality by declaring your intention of achiev-

ing that state of equality. Equality for the Indian people of Canada requires far more than a transfer of jurisdiction to the provinces. We must face the fact that a transfer of jurisdiction by itself could make economic equality for some Indian people, and especially for those who live in the less wealthy provinces, a much more distant goal. We must recognize the fact that some provinces are in a better position to help the Indian people in terms of encouraging economic self determination, jobs, and the like. There are other provinces which are in a less fortunate economic situation and it would be simply unrealistic to expect them to carry the added burden of services to the Indian people. If there is to be a genuine concern for equality, and I am not prepared to question the minister's motives, it is imperative that the government now move ahead with full consultations with the Indian peoples and the provinces. The government must recognize that progress will be made much more difficult if the consultations are carried out in an atmosphere of distrust on the part of the Indian people and representatives of the provinces.

There have been enough unilateral announcements by the government. We all accept the goals of equity laid down by the minister and I accept his sincerity of purpose. I am disappointed this new effort has been launched in an atmosphere which indicates a failure to consult. I am pleased to learn the minister is now visiting the provinces. I hope he will not try to proceed with a program that simply involves a declaration of intention on the part of the government of Canada to transfer the rights of the Indians to the Provinces.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I hope the minister will settle down to the very serious and prolonged problem of developing a program that will be satisfactory to the Indian people, a program which the provinces would be willing to undertake and for which they will be given the financial resources to enable them to carry out this responsibility.

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate at this time because I have to leave for Vancouver. Perhaps I can make a few remarks, however. This is a very important matter. There are approximately ten reservations in my riding. The reason I am going to Vancouver and the interior of British Columbia is to meet many of these people. I want to know their opinions. I want to know what they think of this particular policy before I make a lot of statements on their behalf.

There have been a lot of misrepresentations and misunderstandings as a result of some of the statements which have been made. A lot of these things that are embraced in the policy are things for which the Indian people have been asking. We have been asking ourselves, are we going to be treated as children for the rest of our lives or are we going to take on the responsibilities of adults? We must accept these responsibilities in the same way that other people do. We want to do these things. We want to take on the responsibilities which other people have. We cannot be treated like children forever. We cannot look upon ourselves as children. We have to participate in all aspects of Canadian life as human beings. I think this particular policy is paying off. It sets out some of the goals to which the Indian people have been aspiring. We have the same aspirations as other people.

Reference has been made to some of the things which are unacceptable. One of the major fears of the Indian people is that there will be a constitutional change which will turn over the responsibility for Indians to the provinces. This is something which the Indian people have feared for a long time. I plead with the minister to look at this matter very carefully, and clarify it so that it will be clearly understood.

Even though there is some fear on the part of the Indian people with respect to turning over the constitutional responsibility with regard to Indians, this does not mean that they do not want provincial services. We want provincial services, but there is another way of doing it. Many people have asked for this, including the North American Brotherhood, of which I have been a member for a very long time, as well as the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia.

The provincial governments are in the best position to provide many services, such as social welfare and education. They are in the best position to provide education because that is their responsibility. It is only right that we obtain our education from the same source as other people. It is not a matter of the federal government abdicating a responsibility. The government is trying to provide the best services possible for the Indian people. On many occasions I have asked the minister to give consideration to giving jurisdiction to the provinces on a function by

function basis rather than granting complete jurisdiction to the provinces. This should be done in consultation with the Indian people and with the provinces.

Another program the Indian people have been requesting for a long time is a program of economic development. I hope the minister will clarify some of the present programs for economic developments. I understand that $6 million has already been provided for this economic development program. I hope the minister will spell this out. One of the big difficulties connected with the development of Indian people has been the lack of adequate funds. One of the hang-ups has been the peculiar mortgage position of our land. We have not been able to mortgage our land in the same way as other people. There is an historical aspect to this. As one Indian chief pointed out, the Indian people are afraid that if they have this responsibility, some people will sell their land for a bottle of wine. I do not know whether this will happen, but the Indian people are afraid something like this might happen.

I hope as a result of the announcement of the provision of this $50 million we will see a greater development of Indian reserves across the country. There are some very valuable Indian reserves in this country. Caughnawaga is one of these, as the hon. member who represents that area will tell you. I have heard various estimates of the value of that reserve ranging from $400 million to $800 million. This $50 million program over the next few years will be very, very meaningful to those people. Time is running short. I would like to make more comments but if I do I will miss my flight.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): The last time I spoke in this house, Mr. Speaker, it was with regard to the official languages bill. I said that was one of the most important pieces of legislation which had come before this house. I think I took a positive approach to that bill and I will attempt to take a positive approach to this debate.

The Indian people were the first citizens of Canada. In all their dealings with the white man, both in peace and in war, they have treated us with honour. This is the point at which we should pick up the threads, because I must admit on behalf of the white race that we have let them down in this regard. When you let people down on points of honour, you lose all the way down the line.

I think I speak with some knowledge of the Indian people. My ancestors pioneered the west. My grandfather ran a Hudson Bay Fort. My mother was raised with Indian children because there were no white children in the area. She was the eldest in the family of nine. Both my grandfather and grandmother loved these people. I think that if we, the white people of Canada, can only get that one point across, that we love them the way my grandfather did, the way my mother did and the way I claim I do, then 99.9 per cent of the battle will be won. That is all they really want to know. When I say love them, I mean love on the highest plane. I mean that we have their best interests at heart. And if we have their best interests at heart we will treat them with honour. If we can convince the Indian people that we intend to treat them with honour we have won that battle.

• (4:00 p.m.)

They have always treated us with honour. If we can get them to sit around the council table now, roughly 100 years after most of the treaties were signed, the Indian people will meet us in exactly the same spirit. There have been threats of violence. I will not add anything except to say I would not blame them if they thought that during the next hundred years we were not going to treat them any better than we did in the last 100 years. But I do not think that is the case.

I want to compliment our young minister—after all, there is nothing wrong in being young—on the fact that he has taken the treaties out of the mothballs. Whether he intends to discard them or not I do not know, but I do not think so. I don't think he wants to, and I don't think he will. I agree with the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) that he can expect the fullest co-operation from all sides of the house in arriving at a reasonable agreement on what we can do for these, our people.

I have some personal views on the matter, Mr. Speaker, and if you will rule that I am not veering too far from the narrow confines of the white paper I wish to outline a few of them. First of all, you cannot love people unless you understand them. It is very dangerous to go about such basic things as telling Indians the kind of house they should live in unless you understand the kind of house, in which they want to live. Assuming that we want a house made of sticks and stones, like one of the three little pigs, this does not necessarily mean that Indian people want the same kind of house.

The Indians may want a house made of canvas. They may prefer a good house made of canvas to an evil house made of bad sticks and bad stones. If they want to live like nomadic people, they have a right to do so, the same as we have. When we are tired of living in our highrise apartments, tired of the rat race in our great cities where most of us work 11 months of the year or more, we want to escape and go back to some form of nomadic existence for at least two weeks. We want to live in a canvas house, or one made of aluminum, on wheels. The Indians know that outdoor living is good for the soul and the body. Why should we, in our city-raised splendor, tell them how to live?

If we are going to spend large sums of the taxpayers' money building homes for Indians, for goodness sake let us consult them before we start. We should ask them what they think could be done with X dollars to provide the type of accommodation they want for themselves and their children, the type which fits into their lives, which fits into the kind of cooking arrangements they need. If we do that they will know we love them and they will be ready to take the next step, if they want to, towards our enlightened, civilized way of life.

Religion is a subject too hot to handle for most people, but not for Buffalo Two Horns, which is what the Indians call me. I have two horns and I am going to use them. I speak for the Indians I know on the western plains. They had a wonderful religion. They believed in the Great Manitou, the Great White Spirit. Today we almost have to apologize when we use that name—the Great White Spirit indeed, the Father of Mankind, the Creator of the Universe. They did not think he was dead; they had not buried him. Why should we go about trying to sell them our half-dead God when, left to their own devices, they still believe in the Great White Spirit who made them, who loved them, who made the whole human race, and who still watches over them? If we cannot give them a better God than the one we are peddling in our institutions, we should leave them with the one they have. But I am not one who thinks that God is dead, and I say let the churches join with us in parliament in giving the Indians a live religion in which they can believe, a religion which will help us to love them and make them love us in the way that we want to be loved by them.

In our civilized way of life we have tried to find an answer through labour unions. These have their place. Some people think labour unions have ennobled labour almost to the point of worship. As I say, I think labour unions have their place, but they have not given man fulfilment. They do not give men fulfilment if they contribute to unemployment, if they call strikes the men do not want. Why should we go to the Indians and ask them to accept our standards of labour, or even our standards of wages, if we do not give them the dignity and the type of fulfilment that we ourselves would like to have?

I think it goes without saying that if we ask an Indian to work he certainly has a right to equality of wages with the white man, equality of working conditions, equality of advancement and opportunity. I have worked with these people in the ditches, over the pack trail, paddling canoes, and I have fought with them in the army. In every respect and in every endeavour in which they have competed with me I have found them my equal, and in a great many cases out in a natural environment have found them vastly my superior.

Some people would interpret the health provision clauses of the Indian treaties as meaning that we offered the Indians only the Hudson Bay Company's medicine box. But I think we must agree that we offered them whatever small advances we have made and will make in medicine. If the white doctor at Fort Garry was able to help them get through the fever, or could mend the bones of their children we were glad that they got that service. We were glad because we claimed we loved them, because we claimed we wanted to live in peace and harmony with them.

When the Indians signed treaties with us they did not later attack us and burn our wagon trains, as is usually depicted in Hollywood movies. In fact at the very time we most needed peace and quiet throughout the western plains, they remained peaceful and stayed on the side of law and order. In fact some of them were accused of being white-man lovers when they folded their arms and said, "There is nothing good for black, red or white in murdering each other." When we offered them health I believe we offered them both mental health and physical health. Here I mean equality of health services, the same as equality of work and equality of religion. If we are to put first things first then mental health starts with spiritual health. You cannot have a happy mind unless you have a happy spirit.

• (4:10 p.m.)

So we must proceed with this religion of love and faith. We must give them that. We must give them mental health, self respect,

love and brotherhood. Then they will be ready to clean up their lives and their bodies. I venture to say that the people of the Indian race even today, neglected as they are, would pass physical tests equally as well as their white brethren. When we speak of health, of course, we mean economic health. We mean food and lodging; it is all of a piece. When we speak of integration what do we really mean? Do we really mean that we will try to make white men or Canadian citizens out of the Indians? I say to the minister and to parliament that if by integration we mean we will try to give these people the equality, fraternity and opportunity which every Canadian citizen demands and expects, and which every Canadian citizen should have, then I say let us integrate them. But if it is our intention to make poor white men out of the Indian people then I say let them alone; they are better off starving on their own Indian reserves than living with people who do not want to give them the equality, opportunity and fraternity which is the birthright of every Canadian.

The program which is involved here is a large one. If my figures are correct there are approximately a quarter of a million people of native blood in this country. They are increasing in numbers faster than any other group of people. Fifteen years from now there will probably be one million. I believe these people are willing to meet us more than half way. As I read this statement it would seem to represent positive action on the part of the government. If we can forget our petty differences here and work together to help the Indian, and above all teach him that we do in fact love him as a Canadian, it may well be that long before 100 years from now these people will be integrated, as I said before, as full fledged Canadian citizens. This parliament may well be proud that today, this week, this session, we have taken the first step which is long overdue.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, this debate this afternoon arises from the position in which the minister is now in respect of his dealings with the Indian people and the provincial governments. I think we realize, however, that it also arises out of his statement made in this house not too long ago. In other words, the current situation flows from that statement and we cannot, I submit, have a meaningful discussion unless we base it on that statement. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), who is so glib, made some comment on the statement made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) following the minister's announcement. I should like to make one or two references to just what was said on that occasion by the hon. member for Skeena. His remarks are reported at page 10584 of *Hansard* for June 25.

> Some of the ideas contained in the minister's statement are good. Some of them are not so good. A great many of them are rather vague. I do not say this in an unkind way, and I am sure the minister does not take it in an unkind way.

A little farther on, we find this:

> I submit it is extremely important that in the negotiations, discussions, or whatever they may be that the minister will have with the provincial governments, the negotiations or discussions proceed only at a speed commensurate with the desires of the Indian people in the provinces concerned.

I think those remarks bear a very close resemblance to some of the remarks made a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand). I point this out in an effort to make clear to Your Honour and the members of this house that the hon. member for Skeena has tried to show, as he said in his remarks earlier today, that he does not seek to enter into this discussion in any sort of a partisan way. He feels he has some responsibility, as one of the members in this house who comes from an area where there are a great many of these people, to try to understand and voice in this house the real thoughts of the Indian people.

I understand that the minister's dilemma, as the motion moved by the hon. member suggests, arises not so much from what is in the statement but from what is not in it. It arises in part from some of the clarifications of the minister's statement that have been elicited as a result of subsequent questioning in the house and the statements that have been issued by the Indian people themselves. The hon. member for Skeena, quoting from the document issued by the Indian people here in Ottawa prior to the minister's statement, outlined what the principal omissions were. I think the minister confirmed that those are the omissions from his statement.

I am sure the minister will recall that on June 26 a number of questions were asked, initiated by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). At one point I asked the minister the following question:

> Does the statement which terms aboriginal claims to land as being unrealistic and not capable of being dealt with specifically represent a fixed government policy, or is this merely an idea which has been put forward for discussion and negotiation with the Indian people?

The minister's introductory statement was couched in many honeyed words indicating that these were simply the ideas of the government which were open to discussion. Therefore, it was difficult to know what was fixed government policy and what was open for discussion. This was the reason I asked this question of the minister. In reply, the minister had this to say:

> The government acknowledges the legal rights of the Indians and the rights derived from legal documents. As for the other rights they are the same as those of the Canadian citizens.

Any member of this house who participated in the earlier debates on the subject of the establishment of a claims commission cannot be unaware of the fact that when we start talking about Indian rights that are contained only in legal documents we are talking about a very narrow segment of the whole question of their aboriginal rights.

The statement of the minister, so far as he is concerned, may seem quite legitimate. The outrage that has been expressed by Indian spokesmen since the minister made his statement results from the fact the Indian people did not have a chance to look at it. On that same day the minister made the following statement in reply to a question concerning the appointment of a commissioner:

> —but the appointment of a commissoner rests solely with the government which alone is authorized to appoint one.

• (4:20 p.m.)

As far as I am concerned this is the attitude which goes to the nub of the matter. This is basically why there is unrest among the Indian people and dissatisfac ion with the minister. He has continued to insist that this question can be dealt with solely within the normal authority of the government of Canada. While it may be true that the kind of policy statement the minister prepared is normally a proper function of the government of Canada, it is not of much use in this regard. It is similar to other statements of policy announced as a result of decisions made by the cabinet in the privacy of the cabinet chamber. We accept this fact because we recognize the validity of the proper exercise of the authority of the Crown in this parliament. I submit that what the minister has failed to understand, and what the government across the way has consistently failed to see as a result of the discussions we have had on claims commission bills, is that when we get into this particular area in respect of the rights of people in what is now Canada, we have to go beyond the normal terms of reference if we are to consider this question in any realistic and meaningful way. As a result, I can understand at least in part the reaction of one of the younger, but in my opinion most responsible, Indian representatives here in Ottawa with whom I had a conversation the day following the minister's statement. This Indian told me that the young Indians are going to be very bitter about this whole matter. He said there are going to be riots. I suggested to him that he might agree with me that riots were pretty stupid. He gave me a questioning look until I added that, usually they are caused by someone else's stupidity.

I submit that if unfortunately situations of that kind develop, the responsibility will rest fairly and squarely upon those of us who sit in this parliament at this time. They will result because of our own stupidity and because of our failure to recognize that we are dealing with something that goes beyond the normal confines of the jurisdiction of this parliament. We have to look at this problem in broader terms than we look at normal questions of Canadian policy. Unless and until we are prepared to recognize that fact, the so-called Indian problem in this country will never be solved. To me this is the nub of the whole matter, and this is why I feel sorry, like my colleague the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) for the present occupant of this difficult position. We both have a very kindly feeling toward him. So far, at least, he has not appeared to grasp this point, nor have his colleagues in the government.

Let me go back to the remarks I made during a debate we had a week or so before the minister made his statement, during which I said I was hopeful but a little skeptical on the basis of the past experience with government, that there would be something in the statement recognizing the principles I have been trying to outline. On July 4 I addressed a question to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as recorded at page 10842 of *Hansard* for that day:

> Since the policy announced by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in respect of future treatment of Indian people is based on the concept that white is right, is the Prime Minister considering withdrawing Canada's sanctions against Rhodesia?

Mr. Speaker ruled the question out of order on the ground that it contained an allegation. I do not seriously quarrel with the ruling of the Chair but, as everyone who has been a member of this chamber knows, that is perhaps the only way one can attempt to make a

point in this house. I did not hear the Prime Minister make a reply to the question and he did not rise in his place, but *Hansard* has reported him as having said:

Not only is it not in order; it is very low.

I fully admit it was not a nice question. In fact, it was a nasty question and it was deliberately nasty. I feel it was justified under the circumstances. I want now to raise this question about just who and what is low. The point I am really attempting to make, in the hope that the Prime Minister might give some thought to whether the government of Canada might be prepared to go a bit beyond the normal approach accepted in this country, is that we should recognize that the jurisdiction of the Crown does not cover the entire situation. We have all taken an oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, but we know that the prerogatives of the Crown exercised in the right of Canada do not completely encompass this whole question of rights due to the Indian people of this country.

This establishes the relationship. I hope I can make it clear that I am not talking about any form of narrow racism, nor was I when I put that question in those terms. What I was trying to get at was the idea that the policy statement of the minister was based on a concept of white colonial supremacy, which is what brought Canada into being. What I was trying to get across was that in other parts of the world, the initial colonial powers have been divesting themselves of a colonial policy. Because the British North America Act and the Statute of Westminster of 1931 made Canada a sovereign power in the ordinary context of the term, we have this heritage in our midst. I believe there was a statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom the other day which bears this out. We have a responsibility in Canada to do what Britain did in India.

I can remember as a young Canadian being quite smug and complacent, and one of those who was willing to go to great lengths to do something about Britain freeing these other people called Indians. Down through the years we have been very smug and virtuous about the failings of colonialism and how Britain should free the peoples in Africa and in her other colonies. It has been very easy to get that kind of reaction. We have listened to a lot of statements in this house in the last year or so about the problems of Nigeria. Unless we are prepared to approach this matter of dealing with the Indian people with the same spirit we expect Britain, France, Germany or any of the other Imperial powers to approach that question of freeing the peoples of Africa and Asia, we do not really understand the problem. If we are going to understand our Indian people we must first try to understand ourselves, understand what we are and recognize how we came to be.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Some of my ancestors came to this continent in the 1600's. I have colonial blood in my veins, like most hon. members in the chamber, at least those who are not in what is sometimes referred to in other discussions as the third group. If I have learned anything in the last few years from sitting down and talking to Indian people, it is that with humility I should look at myself in the mirror and try to understand what I am before I can hope to understand what they are. I submit this is the whole point behind the motion of the hon. member for Skeena. The hon. member moved his motion in the hope that the minister having moved to the point in time where he now is, may be willing to recognize this concept in his approach to the question of aboriginal rights and rights to land, particularly in a province like British Columbia where we negotiated no treaties with the Indian people and therefore there are no legal documents. It is our hope that the minister will approach the problem in this way. For this reason we thought it desirable to have this debate this afternoon.

I submit, as I submitted when we had a discussion on Indian matters a week or so before the minister made his statement, that we are at a turning point. The Indian people have re-awakened, as peoples are re-awakening in many parts of the world and in certain provinces of this country. We now have the opportunity to sow the seeds of peace and brotherhood, or we can perpetuate the growth of the seeds of bitterness, which the minister must have experienced, as a result of his recent policy statement.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, over the hundred years since confederation the government of Canada has made many fundamental mistakes in the treatment of the group of people in this country whom we sometimes call, euphemistically, our first Canadians. However, I do not think there has been any greater mistake than the premature policy statement the minister made a short time ago. I was startled as I read it. I have been bombarded by telegrams, briefs and personal letters from Indians in every

part of this country, and obviously, their reaction was the same as mine. It is all the more incomprehensible because the government had achieved a dialogue with the Indian people of Canada. There had been gradually built up over the past few years a basis for understanding and mutual respect which gave promise that at long last the government would produce a policy, approved by the parliament of Canada, that would overcome the grave mistakes to which I have referred.

Just to review the matter briefly, the fundamental error, of course, in the treatment of our first Canadians was the establishment of the reservation system, or the ghetto system, which destroyed the Indian way of life and unfortunately, by the very nature of ghettoism, made it impossible for them to become a part of the developing Canadian way of life. This created a situation wherein our Indians, who have a proud culture and heritage, became a marginal people. They were neither Indians nor Canadians; they were subject to discrimination and isolation, with the result that up until about two decades ago they were often referred to as a vanishing people. The only reason they were vanishing was that they were being decimated by disease by reason of many years of neglect.

The government of Canada at long last accepted its responsibility to our Indian citizens and in the past two decades, rather than being a vanishing people the Indian population of Canada has become one of the fastest growing segments of the great Canadian mosaic. There has been progress, as I say, in other areas over the past two decades. For example, just ten years ago the Indians received the fundamental right of citizenship in this country, the vote. Just as recently as that a new educational approach was adopted whereby it was possible for at least the children of our Indian citizens to break through the barrier of segregation on the reservation ghettoes and attend school with other Canadian children in the normal community situation in this country. As recently as this there has been an attempt to encourage Indian citizens living on reservations to accept more and more responsibility for handling their own affairs, in the hope that eventually the reserves will become self-governing communities on much the same lines as normal municipal organizations.

In the midst of this progress toward the assumption of full citizenship and all the rights pertaining thereto, the minister arouses a storm of protest by his premature, arbitrary announcement which has come under debate in the house this afternoon. The situation is quite different from that which used to exist. As a result of the granting of the universal franchise to Indian citizens they have become more keenly aware of their rights and responsibilities. The new educational process has produced a generation of leaders who are no longer content to sit by and be regarded as nonentities to be manipulated by the representatives of the Great White Father. In other words, paternalism which was the curse of the reservation system has long ago gone by the board. This new leadership is represented by men whose names have now become well known in public affairs in Canada, particularly the presidents of the various provincial brotherhoods and the president of the National Indian Brotherhood.

Just a month ago there was a major breakthrough in the province of Manitoba. This breakthrough in the area of economic responsibility was achieved by Chief Dave Courchene, who is one of the prominent, capable leaders of the Indian community today. The provincial government agreed to make it possible for Indian communities themselves to have full responsibility for community development programs in the province.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The lack of wisdom in the minister's premature announcement is manifest by the fact that there has been universal condemnation on the part of these newly emerged responsible Indian leaders of the announcement that has been made. There has been failure to consult in detail or, worse still, it has been the attitude of the government and of the Indian Affairs branch to completely ignore consultation that has been taking place over the past few months. It almost goes back to the situation that occurred a year ago which caused so much confusion and consternation among the Indians and became a *cause célèbre* across the nation when the government decided to arbitrarily remove long standing medical benefits without any preliminary consultations with the Indians themselves. The government backed down from its decision, the breach was healed as a result of special meetings and consultations, and this seemed to have been a salutary lesson for the government.

However, the same mistake is now repeated, unbelievably, inexplicably and incomprehensibly, by the minister. The announcement he made—and this has been pointed out by other speakers this afternoon—ignores the fundamental issue of aboriginal treaty rights,

the land claims, the hunting rights, and so on, subjects that have been discussed ad nauseam in this house and also by the Indians themselves. The responsible leaders of the Indians will not be satisfied until these fundamental rights, which have been long ignored by successive governments of Canada, are dealt with. Perhaps the greatest error of all was the setting aside of something that had been promised by successive governments, including this government, namely the setting up of a long delayed land claims commission which would be able to deal in an impartial and judicial manner with the fundamental rights of our Indian people. This has raised once again the accusation which appears in the excellently documented briefs of the National Indian Brotherhood and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood that the white man is once again speaking with forked tongue. The basis of confidence and understanding that had been gradually established over the recent years of negotiation, and a more positive attitude toward the problem, have been destroyed unfortunately in one fell swoop by the arbitrary announcement of the minister.

Perhaps the government should be reminded once again that it can no longer unilaterally impose its will on the Indian people of Canada. Their fundamental rights have been ignored far too long. There is the matter of cultural survival which arises from the policy announcement of the minister. The situation has been aggravated by the government's own attitude of confrontation on these matters of fundamental rights. I think the most fundamental aspect of the minister's announcement is its complete failure to take into consideration the constitutional situation as it relates to our Indian population. It is constitutionally impossible to pass laws in this house conferring special treatment on Indians as Indians except under federal jurisdiction.

In other words, the minister's announcement that he is going to transfer responsibility to the provincial governments rather abruptly in a short period of five years is in complete disagreement with the constitutional provisions which cover our Indian population under section 91 (24) of the B.N.A. Act. This section gives the exclusive grant of authority to the federal government in Ottawa, and only the federal government can single out the Indians as Indians and confer special benefits on them in that capacity. Provincial governments are quite free to give special treatment to any number of other special groups in our society. It can extend all manner and kind of services to the Indians so long as it is done in a way that does not recognize Indians as Indians. But the moment those provincial governments try to help the Indian people as such—and it is up to them to decide of course—they are legislating unconstitutionally. The tragedy is that the minister's announcement completely ignores this basic fact.

There is no way in which this government can ensure that our special obligations to the Indian people are carried out without doing one of three things: First, amending the distribution of powers in the B.N.A. Act; second, delegating administration of federal legislation to provincial agencies which should now be named, and should have been named long before this generalized statement was made; and, third, carrying out these responsibilities themselves through a new and re-invigorated Indian affairs branch in full and complete consultation with the Indian people. I submit that the latter is the only honourable course and the only constitutional way that is open to the government at the present time. Unfortunately, it now seems that this government is in the process of completely shattering its own Indian affairs branch. After some years of painful rebuilding, after taking on some of the most dedicated public servants of the country, this government has, by its latest action, destroyed the only administrative vehicle left to it which might have been capable of rendering a measure of justice to the Indian people. This is the point that is raised in the briefs that have been submitted by the National Indian Brotherhood and the one that has come into my hands as a member from the province of Manitoba from the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood over the signature of Chief David Courchene. Here is what the chief has to say on the point:

> —when our opinions are ignored, when we are to be bargained over in federal-provincial negotiations like cattle at an auction mart—

They feel they have no other recourse than to protest. The brief goes on:

> The just society that Mr. Trudeau alludes to must be based on mutual respect, mutual consideration, mutual understanding, integrity and good faith. This document, this policy, does not reflect any of this. More important it ignores one fundamental fact that is inescapable and that is that if Indian people are to become equal citizens of this country it must be because they want to, not because they are told to. Mr. Chrétien's policy gives us little reason to want to.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Perhaps I can make an aside in the middle of Chief Courchene's quotation. The point is

that the government has made an arbitrary announcement. It has ignored the recommendations of the various Indian leaders and communities across the country that have resulted from the recent consultations.

In fact, the government has repudiated the policy that it has been talking about over the last few years in this house. The government has said that a new Indian Act was going to emerge from these consultations, that this Indian Act would be an Indian Act in fact as well as in name. As has been pointed out, the present Indian Act was an enactment of the attitudes of the white community to the Indian population. We were assured over the past two or three years that the new act would emerge only after long, continued and very careful consultation with the Indian community. These consultations have been carried out.

A Minister without Portfolio was appointed to carry on these negotiations, and he established an excellent rapport with the Indian community. This responsibility was suddenly removed from him by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when a disagreement developed between the minister of Indian affairs and the Minister without Portfolio. I suppose it was a result of that disagreement that the government rushed pell mell into making an ill-conceived announcement of this kind.

Let me continue the quotation from Chief Courchene because I think it is fundamental to the issue:

> I am calling together the Indian leaders in Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired. If he wishes to pursue his remarks, he can do so with the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Dinsdale: May I just complete the quotation from Chief Courchene because I think it is basic to the argument:

> I am calling together the Indian leaders in Manitoba to discuss the statement in depth. It is our intention to prepare a brief that will contain realistic alternatives to social disaster.
>
> We will not meekly accept cultural genocide—we will marshal support from all sectors—we will fight.

That is the opinion of the Indian leaders themselves, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), in one of his typically partisan speeches, quoted extensively from statements made in this house by my colleague, the member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) and myself, each of which purported, in his opinion, to express a position that was completely contrary to that which we are taking today. Nothing that we said in the quotations to which the hon. member referred is at variance with our criticism of the statement made by the minister.

We maintain that Indians must be first class citizens equal with all other Canadian citizens. We have said that Indians are entitled to be treated as equals, that separate education and health and welfare facilities for Indians are wrong. I said on one occasion, and I repeat now, that just as the United States Supreme Court has ruled that separate but equal educational facilities for Negro citizens are not equal because they are separate, so must separate educational facilities for Indians be considered not equal to the educational facilities of other Canadian citizens. I personally look forward to the day when educational facilities for Indians will be administered by the provinces, as is the case with educational facilities for other citizens.

We have said that the Indians are entitled to see an end to the paternalism that has been so characteristic of the Indian affairs branch. I hope to see the day when the Indian affairs branch as we have known it, and more sadly as the Indians have known it, will disappear. I make no apology for saying this. But none of these things can take place unless and until the Indian people themselves want them to take place and are prepared to give their co-operation and support. Even if we know that opposition on the part of the Indians to a particular proposal is wrong, we cannot impose the proposal upon the Indians. Obviously, if we really believe in consultation and co-operation with the Indians, in letting the Indians make the major decisions on how to improve their living conditions, then we must oppose the method that the minister has in good faith used in bringing forward his white paper.

I am going to put on record the fact that there is almost unanimous rejection by the Indian people of Canada of the white paper that has been brought forward by the minister. I should like to quote from some telegrams I have received and which have been received by the leader of our party. I am sure the minister has also received them.

The first one is addressed to me and is from the president of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, Dave Courchene, to whom the hon.

member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) referred:

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development announced a new policy on Indian affairs yesterday. As an organization we totally reject the policy as outlined in the statement.

The next telegram is from the president of the Indian Association of Alberta and reads:

The Indian Association of Alberta rejects the policy paper enunciated by the Honourable Minister John Chrétien. Our association fully supports the position taken by the National Indian Brotherhood—

Our association is appalled by the fact that the policy statement of the federal government was written in isolation from the Indian people of Canada without any consideration whatsoever of the issues most sacred to them.

Another telegram that I received from the Fraser district bands representative reads:

Delegates representing the bands and band councils of the Fraser district meeting, Vancouver, B.C. June 26 and 27 request that no further action be taken in the implementation of the Indian policy white paper dated June 25 until there have been consultations with band representations on the same manner as for the revision of the Indian Act.

Another one from four chiefs in British Columbia reads:

We the four chiefs of Hobbema reject the policy statement of the federal government in support to position taken by the National Indian Brotherhood.

Chief Nor Yellowbird
Chief Same Currie
Chief James Bull
Acting Chief Maurice Wolfe

I am sorry that the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) had to leave the chamber because I have a telegram signed by the president of the North American Indian Brotherhood of British Columbia, of which he is a member. The telegram reads:

We, the undersigned wish to make the following statements: 1) It is quite evident that the new "white" paper policy made by the federal government is a complete "sell out" of the Indian birthright as the first citizens of Canada.

A little further on the telegram reads:

• (5:00 p.m.)

The new policy does not spell out legal guarantees in terms of lands, education, health, welfare, hunting, fishing and usufructuary rights of the Indians of Canada.

Here is another telegram from the chairman of the Fraser District Bands. It reads in part:

Delegates representing the bands and band councils of the Fraser District meeting Vancouver B.C., June 26 and 27 request that no further action be taken in the implementations of the Indian policy white paper dated June 25 until there have been consultations with band representations on the same manner as for the revision of the Indian Act.

The National Indian Brotherhood, the representatives of which represent all the major Indian areas in the provinces, issued a statement on June 26, 1969, and I want to spend a few minutes reading from it. It is signed by W. Dieter, Chief of the National Indian Brotherhood; D. Courchene, Vice President of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood; P. Doubois, Director of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians; P. Paul, Director of the National Indian Brotherhood of Victoria, British Columbia; A. Deslisle, President of the Association of Quebec Indians; W. Nadjiwan, Director of the National Indian Brotherhood and the President of the Union of Ontario Indians; J. Snow, Secretary of the Indian Association of Alberta; L. Stevenson, Director of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians; J. Pete, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Native Development Fund, and M. Bellegarde, Chairman of the National Native Communications Society, Ottawa. That is a pretty impressive list and, for the next few minutes, I shall read from the statement. I quote:

—in their present form, the policy proposals put forward by the Minister of Indian Affairs are not acceptable to the Indian people of Canada ... We know it was not the intent of the new policy but we fear the end result of the proposal will be the destruction of a nation of people by legislation and cultural genocide ... an essential first step in developing a new approach to the so-called Indian problem would be to honour the existing obligations; the outstanding promises and commitments made to the Indian people—

At all consultations across Canada the Indian people expressed concern over the abrogation of their Treaty rights by the Migratory Birds Convention Act and Regulations—

At all consultation meetings the Indian people expressed a desire to take on greater responsibility in running their own affairs. Yet the new policy will have the affairs of Indian people run by still another bureaucratic structure—

It is apparent to us that while there was a show of consultation, neither the Minister nor his Department really heard and understood the Indian people—

The policy statement was prepared unilaterally. There was no negotiation with Indian people, nor was any part of the policy discussed with Indian people while the Minister's office was preparing it—

The policy mentions a Claims Commission and a Commissioner to be named soon. Will we be consulted as to the make-up of this commission or will there be a unilateral appointment by government?

Since that statement was made, the minister has answered that question in precisely the way the native Indian people did not want it answered. As my colleague for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) has pointed out, who the commissioner is to be and what his terms of reference are to be will be decided by the

government. In other words, the government is to treat our Indians exactly as it has treated them for the past 100 years. The great White Father is to make his decision and the Indian people must like it or lump it. The minister who has displayed good intentions is now shown in the paternalistic and bureaucratic light in which his predecessors have been shown. I continue quoting:

> Throughout the consultation period we re-iterated that the Government must afford constitutional recognition of existing Treaties and obligations at which time the Indian people would meet in good faith with the government to clarify the meaning and intent of existing agreements.

Nowhere in the minister's statement was there any indication that the government had the slightest intention of dealing with basic treaty rights which Indians consider were spelled out many years ago. I continue quoting:

> The Minister's policy statement appears to be a departure from the year's consultations. We view this as a policy designed to divest us of our aboriginal, residual and statutory rights. If we accept this policy, and in the process lose our rights and our lands, we become willing partners in cultural genocide. This we cannot do.

I submit that nothing said in this house by any hon. member at any time will contradict the truth of the statements I have just read. I hope the minister realizes that consultation does not mean simply listening politely to representatives of Indian peoples, as the minister and his officials have done. It does not mean the minister, after listening, will make a unilateral decision, as has happened in the past. In a participatory democracy, about which the Prime Minister spoke eloquently during the election campaign, people have the right, not only to be heard but to participate in final decisions affecting their lives and welfare. The record is clear. The government has not adopted this kind of approach. All too often in the past the Minister, in the final analysis, has consulted his departmental officials and adopted their views. All too often he has embarked on a policy which did not meet the needs and wishes of the Indians themselves. It is they, after all, who are important and it is they who have the right to say what their future shall be. The minister is a reasonable man with good intentions. I urge him to adopt policies leading towards real consultation. They are the only policies we can really tolerate in the sort of participatory democracy the Prime Minister has spoken about in the past.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, before the minister begins his remarks I wonder, notwithstanding what may be the attitude of the Christian member for Renfrew and Lanark (Mr. McBride), whether hon. members would be agreeable to allowing more than 20 minutes for the minister to complete his remarks. He ought to be given all the time he needs and I think the 20 minute limitation ought to be suspended.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I thank every hon. member who has contributed to this debate which, in many instances, has been rewarding. It is refreshing to realize that the members of all parties in the house consider our goals to be the right ones. The problem seems to lie in how we are to implement our plans and how we are to discuss this matter with the Indian people of Canada.

One thing that stands out after a careful review of statements made by Indian leaders and by hon. members in this debate is that many have not read carefully the government's statement. In this connection the first point I wish to make is that the government's statement was a proposal. May I quote from the foreword, which is as follows:

> In the pages which follow, the Government has outlined a number of measures and a policy which it is convinced will offer another road for Indians, a road that will lead gradually away from different status to full social, economic and political participation in Canadian life. This is the choice.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I quote again from the foreword:

> The government commends this policy for the consideration of all Canadians, Indians and non-Indians, and all governments in Canada.

What the government was doing in issuing this statement was putting forward its view after having been in consultation with Indians for over a year, having listened to what they considered to be the evils and the faults of the present system and having formed its own view in the same connection. The government's view which was incorporated in the policy statement, was deeply influenced by everything that the Indian people have been saying about the Indian Act, about the department about their separate status, about discrimination, not only in the period of consultation to which I have referred, but for many years.

The government's view, of course, also arose out of an analysis of the merits of the situation in each of these particulars. It so happened that the results of this analysis coincided almost exactly in every instance

with the views the Indian representatives had been expressing for years. However, the point which appears to have been missed is that the government is offering it as a view, a proposal, something upon which the consultations will now take place. The government considered that it had the duty to put forward proposals for public debate by the Indian people and by all the people of Canada. The language of the policy statement was carefully drawn to make this point.

Again, I quote from the document on page 6:

> The government believes that the framework within which individual Indians and bands could achieve full participation requires:

There follows the six points which indicate the government's view of the principles involved, followed immediately by this sentence:

> The government would be prepared to take the following steps to create this framework.

Following this are the four steps which the government would be prepared to take if, following consultations and public debate in Canada, these seemed to be the appropriate things to do. Similar references can be found throughout the document, but the emphasis is on consultations and participation of the Indian people themselves in the development and implementation of the proposed policy. Reference is also made to financial support to Indian organizations so that they may have the capacity to fulfil this role. In general, the whole thrust of the paper is the offering of a policy for consultation and debate.

Another misapprehension which seems to have arisen is that the negotiations and arrangements may be pressed too fast. The five year period that is mentioned in the statement is, I think, the key to this concern. Here again, however, a careful reading of the document will indicate that this is not a firm deadline. The actual language is as follows:

> The government hopes to have the bulk of the policy in effect within five years.

Obviously this is not a hard and fast matter. It is a hope. If, in fact, it cannot be realized, it will not be realized. This apprehension has also been linked with the subject of land, which is probably the most sensitive area to Indian people—and appropriately so. Many have assumed that the five year period implies some distribution of land to individual Indian people within that period. Nothing could be further from what is proposed.

In the item under "immediate steps" in the document on page 6 where we talk about our hope that within five years we could phase out that part of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development we state, and I quote:

> Indian lands would require special attention for some time. This process of transferring control to the Indian people would be under continuous review—

What we tried to indicate was that we saw the land question as one taking many years and that the Indian people ultimately would assume their rights in this respect. The present system of land control has satisfied no one. It has been under attack for years and the government agrees with these attacks. The system is paternalistic in the extreme. What we seek to do is to eventually transfer the lands of which the Indians now have de facto possession. What has been suggested is not the distribution of land to individuals but the transfer in law to the bands of Indian lands, now controlled by them, subject to the legal requirement of the minister's consent.

We seek to do it under the proposed Indian Lands Act which would have within it a number of protective devices which would ensure that the nature of Indian ownership of land would only change if a considerable majority of the Indian owners so desired and would additionally protect minority rights within these communities and, finally, probably have some novel provisions found in legislation in other countries to control transactions between Indians and non-Indians, should those arise in the future by provision for court review if either the Indian vendor or the band felt that the transaction was not a fair and proper one.

These are the matters upon which we want to consult with the Indian people: Do they want legal ownership of their own lands? Do they want to be free of ministerial supervision? What kind of protection do they want? What other provisions may there be of which we have not thought?

To sum up, I feel that there has not been a complete reading of the government's policy statement by many, and that many of the misapprehensions would have been found to have been answered within the document. It is a proposal for consultation. It happens that the government's view reflects much of what has been said in recent consultations by Indian people and many members in this house, including those who have been prominent in this debate and as recently as the day on which this policy was announced. As I recall it, the comment of members opposite on that occasion was that the government's policy

was not very novel, but that it was what had been advocated by Indians for years. We do not intend to rush, the Indian lands question is one which we have contemplated from the outset and would take a number of years to work out in consultation with the Indian people.

I urge the house and all Canadians, Indians and non-Indians, to look again at the language in the foreword of the policy statement in which we concluded, and I will repeat it:

> The government commends this policy for the consideration of all Canadians.

It is our sincere hope that everyone will take time to read the policy statement carefully. We will be involved in extensive consultations with the Indian people in the years ahead. We want to offer the Indian people a very real opportunity to participate in shaping their future.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Finally, it is quite clear that the more generalized concerns about Indian rights and treaties are clouding consideration of the specifics of the government's proposed policy. We believe that the specifics of our proposed policy have to be considered for their value to Indian life today and in the future. It is important that the future not be sacrificed by undue concentration on the past. However, we have not neglected the past. We understand and appreciate the feeling of the Indian people with regard to possible past injustices in regard to treaties and, as indicated in the statement, we propose to appoint a commissioner who, in the quality of his person, will satisfy everyone as to his objectivity to meet with Indian representatives and any others. He will consider these matters very carefully and make his recommendations to the government as to what action the government might take in this regard.

I would, therefore, urge the Indian people to make use of this means of putting forward their views and feelings with respect to their treaty rights so that a greater understanding may be had by the government and by all Canadians, but not to let this interfere with getting on with providing a better way of life for Indians today and in the future. This is a very serious and important problem that the country faces and I hope that no one in this house or in the country will take a narrow or partisan approach to it. Hon. members have spoken about consultation, and have said we should have more consultation about the implementation of this policy. I agree, and I point out that this is mentioned in the policy statement that I made. It is clear that we want to consult.

I have been visiting some of the provinces. I want to meet representatives of the provincial governments at this stage, not to negotiate but to give them information and to reply to the questions that they wish to raise. I may say they have many questions that they want to ask. I have met with some representatives of the Indians and have listened to them. They have put many specific questions to me and I have tried to reply. I am planning to visit all of the provinces within the next few weeks for information purposes.

We are not rushing anything or anyone. We want to reassure the Indians on the land question. It was alleged that we wanted to see the Indians sell their land for two bottles of wine, or something like that. This is not so, Mr. Speaker. We want to give them what every other Canadian has in this country, namely, the right to make decisions for themselves.

At present Indians have to seek permission from the Minister of Indian Affairs if they wish to lease their lands. I do not think they should be obliged to do so. I feel very strongly about this matter. The procedure they must follow is through the district agency and on to the department in Ottawa, to my desk, and then back again from there. Sometimes this procedure takes weeks and weeks, even months and months for minor decisions to be made. I do not think it is right, and I want to change it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: I know that the members of this house agree with me on that.

Some hon. Members: Hear hear.

Mr. Chrétien: These Indian people are human beings and I want to get rid of our paternalistic approach to them. It is said that they are afraid we want to dump them. This is not so, Mr. Speaker. We do not want to dump any of the programs that we have for Indians. But we do want Indian children to receive the same education as their neighbours.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) said there could be no equality of services when separate services were provided to white people and to Indian people. That is right. We want to give the Indians the same kind of services that the other citizens of Canada have. I repeat that we do not want

to go ahead with this program too quickly. We will consult with the Indians. If they have some good suggestions to make we will listen to them. We will send a special team of people to meet Indians all across the nation, to try to find ways for Indians who live on reserves to make their own decisions.

I do not want to have to make decisions for them any longer. But if they suggest that the present system be retained for a period of years I may agree. However, I hope they will realize it is in their own interests to take their future into their own hands. They have many new leaders. During the past ten years there has been a great improvement in the education of Indians. Ten years ago only 15 per cent of Indians received education above the fifth grade. Now, 95 per cent of them go above the fifth grade.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Chrétien: Yes.

Mr. Stanfield: Is he sticking to his proposal that any grants to the provinces covering the costs of services to the Indian people would gradually be phased out?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think that it will take some time. I have not negotiated anything, but I hope there will be a day in Canada when there will be no special programs attached to a group of people because of their race.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: How long this will take I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I am ready to negotiate and to discuss it with the provinces and with the Indians. I know the Indians have to catch up. I realize this. It is a collective responsibility of the people of Canada to make sure that they catch up. But we should not deal with these problems simply on the basis that these people are Indians. We should deal with these matters on the basis that they are human beings.

Often the problem of the Indian is the same problem as that of the Metis or of the white people who live in the north. Sometimes it is a problem of regional development rather than a problem of racial development. Anyway we have to correct the situation. It will take some time, but I believe Canadian Indians are citizens of the provinces on the same basis as other citizens, and I want to assure them of that.

I have seen a situation in which a provincial government has refused to build a road to an Indian reserve simply because it said, "We build roads only for the public." The province did not want to build even one mile of road to reach a reserve. I do not think that is right, because the Indians who live in a province are citizens equal with others within the province.

It has been said many times that Indians do not pay taxes. When they go to buy gasoline, or into stores to buy other things they pay the indirect taxes that all other Canadians must pay. They contribute to the provincial treasuries in the same way as other citizens. I think it is fair to ask the provinces to extend their services to them. Now, we do not want to transfer responsibility. What we want to do is to ask the provinces to treat the Indians as citizens of the provinces, and we are willing to contribute financially to achieve that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not want to press the minister unfairly but I am wondering now whether he expects the Indian people to feel easy about the services that the provinces, particularly some of the provinces, would be able to provide without a full assurance from the Government of Canada that it will enable those provinces to provide services which are now the responsibility of the Government of Canada, and which services will increase in expense?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I said that we want to contribute, to make arrangements with the provinces, and we will negotiate that. But I hope that there will be a day when Indians within the provinces, will be considered as full citizens of the provinces and will be treated in that manner. I think this is the goal we have to achieve. As I said, the problem is also a problem of regional development. It is not a problem related to the Indians alone. In the northern part of Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the white people who live there often are faced with the same problems. The Métis are often in a worse situation in these localities than the Indians.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired unless there is agreement on the part of hon. members that he continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chrétien: Thank you. I shall not take too much more of the time of the house. But we do want to discuss these possibilities with

the Indians. I think we must help the Indian people obtain economic equality. We want to offer them economic and social equality in Canada. We do not want, however, to destroy them as Indians. I believe it is possible in Canada to be a full Canadian and at the same time be different.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: The Indian culture is worth preserving. These people were in Canada before we arrived here. They have contributed to making Canada the country it is. We must help them retain their traditions and their own culture, because in themselves they have good values. We can help them. There is no such thing in Canada as "assimilation". I do not want anyone in Canada to be assimilated. No one will assimilate me. I am a different person, a Canadian who speaks French, but I want to share the advantages and the responsibilities of being a Canadian. I know that it is possible for the Indians of Canada to be Canadians of Indian origin and share in the advantages and responsibilities of having Canadian citizenship.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress once more that we will be flexible. We do not want to impose anything on these people we want to negotiate and counsel. If people have good ideas concerning how the Indian people may be permitted or helped to catch up further I would be glad to hear them. These people, however, are not the only ones with problems. There are the Métis who have been left out because there are laws which pertain to a certain number of citizens of Canada. Therefore, I maintain the Indian Act is not one which should be retained in Canada because in it we take a distinction between people because of their colour. The language, colour or religion of people should not make any difference. What is important in respect of a human being is the grey stuff he has inside. It is grey for everyone.

We will take whatever time is necessary to implement this policy. The Indians are concerned about their land. I am concerned about it too. I do not want to see it fall into the hands of some speculators. We must design the Indian Act to protect the land of the Indian people. At the same time we must give them an opportunity to make their own decisions in respect of the development of these lands. We shall do so in consultation with them and with the provincial governments. I want to say again that there will be a good deal of consultation. I am not referring simply to negotiation. We want to inform the people. I was glad to see a few days ago that the Indian people asked for more time. I think this is a very good request on the part of their leaders because it is necessary that they look into all the implications. We will take all the time that is necessary.

It is important that the government and all the people know in which direction we must go. For a period of a year there have been consultations with the Indians. They say that they want to make their own decisions. They ask us to get off their backs. We want the same thing for them. We want them to make their own decisions. This policy is designed to give them that opportunity. So far as implementation is concerned, there are many ways in which this can be done. We will listen to them and offer them some solutions. There are some solutions which we have offered to them. But if they should wish to retain the same system for many, many years, I would be disappointed because I think with the new possibilities and their new leaders they are able to make more decisions. I believe we should let them do this.

The problem is one of human dignity. I think this policy in general terms has been approved by everyone in this House of Commons. So far as the implementation of the policy is concerned, we will consult with the Indians and give them an opportunity to make their point of view known both to the Canadian public and to the government through more consultation. I think, however, that never in the past has there been so much consultation with the Indians; never in the past has there been a government which has given so much opportunity to the Indian people to make their case not only to the government but to the Canadian public. During the past year 18 consultation meetings were held. We have paid people to make sure that these consultations would be covered by the press and television so that not only the Indians and the employees of the department but also the general public would be informed. I believe this has been a great achievement because never before have we heard so much about the Indian problems. This was due to the fact that, as a government, we were not afraid to put the case of the Indian people before the public. We did not carry on the consultations through the back door. We opened the door to the general public in Canada.

Before ending my contribution to this debate, Mr. Speaker, I should like to cover

one more point. A reference was made to a message my deputy minister sent to the employees of the department. I was quite disappointed about the remark that was made in this regard because we had announced the intention of the government, if the provinces and the Indians agreed, to extend provincial services to Indians and at the same time the department would be phased out. It was of the utmost importance that the government should inform these people who have devoted many years of their lives to working very hard for the Indians that their rights as citizens, and as civil servants, would be protected. I am saddened that a member of the New Democratic party would make reference to that because these people deserve better treatment. We must make sure that all the teachers, for example, who have worked for years and years on the reserves devoting their time to the Indian people will not be left out on the streets because we are implementing a new policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: The action that was taken was taken to reassure these people that we would protect their rights as employees and as people who have served their country and the Indians. I wish to stress once more that we will continue the consultations. I will be in British Columbia next week to carry on discussions with representatives of the provincial government. While I am there I will stop at three different cities, not to have consultations but information sessions with the Indian people in which I will answer their questions and make sure they understand the policy.

I hope there will not be too much of a partisan approach to this problem because it is an important problem. I do not believe that in our society we can accept a situation in which there are people who are considered to be second class citizens. We must offer these people full citizenship in the Canadian society. At the same time, however, we will respect the treaties we have signed with them. We will respect the special rights we have given them by treaty. One will see by the policy statement that we have taken steps to make sure that these rights will be protected. But these things must be analysed not only by the government but by the Indians themselves.

• (5:40 p.m.)

This is now the policy and what the Indians have asked us to do. They have asked us to provide them with funds. This we will do. At the same time, we will have a commissioner look into these matters on behalf of the Indians of Canada and make recommendations to the government. The Indians will draw their own conclusions. Following that it will be up to the parliament of Canada to make a final decision. I thank every member, Mr. Speaker for being gracious enough to extend my time. I hope in the weeks ahead every one of us will try to persuade the Indian people of Canada that we want to offer them a choice, and that they should accept that choice, because they should not be ashamed to become full citizens in the Canadian society.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the minister would permit me to ask him a question before he concludes his remarks. It seems that one of the nubs of the disagreement which has developed over the policy statement is the manner in which it was prepared. Is the minister now prepared to discuss with the native Indian people the possibility of enshrining within the constitution, and this is what a great number of them want, these aboriginal, hereditary or treaty rights—that is a misunderstood term—favourable to Indian people? Is he prepared to discuss this possibility and make a commitment that if it is desirable to the Indian people we will put those rights into the constitution?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think the Canadian constitution should be drafted in such a way that the rights of every citizen are protected. We want to respect these treaties and we will. To suggest that we should have in the constitution a provision to make the Indian citizens of Canada something other than full citizens is wrong. What we must do is prove to the Indians that we respect the treaties. If we have not respected these treaties, we must make sure to correct these injustices. When we have corrected these injustices by respecting the treaties the Indians will become equal citizens in Canada. That is a desirable step in our society.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the minister accept another question? Before posing it, I should

like to indicate that the latter part of his statement this afternoon was much better than the policy statement delivered the other day.

Mr. Speaker: I hope we do not re-open the debate. The hon. member has already had his time and has been recognized now for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. Dinsdale: My question, Mr. Speaker, is, how does the minister answer the criticism of the Indian leaders who have almost universally expressed the idea that the policy statement enunciated ignores the recommendations they have made during recent consultations?

Mr. Chrétien: This often involves the kind of dilemma faced by the government. We have consulted with them. They have made their representations and we have noted and studied them. I have studied them myself and they have been studied by officials and employees of my department as well as by other officials of the government. I said to the Indians that we will propose a policy which they may consider. We had to say something and I spoke on behalf of the government. We now say this is the direction in which we sish to proceed. Let us study it along with the Indian people of Canada and the provincial governments, and then implement a proper policy. If we were proposing legislation today, there might be a valid criticism. We are not ready to legislate. We are ready to discuss this policy and bring forward legislation next fall, or perhaps two or three years from now. I do not care very much when, as long as everyone will agree that we are on the right path.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to ask another question relating to a subject upon which neither one of us has touched. It has to do with consultation. I should like to ask the minister whether in the course of these consultations, and in light of the fact he has indicated a flexible approach to policy, he will be prepared to make some sort of payment and set up some sort of procedure which might result in the culmination of a national conference on Indian affairs such as the one held from April 28 to May 2? Will he guarantee some procedure to provide the Indian people with the wherewithal to meet with him to express their opinions?

Mr. Chrétien: I have said in the house many times that we are ready to provide the Indian associations with funds to assist them in their job with their own people and to consult with the government. I hope soon to be in a position to make an announcement in this regard. I have made a proposal to the Treasury Board and I hope soon to receive a definite answer. I have referred to the special committee on Indian rights and treaties. Funds will be made available to that committee, not directly through me, but through the commissioner who will be appointed soon.

Mr. Speaker: I trust that hon. members will not be dissatisfied if I say that pursuant to Section 13 of Standing Order 26 I am satisfied that the debate has now been concluded. This house stands adjourned until Monday, July 14 at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

At 5:50 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 14, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRADE

WHEAT—STATEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL MARKETING SITUATION FOLLOWING WASHINGTON MEETING

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the international wheat marketing situation has in recent weeks become increasingly more difficult. This is not a specific Canadian problem but reflects, rather, an over-all international situation which Canada must seek to influence and to which we must also adapt. Record stocks of wheat are held by exporting countries at a time when world trade in wheat, both commercial and non-commercial, has dropped substantially below the levels of two years ago.

Not surprisingly, this underlying supply-demand situation has exerted downward pressure on wheat prices from the inception of the International Grains Arrangement in July, 1968. There have been a growing number of infractions of its minimum price provisions as individual exporting countries, both members and non-members of the agreement, have sought a temporary advantage over competitors by reducing prices. Earlier this year, the Canadian Wheat Board found it difficult to move wheat at the I.G.A. minimum prices in competition with lower prices offered by other countries. As hon. members will recall, I announced on March 14 that the Canadian Wheat Board would have to reduce prices to remain competitive even if this meant going below the I.G.A. minimum levels. In maintaining its competitive position the Canadian Wheat Board is of course being careful to ensure that the best possible price levels are maintained.

All exporting countries have in common a real concern about what would happen if the structure of international co-operation built up over the years were to disappear. Thus, over the last many months the major exporting countries have held a series of meetings, notably in Canberra in September, 1968, and in Washington in April this year, to seek to rectify the problems which had been identified. Despite these efforts, pressures for further price cuts had built up in recent weeks and we were faced with the prospect of imminent unilateral price reductions. This might easily have triggered an uncontrollable downward spiral, to the detriment of all exporting countries and of the future of international co-operation in wheat marketing.

Following my visit with the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin, on June 18, the discussions in the International Wheat Council in London, and the Canada-United States ministerial meeting in the following week, Canada supported the early convening of a ministerial meeting of major exporting countries. This meeting was held in Washington on July 10 and 11 and was attended by ministerial representatives from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the E.E.C. and the United States. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and I took part in this meeting and we were accompanied by the chief commissioner and commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board and senior departmental officials.

I would like to table, under Standing Order 41(2), copies in French and in English of the communiqué issued in Washington regarding the wheat exporters' meeting, which reads in part as follows:

> The ministers, in reviewing current prices in world markets, recognized that distortions had appeared and that corrective action would be taken by some exporters to bring prices into proper competitive relationship in the interests of orderly marketing and price stability.
>
> The ministers reiterated their support for the International Grains Arrangement and expressed their determination to strengthen its operations.
>
> As a means of making the arrangement more effective, the ministers agreed to maintain continuing consultations to deal with problems that may arise.

In the case of the E.E.C., the understandings reached in Washington will be subject to the approval of the Council of Ministers representing their member countries.

This ministerial meeting has served to strengthen the determination of the major wheat exporting countries to co-operate closely in the interests of price stability in accordance with the principles of the I.G.A. Canada

has played and is continuing to play a leading role in very difficult circumstances in the achievement of these results. I would not like to give the impression that this Washington meeting has resolved all our difficulties, but I am encouraged by the constructive approach demonstrated by exporting countries at this meeting. The new arrangement for continuing consultation among exporting countries will facilitate more effective co-operation.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be able to give any precision to the measures of corrective action referred to in the communiqué. I am anticipating questions that are to come. Wheat pricing is a highly sensitive matter, and I know that hon. members would not expect me to divulge specific marketing information which could undermine the day to day selling operations of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I think it was the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) who a few days ago suggested that one of the members of the official opposition should attend a university in order to be able to read and understand communiqués better than he had been able to interpret one. All the universities we have in this country would not be sufficient to enable anyone to understand what the minister has tried to tell us today. The final sentence in the minister's statement reads as follows:

> I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be able to give any precision to the measures of corrective action referred to in the communiqué.

In a previous sentence the minister said:

> —I am encouraged by the constructive approach demonstrated by exporting countries at this meeting.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The minister has told us that the Washington meeting was another failure. This is not encouraging to the western farmer who during the past year or so has found himself under pressure by reason of not being able to deliver grain. The results of the meeting will be no encouragement to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who at the present time is visiting the west in an attempt to bring some kind of message of encouragement to the western farmers. It will be difficult for him to tell them that not only can they expect deliveries to be less but that their income will suffer accordingly.

I have before me a *Wall Street Journal* report dated June 19 which reads as follows:

> As a result, to assure that ends meet, the Argentine government will start buying wheat in the world market. It was announced that a purchase of 7,348,000 bushels will be made next week. Argentina will seek to buy the wheat from Canada, the U.S., Australia and Russia.

Argentina was among the countries which participated in the discussions. I cannot visualize how a Canadian minister can return from the United States and tell us that Canada has not been successful in concluding a sensible arrangement in respect of marketing our wheat. Apparently Argentina has some idea of how to deal with its marketing situation. In view of the fact a previous Liberal government assured the western farmers that there would be a minimum price of $1.95½ a bushel, does the minister not think there is an obligation on the part of the present government to ensure that the Canadian farmer will receive this price? In view of the economic situation today I ask the government whether this might not be a desirable course to follow, especially since the government has suffered a failure not only at the last meeting but at previous ones?

I do not understand how any minister can expect us to begin the summer recess with the realization that we do not know whether there will even be a five bushel quota in many areas. Some farmers with low grades are not even able to obtain $1.48 or $1.45 a bushel. This is the kind of economic situation we face. Yet this government cannot give any assurance to the farmers or to their creditors. I believe the government has an obligation to the Canadian people. I ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to telephone the Prime Minister who is out west and, considering the failure of the minister's mission in Washington, suggest a type of approach that will make the Prime Minister's trip a little easier.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the minister has been able to report to the house today. I am sure he has returned from a difficult mission. Judging from the communiqué it would seem that he probably is not too well satisfied with the results. The information he gave us is inconclusive. It is not the type of report upon which I could advise the farmers of my constituency to build firm hopes and make firm plans in respect of their general operations as grain farmers.

The International Grains Arrangement has been an ill-starred agreement from the time it was signed. Whether this is due to the fact that it was not carefully considered or because some of the parties did not feel they wanted to be wholly committed to it, I do not know.

The minister's report does not tell us what is going to be done to correct the substantial differentials of 20 to 25 cents a bushel which exist between our grain and grain of comparative quality with which we compete in the markets. The report does not say that the European common market countries are prepared to support this agreement. It merely says that understandings have been reached with the European Economic Community, subject to the approval of the Council of Ministers representing their member countries, whatever that means. This is the area from which the disruption of the agreement has been coming.

The report speaks of constructive approaches, and I hope there are some. What we need from the minister at this moment is a clear statement of government policy toward the wheat producers of this country in view of the fact that the International Grains Arrangement is not working too well. I hope it will work well in the future. I hope it can be shored up and that these other countries will accept their responsibility as Canada has done. We cannot expect the wheat producers of western Canada to hold an umbrella over the International Grains Arrangement all by themselves. I am sure the minister knows very well this cannot be done by this group of wheat producers.

Therefore I think it is time the government told the grain producers of western Canada frankly what its position is. It should make it clear that it will make support available to the grain producers in terms of price and in terms of quantity, and will also take the responsibility along with other nations of the world to see that the International Grains Arrangement does work. I plead with the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, to come down to earth and say that there will be a support price at some level. If it is to be at $1.95½ on the basis of the present International Grains Arrangement, let the government say that. If it is going to be $2, let the government say so. Let us not leave the farmers in the limbo of uncertainty in which they find themselves today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, we heard the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) on his return from Washington where he had talks with the representatives of other countries that signed the International Grains Arrangement.

Before making any comments, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the minister that we did not receive the French version of his statement, which assuredly causes us some prejudice. Since there are two official languages in this country, it would be normal that a bilingual copy of ministers' statements should be available to us.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the minister's statement, it seems to me that Canada is, with regard to the present situation, prisoner of its own production. Caught in an international context of negotiations and agreements on wheat, Canada has had in the way of imaginative trade, over a number of years, nothing to say but to accept this pernicious situation, as it will no doubt continue to do, and to make wheat producers submit to it.

In the meantime, Canadian wheat producers are faced with hardship in one of the richest agricultural countries, especially with regard to wheat.

On the international level, a situation has developed wherein the big wheat exporters have adopted uniform systems and wherein guaranteed prices higher than Canadian prices have been established. Such prices are often much higher than ours, in the case of France for instance, and consequently exports are subsidized and this Canada cannot do. Competition has caused a decrease in prices and Canada has followed suit as always, so as not to destroy competition.

What to my mind is of primary importance, Mr. Speaker, what may be deduced from the minister's trip, and this seems very clear to me, is that we cannot require the Canadian producers to pay for this government's lack of responsibility.

Since 1949, the cost of products and services used by the farmers of western Canada has increased by close to 50 per cent, while the price of wheat is still below the levels of the 1949-50 crop year. That is one factor of the decline in the Canadian wheat trade.

In such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, price decreases like the recent ones which will not be the last apparently, due to the irresponsibility of this government. place on the shoulders of wheat producers a load which they should not be obliged to accept. To conclude my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I find most regrettable that the government, with all its commercial imagination, could only come up with the idea of sending the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) check its popularity rating, rather than the quantitites of unsold wheat.

Members' Attire in House

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion such a position shows irresponsibility. Before checking on the popularity of the Prime Minister, the government should look into the problem of the wheat producers of western Canada in order to help them. They should not be held responsible for the wheat situation caused by the obvious irresponsibility of the present government.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER ON MEMBERS' ATTIRE

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we proceed with motions I wonder whether hon. members would mind my reminding them that it has always been the practice in this house that hon. members come into the house wearing a jacket and tie. It may be that in certain circumstances and certain places a turtleneck sweater is acceptable. I suggest to hon. members that it is not acceptable, in so far as my own standards are concerned, in any event. If hon. members were allowed to make exceptions to the rule, they might eventually come into the chamber in shorts and sportshirts.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Sandals?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not pointing to any one hon. member at the present time. Hon. members will probably realize that from the chair it is sometimes a little difficult to determine exactly how hon. members are dressed and whether they are dressed in conformity with our practice. I do not wish to be difficult about this matter but I mention it in a general way and hope hon. members will agree with what I am saying. I do not suggest it is applicable today and that anyone is now contravening the rules. However, perhaps on a future day we will have the situation where someone's dress will contravene our practice in this respect, and I hope that what I have said will then be borne in mind.

Mr. Lewis: Will someone convey this to the Prime Minister?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Since I am the member concerned, I merely wish to explain to the house that I am now receiving cobalt treatment for my throat and, according to the physician, circumstances do not allow me to wear a collar and a necktie.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The explanation of the hon. member can certainly be accepted—I am sure,—not necessarily by the Chair, because I am here to express the wishes of hon. members. I am sure that I express the wish and the opinion of hon. members when I agree that, due to special circumstances, the hon. member is entitled to be exempted from the application of Standing Orders. The hon. member will enjoy with the unanimous consent of the house an exemption from the enforcement of Standing Orders which remain unchanged.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

TABLING OF ADJUDICATION REPORTS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Further to the undertaking given on Friday, Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies in English and in French of the reports of Mr. W. S. Martin as adjudicator of the Public Service Staff Relations Board, for April 30, May 15 and May 16.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RAILROAD CARS CARRIED BY NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT FERRIES

Question No. 2,250—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. How many railroad cars were carried by the C.N.R. Northumberland Strait ferries in 1968?
2. How many of these cars were fully loaded, partially loaded, empty?
3. What is the cost charged by the C.N.R. Northumberland Strait ferry system against the C.N. Railroad Division for transporting these cars loaded or empty?
4. When were costs last increased on this service and by what amount?
5. Is it contemplated that the cost will be increased and, if so, when and by what amounts?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. 41,774.

2. 21,964 loaded; 19,780 empty.

3. The cost charged by the ferry system against the railway for services rendered in 1968 amounted to $106,179 based on the

average revenue per ton mile on the Atlantic region.

4 and 5. The allocation to D.O.T. varies month by month with increases or decreases in volume and general rate adjustments made from year to year affect average revenues.

ALBANY AND SEVERN RIVER PROJECTS

Question No. 2,328—**Mr. Aiken:**

Has the federal government under construction or study, any projects on the Albany and Severn Rivers, North of Geraldton, Ontario and, if so, for what projects and for what purpose?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): No.

ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING

Question No. 2,352—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Will the government give a definite statement of its intention to regulate the use of electronic eavesdropping equipment in Canada?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): The matter of electronic eavesdropping is currently being studied by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I understand that the Committee hopes to table its report soon after Parliament reconvenes this fall. I wish to have the benefit of that report before deciding what legislative recommendations to make to my colleagues in Cabinet.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,435—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Postmaster General provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. Yes, combined with a public relations program. (a) Costs as follows: 1960-61, $262,258; 1961-62, $312,738; 1962-63, $300,623; 1963-64, $270,943; 1964-65, $377,416; 1965-66, $416,060; 1966-67, $515,387; 1967-68, $583,585; 1968-69, $764,594.

Note: These figures are the expenditures identifiable with the Post Office Information and Public Relations program. They include cost of advertising, printing, distribution and, in the case of the years 1964-65 and on, the cost of headquarters salaries.

Salary costs for field personnel are not included as the information cannot be extracted from expenditure records without substantial delay and excessive cost.

Salaries and travel costs for headquarters personnel prior to 1964-65 are not included, since they were not segregated in a separate allotment prior to that year.

2.

	Postmark 10 issues per year	Weekly bulletin 52 issues per year
	$	$
1960-61	25,280	12,152
1961-62	22,033	7,352
1962-63	29,660	9,641
1963-64	30,637	9,581
1964-65	29,170	9,182
1965-66	30,985	10,656
1966-67	38,832	10,794
1967-68	38,328	12,090
1968-69	49,915	10,962

Information booklets, rate sheets (indicating revised postal rates), and news releases are printed and distributed when required.

3. Postmark sent to each employee, total number, 32,350 English; 10,715 French. Weekly bulletin distributed to each Postmaster and Supervisors requiring the information, 18,500. News Releases, distribution governed by the subject material, e.g. all media, dailies only, radio only, weeklies only, philatelists, etc. Rate sheets to each Postmaster and Postage Stamp depots. Distribution of the above is made by mail.

Note: Publication of the Postmark was discontinued with effect from April 1, 1969.

EXCHEQUER COURT—CHANGE IN NAME AND JURISDICTION

Question No. 2,450—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the government intend to change the name of the Exchequer Court of Canada to the "Federal Superior Court"?

2. Is the government studying the possibility of transforming the Immigration Appeal Board into a Division of such Court?

3. Is the government studying or will it study the possibility of transforming the Tax Appeal Board into a fiscal Division of such Court?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1, 2 and 3. Government policy relating to improvements in the federal administration of justice has not as yet been finally settled.

Questions

EMPLOYMENT FOR HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Question No. 2,477—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the policy of the federal government toward the provision of part-time and/or limited employment for handicapped and/or marginal workers?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: The Public Service Commission has no special policy towards provision of part-time and/or limited employment for handicapped and/or marginal workers.

The Commission does have a special program for the employment on a full-time basis of the mentally retarded. Up to the present, this program has been a pilot project in the National Capital Region. Steps are now being taken to extend it throughout Canada.

For such handicapped persons as the blind, the deaf or hard of hearing, the Commission provides special examination testing arrangements so that such persons can compete on an equitable basis with other candidates. It also provides a special service to assist in the placement of such persons.

POLICY RESPECTING RETENTION OF FINGERPRINTS, ETC.

Question No. 2,500—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is it the policy of the federal government to keep on file the (a) fingerprints (b) photographs (c) records of persons accused of criminal offenses when the charge is subsequently withdrawn or dismissed against first offenders and, if so, for what reason and, if not, when are the (a) fingerprints (b) photographs (c) records destroyed?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): In so far as it relates to the Department of the Solicitor General, is as follows: The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, as the National Bureau of Identification and the central repository in Canada for fingerprints and photographs, is responsible for the safekeeping and security of all identification data submitted by various law enforcement agencies.

References concerning withdrawn or dismissed charges against first offenders are expunged from the files of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police when a request is received from the individual concerned or his solicitor for the return of the material through the contributing law enforcement agency.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

DIVORCE, FOREIGN EVIDENCE—RATIFICATION OF CONVENTIONS

Question No. 2,509—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the federal government entered into negotiations with the provinces concerning ratification of (a) the Convention on the recognition of divorces and separations, and (b) the Convention on the obtaining of evidence from abroad in civil and commercial cases and, if so, what stage has been reached in these negotiations?

2. If there have been no negotiations, for what reasons?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1. (a) and (b) No.

2. All explanatory reports of the "rapporteurs" have not yet been sent by the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law to the Department. A provisional edition of the Report on the draft Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters has been received on June 10, 1969 and is presently under study. These reports are essential to the interpretation of the draft conventions. However, marriage and divorce are subject matters for legislation by Parliament under the British North America Act.

RENTAL OF N.C.C. PROPERTIES BY PRIME MINISTER'S STAFF

Question No. 2,534—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Which members of the staff of the Prime Minister's Office rent properties from the National Capital Commission (a) in Gatineau Park (b) in the Greenbelt (c) in other areas?

2. What is the rent paid in each case and what was the rent paid by the previous tenant?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. (a) None; (b) None; (c) Not applicable.

2. Not applicable.

IMMIGRATION—DIRECTIVES RESPECTING APPLICATIONS

Question No. 2,536—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Has the Department of Manpower and Immigration recently sent new directives to its Immigration Officers regarding applications for immigration to Canada?

2. If so, what were the details of these directives?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1 and 2. As indicated in *Hansard* for June 12, page 10,038, the Department, because of the improved situation in Canada, has been considering various measures or administrative steps by which the immigration flow might be in-

creased. All Canadian immigration offices abroad have now been informed of the results of this review. The measures referred to relate to the counselling of immigrants (who qualify under the selection criteria described in the Immigration Regulations) and to the use of assisted passage loans which are made available to immigrants with occupations in relatively high demand, so as to reflect the improved situation in Canada. As another stimulus, promotional and advertising activities are being rescheduled and increased.

PRIVY COUNCIL—STUDIES UNDERTAKEN BY SCIENCE SECRETARIAT

Question No. 2,537—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What specific studies and reports have been undertaken by the Science Secretariat of the Privy Council Office?

2. When is it anticipated that the above studies will be completed?

3. Who are the individuals participating in the above studies?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1, 2 and 3. Studies and reports initiated by the Science Secretariat are confidential to the Privy Council Office. They are, therefore, not published.

STUDIES UNDERTAKEN BY SCIENCE COUNCIL

Question No. 2,538—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What specific studies and reports have been undertaken by the Science Council of Canada?

2. When is it anticipated that the above studies will be completed?

3. Who are the individuals participating in the above studies?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): I am informed by the Science Council of Canada as follows: 1, 2 and 3. Studies undertaken by the Science Council to March 31, 1969, along with completion dates and the individuals involved, are detailed on pages 12 to 18 inclusive of the third annual report of the Council deposited with the Clerk of the House on June 26, 1969.

The following studies have been initiated in the current fiscal year: Special Study on Marine Sciences and Technology: Science Council Project Officer, Dr. Roger Voyer. Study Group Co-leaders, Dr. R. W. Stewart, University of British Columbia. Dr. L. M. Dickie, Marine Ecology Laboratory, Dartmouth, N.S. Science Council Committee Chairman, Dr. J. M. Harrison, Deputy Minister, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Special Study on Fisheries and Wildlife Research: Science Council Project Officer, Dr. W. J. D. Stephen. Study Group Co-leaders, Dr. D. H. Pimlott, University of Toronto. Dr. C. J. Kerswill, Fisheries Research Board, St. Anne de Bellevue, Québec. Science Council Committee Chairman, Dr. P. A. Larkin, University of British Columbia. Special Study on Forestry Research: Science Council Project Officer, Dr. W. J. D. Stephen. Study Group Co-leaders, Dr. J. H. G. Smith, University of British Columbia. Mr. Gilles Lessard, Department of Forestry, Quebec, Quebec. Science Council Committee Chairman, Dean J. W. Ker, University of New Brunswick. Special Study on Transportation in Canada: Science Council Project Officer, Mr. D. Cass-Beggs. Science Council Committee Chairman, Mr. L. Hynes, President, Canadian Industries Limited. Special Study on Urban Development: Science Council Project Officer, Dr. D. E. L. Massland. Science Council Committee Chairman, Dr. Pierre Dansereau, University of Montreal.

It is planned that the Fisheries and Wildlife, Marine Sciences and the Forestry Research Studies will be completed in the current fiscal year. The Transportation and Urban Development Studies are due for completion sometime between March and July of next year.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CARIBOU-WOOD ISLANDS FERRY

Question No. 2,566—**Mr. McQuaid:**

Are aids to navigation at Caribou, Nova Scotia and Wood Islands, Prince Edward Island considered adequate for 24 hour navigation by ferry operators and, if so, is it the intention of the government to extend the hours of sailings of the ferries operating between these two points and thereby provide a more adequate service to the people concerned?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, and from May 1st to mid-May service period was extended one hour providing two extra round trips daily. From mid-June to the end of June service was extended by one hour providing two extra round trips daily. During the peak summer period service is to be extended three and one quarter hours, providing two additional round trips a day.

PARKING—TORONTO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 2,579—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the federal government tender for the automobile parking concession at the Toronto International Airport?

Questions

2. Is the concession awarded by tender?

3. What revenue does the federal government receive from the parking concession?

4. What security, if any, is there for the parking operation?

5. Is the security in the parking operation the responsibility of the concessionaire?

6. Is it one of the terms of reference that the parking concessionaire provide special security police?

7. Has the federal government received any complaints about the parking situation at the Toronto International Airport with regard to (a) theft of gasoline (b) breaking and entering of automobiles (c) theft of automobiles (d) theft of contents of automobiles (e) damage to automobiles (f) theft of automobile parts and equipment?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. The Department calls for tenders for the management of the car parking facilities and the operator is paid a fixed management fee.

2. This is not a concession. It is a service contract and is awarded by tender.

3. Revenue for fiscal year 1968/69, $1,108,-686.

4. The parking areas are regularly patrolled by the operator's attendants, the airport R.C.M.P., and the Mississauga Police.

5. Operator is expected to patrol the car parking facilities.

6. No.

7. The following complaints have been received in the past six month period. (a) gasoline theft, one; (b) breaking and entering of automobiles, 11; (c) theft of automobiles, none; (d) theft of contents of automobiles, 20; (e) damage to automobiles, nine; (f) theft of automobile parts and equipment, twenty.

ARTIFICIAL SWEETENERS—INFORMATION ON LABELS

Question No. 2,588—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

Is the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare considering introducing a regulation which would require new labels on food products containing cyclamates, the widely used artificial sweeteners, which would specify the amount of cyclamate contained in a normal serving of food or in a bottle of beverage and the upper limits of cyclamate consumption that the Food and Drug Directorate considered safe for adults and children?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare, in consultation with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, is currently examining all aspects of the safety and use of the cyclamates. This review includes an examination of the labelling of foods containing this material. No decision has as yet been made with regard to the suggestion that the label of foods containing the cyclamates carries a statement specifying the amount of the cyclamate present and the limits considered to be safe for adults and children. Consideration is being given, however, to limiting the concentration of cyclamates which may be added to special dietary foods.

[Mr. Robinson.]

ANGOLA, MOZAMBIQUE, RHODESIA—DISAPPROVAL OF INTERNAL POLICY

Question No. 2,599—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1 With reference to Questions numbered 1,964 and 2,297, on what specific occasions and which specific channels are used to make "clear our disapproval of Portugese policy respecting Angola and Mozambique"?

2. What criteria are used to determine whether a question constitutes the "internal affairs" of a country?

3. Is the question of NIMBAR in Rhodesia regarded as the internal affairs in that country?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Canadian disapproval of Portuguese policy respecting Angola and Mozambique has been expressed at each recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, and directly through the Canadian Embassy in Lisbon.

2. Internal affairs are defined in the United Nations Charter as matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state.

3. No. The Canadian Government does not recognize the competence of the illegal régime in Rhodesia and continues to consider the territory as within the jurisdiction of Britain. The question of internal affairs does not arise insofar as the illegal régime is concerned. The British Government has shown interest in the views of other members of the Commonwealth on the best solution to the Rhodesia problem. It was in this context that the Canadian Government's NIBMAR commitment was made.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

TONNAGE OF GOODS HANDLED AT CERTAIN DOCKS

Question No. 1,872—**Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski):** (Corrected)

What was the tonnage of goods handled during the years 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 in each of the following docks or

harbours: Rivière-du-Loup (main dock), Rivière-du-Loup (river dock), Gros Cacouna, Rimouski-Est, Pointe-au-Père, Matane, Trois-Pistoles, Cap-Chat, Sainte-Flavie, Sainte-Anne-des-Monts, Mont-Louis, Marsoui, Gaspé, Sandy Beach, Chandler, Forestville, Baie-Comeau, Sept-Îles, Havre-Saint-Pierre, Bathurst and Dalhousie?

Return tabled.

BILINGUAL GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Question No. 1,889—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What is the government policy about advertising which uses both official languages in one advertisement?
2. How many departments, agencies or Crown corporations use such bilingual advertising?
3. Are any of the publications in which such advertisements are placed bilingual?

Return tabled.

FREE DISTRIBUTION OF MINISTERS' SPEECHES

Question No. 1,939—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Is it a general practice for Ministers of the Crown to distribute free of charge to a general or extensive mailing list of each Ministry, copies of speeches by the Ministers in English and/or French, including copies of speeches delivered at partisan meetings of the Liberal party, under cover of Ministry front covers?
2. If not, how many Ministers are in the habit of doing so, and in particular, how many Ministers, by Ministry have done so since September 12, 1968?
3. What is the average cost of printing and distributing such an issue of a speech, including separate envelopes for the English and French versions addressed to the same addressee?

Return tabled.

INFORMATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFFS

Question No. 2,018—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many individuals were on the information and public relations staff of each department of government on March 30, 1968?
2. How many persons are on the information and public relations staff of each department of government today, what are the names of the individuals and the salary received by each?

Return tabled.

TOLL BRIDGES

Question No. 2,222—**Mr. Gervais:**

1. How many toll bridges coming under federal jurisdiction are there in Canada and where are they located?
2. What are the tolls for cars and for the various categories of trucks on these bridges?
3. What balance remains to be paid on each of these bridges?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—WORKING CAPITAL RATIO

Question No. 2,227—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the last five years, what was the working capital ratio for each of the proprietory Crown corporations?
2. If this ratio is below standard, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NATURE OF CAPITALIZATION

Question No. 2,230—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the percentage of the total capitalization contributed by bond holders for each of the last five years?
2. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the percentage of the total capitalization belonging to shareholders for each of the last five years?
3. Are these percentages normal and, if not, what is being done to improve them?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—INTEREST COVERAGE

Question No. 2,231—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the interest coverage for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. Is this ratio satisfactory and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—EQUITY VALUE PER SHARE

Question No. 2,232—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the equity value per share for each of the proprietory Crown corporation for each of the last five years?
2. Is this ratio considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NET TANGIBLE ASSETS

Question No. 2,233—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what were the net tangible assets per $1,000 bond for each of the last five years?
2. Is this ratio considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

Questions

CROWN CORPORATIONS—QUICK ASSETS RATIO

Question No. 2,234—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the quick assets ratio for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. Is this quick assets ratio satisfactory and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—GROSS AND NET PROFITS

Question No. 2,235—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the gross profit margin percentage for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. What was the net profit margin percentage for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
3. Are these percentages considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve them?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—RETURN ON INVESTED CAPITAL

Question No. 2,236—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the return invested capital for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. Is this percentage considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NET PROFITS DISTRIBUTED TO SHAREHOLDERS

Question No. 2,237—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What was the percentage of net profits distributed to shareholders for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. Is this percentage considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NET RETURN ON INVESTED CAPITAL

Question No. 2,238—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the net return on invested capital for each of the last five years?
2. Is this return considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—RETURN ON COMMON EQUITY

Question No. 2,239—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the return on common equity for each of the last five years?

[Mr. Fortin.]

2. Is this return considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—INVENTORY TURNOVER

Question No. 2,240—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the inventory turnover ratio for each of the last five years?
2. Is this ratio normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—CASH FLOW

Question No. 2,241—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. For each of the proprietory Crown corporations, what was the cash flow for each of the last five years?
2. Is this cash flow considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve it?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—EARNINGS PER COMMON SHARE

Question No. 2,242—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What were the earnings per common share for each of the proprietory Crown corporations for each of the last five years?
2. Are these earnings considered normal and, if not, what is being done to improve them?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN COMMERCIAL CORPORATION—MILITARY AND NON-MILITARY SALES

Question No. 2,375—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. By country, what was the value of sales of weapons or defence material in which the Canadian Commercial Corporation was involved, in any way, in the years 1965, 1967 and 1968?
2. For each of these years, what was the value of non-military sales?

Return tabled.

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,398—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?
2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?
3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TRADE

WHEAT—INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT—EFFECT OF PRICE REDUCTIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce a question based on an excerpt from the communique which he read. I quote the excerpt: "The ministers—recognized that distortions had appeared and that corrective action would be taken by some exporters to bring prices into proper competitive relationship in the interests of orderly marketing and price stability."

Does this mean that the ministers attending the meeting on behalf of the various countries recognize the right of exporting nations to reduce their prices to competitive levels, and does this constitute a recognition by the ministers that such reductions would not be tantamount to a violation of the International Grains Arrangement and that therefore, in effect, the agreement is a dead letter?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think the communiqué recognizes that some exporters were in a difficult situation because of present circumstances which I will not go into. Those exporters who have been doing well recognize that those who have not been doing quite so well have the right to adjust their prices in order to become competitive. That applies particularly to the United States and Canada. This means, I would think, that minimum prices under the I.G.A. are to be *de facto* temporarily suspended. Exporters believe however that these minimums still have some orderly effect in the sense that they remain an indication of what is fair and reasonable, at least as far as Canadian wheat farmers and the Canadian government are concerned.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the I.G.A. minimum prices appear to have become guidelines only and since our grain farmers, wheat farmers in particular, face a very grim cash situation, what substitute does the government propose for the floor price which everyone thought was guaranteed under the International Grains Arrangement?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, this is another subject involving the incomes of wheat farmers. The Minister of Agriculture, the Prime Minister and I have said on a number of occasions that this matter is under study. We must deal with events as they occur. May I be permitted to say that no one in the world knew precisely what was going to happen in world wheat marketing when a few months ago this government was being asked to guarantee the floor at $1.95½ a bushel.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since there is no longer any doubt that a new policy will have to be implemented, can the minister indicate to the house when the government will bring in the policy it will implement as a substitute for the floor price that had prevailed under the I.G.A.? It appears that that floor price is temporarily in abeyance.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If I heard the minister correctly, he said that exporters were inclined to support the minimums under the International Grains Arrangement. As I recall, that agreement includes both exporters and importers. What is the attitude of the importers? Are they also inclined to support the minimums laid down under this arrangement?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the conduct of importers in recent months has clearly indicated that they are not keen to do that. Most of them are keen to buy at the cheapest possible price. In my view these are taking a very short term view of the necessity of preserving an orderly market in the world. The hon. member should not forget, however, that exporters are basically responsible for maintaining stable prices in the world. That was the spirit in which we approached these questions in Washington last week.

Mr. Gleave: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statement the minister has just made and considering that this is an international agreement signed under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, will the government consider asking the United Nations, under whose auspices these negotiations were carried on, to reconvene the conference in order to discuss this matter?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, in time that may be the right approach to take. At this time I do not think it would be a practical crusade to undertake.

[*Translation*]

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

Inquiries of the Ministry

In view of the ministers' statements and of the fact that the wheat problem is twofold, having to do with exporting countries and with Canadian wheat producers, and because the problem partly falls on the producers who are now burdened with it, could the minister tell us whether the studies presently considered by himself, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture aim at the establishment of support prices for the production of Canadian wheat?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, at the moment, I do not wish to make any comments about that.

[*English*]

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the I.G.A. minimums are no longer effective, at what price below these I.G.A. minimums is the Canadian Wheat Board offering our wheat at the present time in order to meet world competition?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, we are offering it at the best possible price. What was done in Washington was to prevent a great downward movement and collapse of prices. That was the purpose of our meeting. We thought that some exporters who had been quite successful in recent weeks, and I will not comment on how they went about their business, would restrain their aggressiveness. Some of them have offered to do that. There will be a readjustment of prices but at a lower level obviously than the minimums under the I.G.A. but a higher level than might otherwise have been the case. Exactly what will happen I do not know. We shall have to wait and see. It is possible that some exporters will strengthen their prices and that others will adjust them downwards, thus bringing about a new level of prices. We must also remember that some exporters do not belong to the I.G.A. They must also be taken into consideration.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At the meeting was there any indication of how long this present trend will endure? Is relief in sight? Will there be any relief in the next several months? Can the minister indicate whether there will be any relief for the farmers who are growing crops and delivering grain?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the exercise was to prevent a possible collapse of international prices. We wanted to prevent a greater downward movement of prices and to restore the co-operation among IGA exporters. On both counts, I am an optimist. I think progress was made. I am not in the habit of telling the house anything except what I feel I am justified in telling it. In this case, and I have said this in answers to previous questions, I am optimistic but without illusions. We are working hard, both diplomatically and commercially, in order to arrest the downward movement which has been going on in this connection.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, will the situation last for the duration of the present crop year?

Mr. Pepin: It depends on how willing exporters are to co-operate and on the will of importers to take a long view of these matters.

Mr. Harkness: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the minister correctly, when he answered my previous question, that the Wheat Board is not quoting prices at this time? If that is so, how are we to make sales? Unless prices are quoted to prospective customers, how are we to sell wheat?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Wheat Board is quoting prices at this time. I am also under the impression that importers at the moment are being restrained because of the uncertainty connected with current developments.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, then may I repeat my first question. If the Wheat Board is quoting prices, what prices is it quoting in order to sell Canadian wheat?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I will send the hon. member a price schedule tomorrow.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did not those at the conference conclude that an agreement among sellers could only stand as long as a sellers' market prevailed?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, there is some truth to that, and it applies not only to wheat marketing. That is true of all other kinds of commercial activity. However, that proposition is not infallible because, as I have said previously, there must be co-operation between exporters. In the long run that will serve the best interests of importers.

Mr. Hees: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, human nature prevails.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Although I recognize the importance of this matter and although I have displayed great leniency in allowing hon. members to ask supplementary questions, I think it might be a good idea for the house to turn to another subject matter on the understanding, of course, that we might return to the present one later.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—REPLY TO CANADIAN OFFER TO PROVIDE NEUTRAL RELIEF FLIGHT OBSERVERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the Canadian government yet received from the Nigerian or Biafran authorities a reply to its offer to provide neutral observers to inspect flights flying into Biafra from points outside Nigeria?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The answer to that particular question is no, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet received any response. Hon. members will have noticed that the discussions are still going on in Lagos. At least one relief shipment by the International Red Cross was approved. We still hope to work out a system which will be acceptable to both sides. If our offer has been helpful, I am sure everybody will applaud.

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED LOANS TO EASTERN CANADIAN MILK PRODUCERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence I shall direct it to his parliamentary secretary.

We have just learned that the government has lent $1 million to Korea for the development of its milk industry. Would the Department of Agriculture grant similar loans to dairy producers in eastern Canada?

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture): I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look back on what has been done these past years by the Canadian Dairy Commission, it will be found that grants totalling $125 million are now being handed out to Canadian dairy producers.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, will the Acting Prime Minister accept the condolences of the opposition because of the fact that during the weekend, despite the offer of free food and ten-cent beer, the joint Liberal rally in Calgary could only attract 400 people?

GRAIN

BOX CAR ALLOCATION—INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. On Thursday and Friday, July 3 and 4, the minister replied to a series of questions I asked concerning the allocation of railway rolling stock to terminal elevators that have space. The minister advised he would have that on his shopping list when he was in Winnipeg on Monday, July 7. I ask the minister to advise the house specifically—I emphasize the word "specifically"—what action the government is taking to require the railways—I emphasize the word "require"—to supply sufficient additional railway rolling stock to allow for the full maximum unload capacity in the terminals at the Lakehead to the used?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, and as confirmed by the acting minister when I was away, this is now being done. The fact is that full co-operation of the railways was requested and is being given.

Mr. Benjamin: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the house whether he and the chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board have given specific figures to the railways as to the additional number of cars that will be required, in addition to those now in service, to meet the five bushel quota by the end of the July and have the railways responded that they will supply these additional cars?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a copy of the report showing the number of cars needed at the west coast, at the Lakehead and at the interior terminals and mills per day for the whole duration of time until August 1. I will be glad to show it to the hon. member if it will assist him. As the acting minister stated on Thursday, I believe it was, the totals I

have here demonstrate that physically it can be done. As is normally said by the Creditistes, that which is physically possible can also be politically or materially achieved.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION—POLITICAL AFFILIATION OF THOSE EMPLOYED

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. In light of the minister's confirmation of a strong bias favouring the Liberal party in public affairs programming of the C.B.C., will the minister advise whether any record is kept of the political party affiliation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Paproski: —of persons permanently or frequently employed in the public affairs division of the C.B.C. or of Radio Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is not in order because it contains an allegation. The hon. member knows that a question in those terms is not acceptable.

Mr. Paproski: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FISHERIES

COHOE SALMON—BANNING OF OPERATION IN STRAIT OF GEORGIA

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries arising from a question asked the minister last Wednesday by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. Have there been any further developments since last Wednesday in connection with the closure of salmon fishing to commercial fishermen in the Strait of Georgia?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): There are no new developments, Mr. Speaker. Fishing is closed for the weekend for commercial salmon fishermen, but not sports fishermen.

Mr. Barnett: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister under consideration, in view of the fact commercial fishermen cannot operate on weekends, closing sports fishing from Monday to Friday when the commercial fishermen are allowed to fish?

[Mr. Pepin.]

Mr. Davis: It is well known that the commercial fishermen catch 90 per cent or more of the fish. At this stage of the year we do not know how many fish are coming in; therefore we are going slow with respect to the catch.

INDUSTRY

FINE PAPERS—EFFECT OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the rising unemployment in the fine papers industry, especially in areas of the province of Quebec which have been designated as regions of underemployment, is the government reconsidering the tariff cuts affecting this industry, or are any special arrangements contemplated to alleviate the situation?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will not deny that the advanced cuts have caused some preoccupation in the fine papers industry. I have been so informed, and I agree this is so.

There is quite an intensive study being carried out by my department with regard to the fine papers industry. This study tends to show that Kennedy round cuts are only one of many factors causing the difficulties of the industry at the present time and not the most important. My department is cooperating fully with that industry in order to find some solution to their difficulties.

Mr. Harkness: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the tariff cuts affecting the fine papers industry are forcing delays and abandonment of the long-range capital expenditure programs which the industry had planned in order to increase its efficiency and competitiveness to be able to meet the reduction in tariffs which they expected would take place in 1972, is the minister pressing his colleague, the Minister of Finance, to take steps to postpone the coming into effect of these reductions?

Mr. Pepin: I was under the impression the industry was very keen to get to the root of the problems it faces, right away. Would delay on the Kennedy round exemption acceleration help that to any substantial extent? I'll inquire.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since one of the roots of the difficulties is sitting immediately behind the Minister of Industry, Trade and

Commerce, will the minister consider pulling that one?

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL RATE FOR EDUCATIONAL PERIODICALS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

Since a great number of periodicals had to stop their circulation because postal rates are too high, does the government intend to set special rates for periodicals directly involved with data processing in the field of education?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question should be put on the order paper or debated at the time of adjournment.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING QUOTA ON CANADIAN EMIGRATION—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Thursday last I asked a question about the quota system imposed by the United States which effectively discriminates against Canadians who wish to move to that country. The minister replied that a committee was being established. Has the committee been established and, if so, is it an officials' committee or a ministerial committee? What is the timetable for that committee to report on this long outstanding problem?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the ministerial meeting was held in Washington we brought two questions to the attention of the secretaries in the United States administration. One was in respect of the quota system to which the hon. member has referred and the second was the limitation upon Canadian musicians performing in the United States. I think the United States secretaries were sufficiently impressed with the cogency of the representations that they said they would like to establish a joint committee between the two countries to see what could be done to rectify the situation. The hon. member will understand that Congressional action may be required because it is not simply the cabinet which is concerned.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be good enough to table the representations the Canadian government made in respect of the quota system referred to previously? They were sought on two previous occasions. The first was on May 5, 1969, as recorded on page 8295 of *Hansard*, and the second occasion I believe was February 10, 1969 as recorded on page 5314 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to consider the question. As the hon. member knows, it is not customary to reveal exchanges of this nature between two governments, although there is nothing in these exchanges which I would have any hesitation in showing to my hon. friend. There is simply the question of whether one should reveal publicly diplomatic dispatches.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, during this peaceful and unhypocritical question period I should like to direct a further supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs relating to the first question I asked. When will he table a report, and when can we expect some action on this problem?

Mr. Sharp: Following the ministerial meetings officials are now considering the establishment of a committee which probably will be at the official level. It is most important to establish the terms of reference in such a way as will meet our requirements. That is the only reason there has been any delay.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ADJUDICATION REPORTS—INQUIRY AS TO NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN DEPARTMENT AND UNIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the following question to the Postmaster General. A week ago today the matter of the awards of Mr. Martin was raised in the house. The minister said he had asked for staff meetings with the postal unions to discuss the effect of one of the awards. May I ask whether or not there have been negotiations between the Post Office Department and the relevant postal unions with regard to the awards tabled today?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Yes. There was a preliminary meeting last week. There is to be another more formal session tomorrow morning.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister whether these meetings are limited to the award dealing with the pay of those people who did not go back to the post office at noon hour—I forget the date that award was made—or are these meetings concerned with the general problem of the introduction of new working conditions on February 9?

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, the meetings are concerned with the general interpretation of the awards tabled today.

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITIES—EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CANADIANS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I am glad to see he is here. Following the recent statement by the Canadian Association of University Teachers, can the minister advise whether he is contemplating any measures to assist Canadian graduates of Canadian universities to obtain fully and promptly information on employment opportunities on the faculty and staff of the universities of this country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we are not contemplating any additional measures to improve the information in this field. We have recently undertaken on an experimental basis a placement service in the various manpower centres and in addition circulate information on job opportunities at the conventions.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister consider surveying Canadian graduate students who are studying abroad and the experience of Operation Retrieval with a view to seeing whether the program is in fact effective or whether there are ways in which it could be improved?

Mr. MacEachen: That is a good suggestion. We think operation "Retrieval" has had some good results in encouraging Canadians to return to Canada. I think it should be mentioned that regardless of the number of graduates or scholars from Canada who have failed to return there is a general demand for scholars in Canada which cannot be satisfied for some years from the Canadian output.

[Mr. Kierans.]

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

PUBLICITY BRANCH—ALLEGED PROMOTION WITHOUT COMPETITION

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce concerning an internal matter within his department. Is he aware that promotions within the publicity branch of his department have been made without competition and therefore qualified officers have been bypassed by this procedure? If the minister is not aware of this, would he look into the situation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation to the minister and may assume it will be considered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO COMPLETION OF STUDY, PUBLISHING OF REPORT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct this question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the way in which the C.B.C. has been turning a searchlight on the dire poverty which faces a great many Canadians, may I ask the minister whether the study or review of all our social security measures which the government has undertaken has yet been completed and when it is completed whether the report will be made public?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): We hope the review will be completed some time early in the fall. We have under consideration now the question of making it public or not.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

GUIDELINES RESPECTING PARTICIPANTS IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Secretary of State. Could the minister advise whether the C.B.C. will be issuing guidelines regarding the allotment of people for political interviews and, if so, whether the guidelines will be established by the minister, or the national leader of the Liberal party?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If this question is in order it ought to be placed on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DESIGNATED REGIONS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, I will put my question to his substitute, probably the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Would the minister or whoever is responsible for this field tell the house if the study to establish the so-called designated regions in Canada is about completed? If so, may we expect an enrly statement on this in the house?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question was asked only a few days ago.

[*English*]

POLLUTION

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL CONTROLS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport perhaps I might address this question to the well informed Minister of National Health and Welfare. Having in mind the action of the Ontario government over the weekend in announcing strict new controls against exhaust from cars and diesel vehicles, I should like to know whether the federal government is considering taking complementary action?

Mr. Speaker: I would think the hon. member's question is of a very general nature which would invite a statement on motions. However, the minister may wish to reply.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, naturally I would consider making a statement. I can answer very shortly today that the Minister of Transport and myself have been in touch with our respective departments on this matter and hope to have something more informative and more detailed for the house in the fairly near future.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—ATTITUDE TO CHURCHAID RELIEF EFFORTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs relating to Nigeria and Biafra. It has been indicated that the negotiations are continuing, but they appear to be protracted. In the meantime could the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicate the attitude of the government toward assisting Joint Churchaid which is attempting to fly relief supplies into Biafra. Has the minister reached any decision with regard to channelling aid through Joint Churchaid?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government has been looking at all the possibilities. Our main problem, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, is not that relief is lacking but the matter of transportation. This is the problem on which we have concentrated. That is the reason we made our offer to provide neutral observers both inside and outside Nigeria. I am also prepared to recommend to my colleagues, and I think they will accept the recommendation, that an addition be made to the appropriation for relief supplies. However, there are indications that this is not the problem at the moment, and I believe we should wait until we see how the negotiations proceed.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the minister say whether the government is prepared to use Joint Churchaid or will it continue its policy to date of channelling relief solely through the International Red Cross?

Mr. Sharp: This really depends upon the outcome of these discussions. I think everyone will agree it would be better for the Canadian government to channel its relief through an agency that supplies relief to both sides, Biafra and other parts of Nigeria. That has been the principle upon which our policy has been founded. If, however, the situation changes the government does not rule out any possibility. Until that situation is clarified I really cannot give any further answer.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs implying that Joint Churchaid does not channel relief to the federally occupied parts of Biafra?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, but the application that was made to me was made on behalf of Canairelief which works with Joint Churchaid. They made an application to me and as of the last discussion with them they were supplying aid only to Biafra.

GRAIN

BOX CAR ALLOCATION—INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I return to the matter I

raised earlier. In view of the statement earlier this month by the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the representations made to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on July 4, did the minister acquaint himself with the situation at the Saskatchewan Pool terminals at the Lakehead in terms of car unloadings, and what action was he able to have taken following his visit to Winnipeg to have an increase in the allotment of cars for unloading at the Lakehead?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member referring to the Lakehead or to Vancouver?

Mr. Benjamin: I was referring to the Lakehead, Mr. Speaker, but Vancouver could stand an increase as well.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, this information which I have in my hand could also be the subject matter of a discussion the hon. member and myself could have later. I have figures also in respect of Vancouver indicating the number of box cars needed to reach the 5 bushel quota.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—APPLICATION TO R.C.M.P.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, is the Solicitor General now in a position to reply to my question about the federal government's participation through grants in supporting the cost of medicare for the R.C.M.P. in the province of Alberta?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the situation in relation to Medicare in Alberta is exactly the same in the R.C.M.P. as it is in the armed forces. I think that deals with the question asked by the hon. member on July 9.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FROM FARM UNIONS TO MEET PRIME MINISTER ON WESTERN TRIP

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the Prime Minister's office received a request from the farm unions to meet with the Prime Minister when he is in western Canada and, if so, will he accede to that request and meet them?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I will make inquiries of the Prime Minister's office, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

POSSIBILITY OF VACATIONS FOR SOME MEMBERS OF STAFF

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as government house leader. In view of the fact that we could probably get along during the remainder of this session with something less than a full staff, at least in some areas, will the government house leader take up with the appropriate authorities the possibility of letting some of our employees take their holidays while the weather is so good?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that such questions have to be directed to the Chair in writing and that his question cannot be asked in that way.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, in presenting this rule change—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: I thought you had called orders of the day, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Not yet.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I did. I apologize to the hon. member as I had called orders of the day. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was recognized and asked another question. I shall now call orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Friday, July 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, in presenting this proposed rule change in 75c the government claims that the purpose of the change is to speed up the parliamentary process through the elimination of what it alleges to be unnecessary debate. The opposition parties are convinced that this measure would deny

to the opposition, when a majority government is in power, the time for debate which is needed to point out the weaknesses of proposed legislation to the public through the press, in order that public opinion may bring pressure to bear on the government to correct those weaknesses and thus prevent bad legislation from passing into law.

I think every member of the house and all people in this country who pay attention to public affairs will agree that at a time when parliamentary schedules are becoming increasingly heavy, year by year, the parliamentary process should be speeded up if this can be done without denying to the opposition the means of enabling public opinion to bring pressure to bear to prevent a majority government from passing bad legislation into law.

The question facing us today is whether there is any way of doing this. I say that the answer is emphatically yes, and I am going to make three suggestions to cut down the time consumed by parliament without reducing the ability of the opposition to do the job it was elected to do.

The first suggestion deals with time allotted for speeches. The time allotted for individual speeches has not changed in any important fashion ever since the parliamentary session lasted no longer than four or five months a year, compared with a full year now. In those days it was generally considered that an aratorical performance was required by an hon. member to present his views adequately to the house. That was when time was of very little importance, but as we know today all of that has changed. In this day of the computer, space flights and instant replay, long-winded oratory is out and short factual presentations are in.

President Kennedy set the pattern for this new type of presentation when he made his inaugural address in 1961. He startled the governmental and political world by giving that most important address in no more than 1,200 words, which required no longer than 12 minutes to deliver. President Kennedy was fond of saying of speeches that if you cannot get your idea across in 20 minutes it becomes increasingly more difficult to do so after that.

• (3:10 p.m.)

President Lincoln was another example of a man who expressed himself very well and very clearly in very few words. I think we all remember that one of the most famous speeches known to mankind, the Gettysburg address, required less than two minutes to deliver. We also remember the most famous speeches of Sir Winston Churchill. They were short. When you examine them you see that the words and phrases used were extremely simple. He gave the key to this whole presentation problem when asked how long it took him to prepare a speech. He answered, "It depends on the length of the speech. If I am to speak for two hours, it will take me ten minutes to prepare the speech; but if I am to make a ten minute speech, it will take me two days." I am convinced that in the future we must spend far more time preparing our presentations to the house and take up far less of the time of the house in making those presentations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Therefore my first suggestion is that we do something that will not only greatly reduce the time taken by the house in carrying out the business of the country but will greatly improve the speeches made in the house. They will be more understandable; they will be better reported; they will have far more effect on the government. I suggest that we cut in half the time presently allotted for all speeches in the house. Instead of allowing ministers and leaders of opposition parties unlimited time to make their presentations, they should be allotted the same time as that allowed other hon. members, with ten minutes added. I believe the result of such a move would in itself reduce by at least one-third the time taken by the house to deal with the matters that come before it. In addition to greatly reducing the time spent in the house to deal with the business of the country, we would greatly increase the effectiveness of our presentations. They would of necessity be far better prepared. They would be far more in logical sequence. They would be far more easily understood.

I remember very clearly that when I first came to this house I was very impressed with the presentations made by Mr. M. J. Coldwell, the leader of the then C.C.F. party. I thought his speeches were a masterpiece of clarity. He always started by stating clearly the proposition with which he intended to deal, and then proceeded logically to develop it step by step and come to a conclusion. His speeches were short, they were always effective, they were always well understood by every member of the house.

My second suggestion deals with the long, typewritten speeches that members of the house all too often deliver, to the complete boredom of all other members. These

speeches are read in their entirety. Members of the house who are still here when an hon. member has finished such a speech are literally bored to death. One can see the effect of this kind of speech on the house by watching hon. members and the members of the press gallery when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) delivers one of his read speeches. People become more and more bored, and often you can hear the snores for blocks away. When members deliver long, read speeches in the house no one pays attention to the most important things in them. The people who should be paying attention from the members' point of view, the ministers of the government and the press gallery, do not do so because the speeches are too dull to merit attention. Therefore, the speeches delivered in this way have no effect whatsoever on debate in the House of Commons.

They have one direct purpose; that is, to advise a member's constituents of his views on matters which are important to them, and what he intends doing to see that action is taken on very real problems. The important thing about these speeches is that they appear in *Hansard* so that an hon. member may send them home for his constituents to read, and to the newspapers in his constituency so they may be published. In this way his constituents may know he is doing a good job, understands their problems and intends to speak to the minister concerned, or raise the matter later in the house and try to get some action. This gives the member a chance to report to his constituency what he has done.

In reality this is a member's white paper to his constituency. It is very important to him. These speeches should continue to be written and should get into the hands of the newspapers in a member's constituency, or into the hands of his constituents. But I do not believe there is any reason or justification for their taking up the time of the house and wasting our time, because they have no effect on anybody in the house. If any hon. member has doubt about that, I ask him to look around the chamber when somebody is reading a speech, and he will see the impression the speech is making.

The United States Congress have developed a method of handling this situation without wasting the time of Congress. The United States Congress allow a congressman to file a copy of his speech with the Clerk of Congress. The speech then appears in the *Congressional Record* just as if it had been delivered in Congress. In this way it does the job it is supposed to do. It is sent to the congressman's constituents and the newspapers in his riding. His constituents learn what he is doing, they are appraised of his views; but Congress does not waste the infinite amount of time that we in this chamber waste listening to such speeches. Every one of us is bored listening to speeches of this kind and there is no reason or justification for it. No member expects to impress the government, no matter what its political stripe may be, because he is talking directly to his constituents. He is not talking to the government or anyone in parliament; he is not trying to influence parliament.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my second suggestion is that we adopt what I consider to be a very successful practice adopted by the United States Congress many years ago, namely, allowing hon. members who have speeches they feel they must make to their constituents—and it is very necessary that they make this kind of speech, but not in the house—to have them printed in *Hansard* without their being read. In this way the speeches could be sent to the hon. member's constituents and the result would be exactly the same, with the advantage that we would not have to spend interminable hours listening to them. The time of the house would therefore be used more effectively and a great deal of the time of this chamber would be saved, thereby allowing more time to deal with the country's business.

I should now like to deal with my third suggestion. It refers to the making of speeches that are intended to influence our debate. Anybody who has been a member of a government will tell you that ministers pay attention to members of parliament only when they are convinced by the delivery of a speech that a member thoroughly knows his subject and feels strongly about it. This can be judged by the method of delivery of the speech. This kind of impression can only be created by a member knowing his subject thoroughly in advance, studying it very carefully and being convinced that what he has to say is of importance to the house in general and the government in particular.

• (3:20 p.m.)

A member wants certain changes to be made. He feels very strongly about it, and has no need to follow a written script because his thoughts are clearly in his mind. In view of this I suggest we enforce a rule which has existed for many years but which has been left unenforced because hon. members did not want it enforced by Mr. Speaker, or the

chairman, or whoever was in charge of a particular debate. I say we should ask Mr. Speaker to enforce this rule in our own best interests. If this were done we would be required to learn our subjects better, to get them clear in our minds, to work out a logical sequence in the delivery of our ideas, and to make a brief rather than a wordy presentation. This would have a greater impact on the ministers concerned and on members of the Press Gallery. This latter point is important, because if our speeches are not reported to the public they really might as well not be made. So I say that in order to make our debates far more effective, in order to obtain far better coverage in the press, we should adopt the suggestion I am putting forward.

At present we often make our speeches so dull, so poor and so mixed up that members of the press cannot figure out what we are trying to get at. Nor do we give ourselves as good a chance to persuade members of the government to make the changes we believe are needed to improve legislation and consequently conditions in the country generally. It is only when our speeches are reported to the nation that public opinion is influenced by our views. Then in turn, through reports and editorials in the newspapers, the government, if it is not influenced by our presentations on the floor of the house, can be influenced by what appears in the newspapers or by what is said in the news media generally, as feedback develops following editorial comments and column features.

These are the three suggestions I make. I believe we should allow ministers to read quotations or statistical material. This, of course, is necessary. If the rule to which I have referred were strictly enforced, speeches would be briefer and far better. As we know, many speeches are now read in their entirety much to the boredom of the house. Far more attention would be paid to them by members of the government and members of the press if they were delivered without notes, or with the aid of very brief notes.

Speaking as a former minister I know that it is only when a man stands up and speaks with conviction and clarity that one begins to take note that he is calling attention to matters to which attention ought to be paid. I also know, having for many years talked to members of the Press Gallery that they are only impressed when they believe a man really understands his subject and speaks with conviction. It is only then that they pay attention to what he says and report it.

If we were to adopt these three changes I believe we could cut the time required to deal with legislation and other matters to about one third of what is spent today. In addition to accelerating the processes of parliament I believe we would make this house a far more effective place. Our speeches would be easier to listen to and carry more weight with Ministers of the Crown; they would be far more likely to influence debate than they are today. I therefore strongly urge all members to give consideration to these suggestions on measures we can take to help ourselves to run our own affairs better.

I come, now, to this question: if it is the desire of the government, as we are told it is, to speed up the processes of parliament, why has there been no inclination on the part of the government to move in the direction I have indicated? I have mentioned three things which could have been done long ago to improve the effectiveness of parliament. Yet the government has shown no interest in making any of these changes. Instead, it seeks to introduce a change which would completely nullify the effectiveness of the opposition in dealing with a majority government.

The answer is that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not interested in accelerating the processes of parliament. He wants to control parliament. He is far more interested in controlling and in programming parliament than in speeding up parliament. He wishes to treat parliament as he treated his classroom when he was a teacher. I know the Prime Minister would like to play the role of a little colonel in parliament; he would like to crack the whip and have parliament jump to attention. He would like to know that on a certain date certain things would be accomplished, just as he would announce a lecture for a certain time and date, or say that on another date an examination would be held and that everything had to be cleared up in accordance with a timetable set out in advance. He sees parliament operating as an assembly line or as a computer, legislation being fed in at one end and laws coming out at the other in a certain form, that form being the way in which the government wants them to come out, irrespective of the views of the opposition.

The Prime Minister seems to think that he can operate in parliament by utilizing methods which dictators have developed to a very high degree. He does not want any opposition in parliament. He simply wants to squeeze it and have it jump. He wants to call the tune and have us dance to that tune. That is not the way to run a modern parliament.

Parliament is not a computer; it is not a classroom, an assembly line or a sausage factory. It is a forum for debate. Debate in parliament must be carried on for as long as is necessary. It must be carried on until the opposition has had a chance to bring to the attention of the press and other media, which in turn will communicate with the people, the weakness of any piece of legislation being considered.

There must be time for newspapers and periodicals to comment. Our people read what is written in our newspapers and magazines about legislation under consideration, and "get the message". Then they write letters to the newspapers, to the Prime Minister or the government minister concerned, and the government "gets the message" that the people do not think the legislation being considered is good and that it should not be passed. This process takes considerable time.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I want to mention three examples to show why we must have time for debate. The first of these, Mr. Speaker, was the transport bill presented to parliament two years ago. At that time the opposition thought a great deal was wrong with the bill and that many of its clauses should be changed. As we know, debate lasted several weeks. During that time about 100 amendments were proposed, many being accepted by the government. Of course, we had a good minister of transport then; Mr. Pickersgill was a man who appreciated the rights of hon. members. After listening to their arguments he agreed that certain parts of the bill should be changed, and the changes were made.

Mr. Bell: A great Canadian.

Mr. Hees: As a result, although debate on the bill was protracted, the legislation coming out of parliament was better than it would have been had there been no lengthy debate. If proposed rule 75c had been in force then it is possible that that debate could have lasted only four days, and we should have had a bad transport bill. Parliament could have done absolutely nothing to improve it.

My second example is the defence production bill of 1955. Hon. members who were here then will no doubt recall that Mr. C. D. Howe asked parliament to give him, under the defence production bill, powers in peacetime that the government had given him in wartime. Those powers would have made him a virtual dictator over Canadian industry in peacetime. The opposition said that no minister had the right to have powers in peacetime which he was given in wartime, and we fought, fought, and fought for many weeks. Mr. St. Laurent, a great prime minister, at last recognized that the legislation was bad and that no minister of any government had the right to have powers in peacetime that he had been given in wartime.

We said to the government, "If there is any emergency situation or any crisis, call parliament and we shall see that you get adequate powers to deal with the crisis right away." Of course Mr. Howe had tasted power in wartime and he wanted more of that same power. We said he could have it in an emergency, but he wanted it then and there. At last Mr. St. Laurent solved the problem by sending Mr. Howe away for a long fishing week end, giving the opposition a chance to propose amendments. That again shows how important is debate in this chamber.

My third example is the famous pipe line debate. Most of us supported the idea of the pipe line, but when a minister of the Crown, the same Mr. C. D. Howe, said he would not give the opposition information as to what part his friend, Clint Murchison, was to play in building the pipe line, we had to continue protracted debate. In the end Mr. Howe decided to implement closure, and we know what the result of that action was. It led to the defeat of the government eight months later.

I could cite many other examples but these three show how important it is for an opposition to have ample time to bring a case before the people. It needs time to do the job so that the people of the country can become aware, through the speeches of members, articles in the press, editorials and so on, of the importance of a matter. When the people of Canada know what legislation is all about and the government gets a feedback, legislation is amended. This process is good and necessary, and that is why we are going to fight proposed rule 75c right down the line.

I think we all wish to see the parliamentary process speeded up. I have made several suggestions as to how that process could be speeded, and I and others like me will make more suggestions in future. I have made personal recommendations, based on 19 years' experience in parliament, as to how we ought to reduce time spent on various stages of discussion.

We all want to make parliament more effective. Why does the government not try to hurry up parliamentary processes by adopting

some of the suggestions we have made? I think they would work very well. Why does it not give our suggestions a try? Let us implement some of this new thinking.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we were told that this session, which apparently is ending with debate on the new proposed rules, was to end on June 27. We were to go home for our summer recess and come back, according to my information, on October 9. If the government has been so held up on its legislative program, why was it willing to give us a recess of 3½ months? I am human, I like a 3½ month recess, and so does everybody else here. But, Mr. Speaker, if legislation was being held up, if legislation was not moving through parliament as quickly as it ought, why did the government propose such a long summer recess? It is not right under those circumstances that we should be sent home for 3½ months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the government wanted us to rise for two reasons. First, it does not like being questioned by the opposition during the question period and, second, Liberal Members of Parliament—and there are many fine, new Liberal members here—do not want to stay around here during the summer months. They feel that being asked to stay here is an imposition on them. Consequently they have exerted great pressure on the government to rise for a summer recess.

I say this to Liberal Members of Parliament. We are well paid on a year round basis and it is our duty to stay here for 12 months of the year if necessary, and do our jobs. We are here to put pressure on the government. Many problems face this nation. We should be considering how to check inflation, and how to stop the rise in the cost of living which is going up at the rate of 10 per cent every year. The government brought in its budget. When I spoke on the budget I think the minister paid attention to me. He answered several of my questions, but there were several he did not answer. I told him that the imposition of new taxes calculated to slow down building in our major centres would have no effect. I said that no builder would wait for two years and have his cost of building increase by 24 per cent, and that sooner than do that a builder would prefer to absorb any extra tax. The minister did not answer that. I also said that the government is doing nothing about controlling inflation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. May I remind the hon. member that we are discussing a specific amendment relating to proposed standing order 75c. I think the hon. member should talk about that.

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I always bow to your rulings, and will do so at this time. I was dealing with an important matter, but I think I have made my point.

In closing I say to the government that if it is sincere in wanting the parliamentary process speeded up, it ought to consider some of the suggestions which some of us here have put forward. The ones I made would not curtail anybody's rights in parliament. They would still allow the opposition to do the effective job it was elected to do. They would make parliament a far more effective place because the speeches would be shorter, better prepared, and would be listened to by more gentlemen in the press gallery and by ministers of the government who have to make any necessary changes. My suggestions would speed up parliament and make it a far more effective place in which to work. I say to the government: delete this foolish, stupid, dictatorial rule 75c which would hamstring the opposition and make it impossible for them to do their job. It should be thrown out the window so that parliament can be put on the rails once again.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before the hon. member takes his seat, may I be permitted to ask him two questions? He was talking about time limits. I do not know whether the hon. member is aware that some of the time limits are 20 minutes. Is the hon. member suggesting they be cut to 10 minutes? My second question—

Mr. Hees: I will answer your questions one by one. Yes, certainly. This was proved during this session when we of the opposition of our own volition on certain opposition days decided that in order to allow twice as many speeches we would cut our speeches to 10 minutes. Do you know what the result was? The 10-minute speeches were infinitely better than 20-minute speeches. The members prepared their remarks and gave excellent speeches. We are very much in favour of 10-minute speeches, so the government can cut them to 10 minutes any time they want.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Does the hon. member agree his 35 minute speech would have been a good one to have been tabled without delivery?

Mr. Hees: I did not understand. I am afraid the minister was mumbling.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I ask the hon. member whether he agrees his 35 minute speech would have been better tabled rather then delivered?

Mr. Hees: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. As Your Honour and every member sitting in this house noticed, all hon. members were sitting listening to every word I said.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: You bet your boots you were! I was speaking with the sort of notes I said all members should use. We would have far better speeches if all hon. members used them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

Mr. Hees: I suggest to the hon. minister that when he speaks he should try using this method. His speeches will be far more effective as a result.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Are there any further questions?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The answer has been given.

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which has just been made by the hon. member. I do not know whether the hon. member had his tongue in his cheek when he said everyone in the House of Commons was listening. In any event, I listened. I want to say that the first 10 minutes of his speech comprised one of the best speeches I have heard in the House of Commons since I have been here. The last 25 minutes were one of the worst. In the first 10 minutes, he made some suggestions that certainly should be looked into by the government. Hon. members should think about these suggestions and perhaps they can be implemented in the future.

First, the hon. member suggested that speeches should be short. He will be pleased to know that the speech I am about to make will be short. I hope it will not be more than 10 minutes' duration. The hon. member emphasized the fact that speeches should not be written. My speech is not. The hon. member mentioned the fact that we should not use notes too liberally. He will be very pleased to know that I have no notes to assist me in this speech.

Second, the hon. member suggested that we should look into the proposition of filing some of the written speeches that members of the House of Commons might wish to deliver, as is the practice in the United States Congress. I think the hon. member is quite correct in this suggestion because there are members who must get their ideas back to the people at home, the voters, supporters, and citizens they are proud to represent, in order that they will know what a particular member may be thinking. The hon. gentleman was quite correct in suggesting that the government should look at the proposition of filing written speeches.

Third, the hon. member suggested we would have better speeches if they were shorter. In the first part of his address he quoted names such as Lincoln and Winston Churchill. Of course there are innumerable speakers throughout the world who have done a wonderful job delivering short speeches. Quite frankly, I believe it would be a better assembly if the speeches were shorter.

In the last part of his speech the hon. member lectured the government, and, in his absence, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). He said the Prime Minister wished to use this house as a classroom. He compared him with a professor in college, saying an examination was going to be held on such and such a day and that he expected people to stand at attention whenever he came along; in other words, to act as a dictator.

This is not correct, Mr. Speaker. What my hon. friend, and all members to the left of Your Honour, must realize is that on June 25 one year ago the people of Canada made a choice and, Mr. Speaker, they did not choose those to the left of Your Honour. This is something the opposition are not bearing in mind. They must realize the reason they were not chosen was because the electors did not think they could do as good a job as the people who sit to the right of Your Honour. The right hon. Prime Minister was chosen to lead this country. By attempting to bring this rule into force in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister is attempting to do the job he is supposed to do, namely, lead Canada to a better and just society.

My hon. friend can very well be critical, but this is one of the fundamental points members to the left of Your Honour must appreciate. They were not put in government

because the Canadian people did not want them there. They wanted the Prime Minister and his government to lead them and carry out their business.

I believe the thinking behind the government's attempt to bring this rule change into force was that they appreciated the fact they must allow the opposition to debate all bills, regardless of the subject matter, long enough to become acquainted with all the details so that the news media, newspapers, television and radio, would have the opportunity to put these before the people of Canada.

If it is a poor bill, the government may withdraw it. If on the other hand they feel it is acceptable to the nation and themselves, they can pass the bill.

I agree with the last speaker when he says that it is a necessity that the public media must have an opportunity to debate a bill. The question is, Mr. Speaker, how long is long enough? How long should a bill be debated? I know my hon. friend is not thinking in these terms, but obviously we cannot debate one bill in the House of Commons for a year. That would be ridiculous. Obviously it cannot even be debated for three or four months. How long should we have to debate a bill? The hon. member suggested four days.

The hon. member suggested that before a speech is given it should be researched, notes condensed, and the person giving the speech should know what he is talking about. I suggest to the hon. member he should look back over his own notes and do a little research. He says the government can put a bill through in four days. He is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the proposed rule change only one day is allotted for each stage of a bill. At the most four days debate could be spread over ten days. Four days debate spread over ten days!

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Whicher: That is absolutely right, but the hon. member also spoke about the newspapers, television and radio. Surely if this is a matter which arouses public opinion it could be discussed during the week and throughout the country. My hon. friend, perhaps unintentionally, left an impression that the news media and the Canadian public would have an opportunity to discuss a proposed bill for only four days. This is not correct. I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the allocation allows for at least three days at each stage of a bill.

Mr. Hees: No. One day.

Mr. Whicher: On top of that there are the week ends. In some instances there would be two week ends. Therefore it would be quite possible that from the first reading stage until the final stage of a bill two weeks could elapse. In addition there are the committees of the house. Bills would go into the committees. On the committees my hon. friends in the opposition have a larger percentage of the membership than they have in the House of Commons. They have the right at that time to bring any matter which is before a committee to the attention of the press, radio and television.

I suggest there will be plenty of time for the people of Canada to be informed about whatever bill may be under consideration. The various arguments will be recorded in the press and public opinion will be fed back into the House of Commons where government members and members of the opposition will have the opportunity to use their consciences and vote as they see fit.

I do not wish to take too much time on this. I say that this government was put in office on June 25, over a year ago now, to do a job. It is all very well for my hon. friend to ask what they are holding up, or what they have held up in the past. I think this is a fair enough question. He also went on to say, and I agree with him, that there are many serious problems in Canada. He mentioned inflation. Of course it is a serious problem which must be tackled. There are many other problems. Canada must be developed. We need more people here. There are a great many other problems which could be mentioned.

I might mention the omnibus Criminal Code bill in respect of which there were many, many amendments. When the government sees that it is involved in a very lengthy debate obviously there is no useful purpose in placing a good deal of legislation on the order paper because there would be no opportunity to present it. The government must know where it stands. It must know that within a reasonable period of time a bill will be passed or tossed out.

My hon. friends, particularly those of the Official Opposition, on numerous occasions have mentioned the Mother of Parliaments in England. I think every member of this house will bow to that great parliament which over the last few hundred years has done so much

for democracy and the whole world. But what the government has asked for here is far less than what the government has in England. This is something I should like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend.

I feel the government must have an opportunity and the ability to bring matters to a conclusion, whether successful or otherwise. I believe that is the reason the people of Canada chose this government. They wanted a government that would bring in a new way of doing business.

My hon. friend quite rightly said there are many new members in the Liberal party. I respectfully suggest there are more new Liberal members than there are new Conservative members. However, there are many new members in our party who do not like sitting around doing what they consider to be nothing. Therefore, they want some action. We want things done in respect of the development of Canada. We want to know that at the end of so many days, within reason, a bill will be completed so that we can carry on and undertake another job. There are many things to be done in this land.

Some people say that this proposed rule is the same as closure. They say it is not different from closure and therefore, if closure is available to the government, there is no need to bring in this rule. With closure debate can be stifled immediately. Rule 75c gives hon. members the opportunity of advance consultation. As I say there is no comparison between the power given by this proposed rule and the power the government now has in respect of closure.

In respect of what I am about to say I would point out that I have not been in consultation with any of my colleagues, and certainly not with any members of the cabinet. I also say this as one who spent many years in opposition in a provincial legislature. I say that the hon. member was quite right in stating that he does not want to sit around here all summer discussing a measure such as this. I have gone into the proposal very thoroughly and I am firmly convinced that this is a good thing not only for the House of Commons but also for the people of Canada, by whom we were sent here. Therefore I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think we should sit around this place all summer. I do not think the people of Canada expect us to remain here.

I have just returned from my constituency. I spoke to a lot of the people there, some of whom are Conservatives. I mention that name kindly because we do not have any Créditistes or N.D.P.'s in my riding. Many of these people asked why does the government not bring in closure now and complete this silly debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Whicher: This is the feeling they have. If you go back to your ridings and if you ask you will find the same feeling. As one member of this house I say I believe that when we have listened to these people in the opposition for a reasonable length of time, another week or a few more days, we should have closure on this matter not only for the benefit of the House of Commons but also for the benefit of the people of Canada.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) a question which is perhaps twofold. I did listen to all his remarks and as he said in respect of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) I too enjoyed the first part of his speech better than the second. I think he made a real attempt to be constructive. I ask the hon. member, as a former member of a provincial legislature, whether he can point to one piece of legislation the government has brought in, or which is on the order paper, which could not have been processed or moved along under rule 75A or 75B? I might refer to the omnibus Criminal Code bill. I suggest that any objective observer would agree that rule 75A and rule 75B would have taken care of that. Secondly, can the hon. member mention one provincial legislature in which there is anything similar to rule 75c? I do not care about the parliamentary system in England, unless the hon. member is willing to adopt all of it.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Whicher: It is a pleasure to answer these questions, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member asked me whether I know of any legislature in which there is a rule comparable to this. I am not familiar with all the legislatures here in Canada. But I want to say this. If you think as far as shouting—I don't know the word you would like to use here—and pushing legislation through are concerned—and if you think these fellows over here in the Liberal party of Canada are dummies—you should see the way the Tories of Ontario operate, because they are perfectionists. They have been doing this for years and years. I don't know what rules they operate under, but I tell you it is most effective. I am glad the hon. member brought this up.

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Whicher: They often sit there until two or three o'clock in the morning until they are worn out and glad to let any bill go through.

Mr. Hees: Answer the question.

Mr. Whicher: I have told you I do not know everything about all the legislatures here in Canada. I have not done my research, as no doubt the hon. member has, into what is exactly taking place, but I say that the Tories in Ontario really push things through. That is how the Tories do it in Ontario.

An hon. Member: Because it is good legislation.

Mr. Whicher: The first question had to do with the omnibus bill.

Mr. Nowlan: We are not so much concerned with talking about 75A and 75B as we are with talking about 75C.

Mr. Whicher: The point is that there are going to be many other bills coming before the House of Commons. I cannot accept the proposition that the Omnibus Bill could have been handled by the three parties. We never know how you people are going to react. How can half of you in the house vote one way in favour of a measure, and the other half vote against it?

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask a question of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings before he sat down. I should like to ask him that question now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member would require unanimous consent.

Mr. Hees: Let him ask the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gibson: I was very interested in the hon. member's proposition relating to the United States Congress and the fact that some of the speeches there are filed. The hon. member suggested that speeches here might be filed as they are in the United States. Does the hon. member suggest that these be printed in a separate section of *Hansard*, or would he simply have these filed in the regular way? If they were filed in the regular way would this not lead to a complete ruination of parliament, everybody simply filing their speeches? Would that not make a complete mockery of the whole process?

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, this does not make a mockery of the legislative system in the United States. As I said in the first place, nobody, but nobody, and you know it, pays attention to these regularly read speeches which just bore everybody in the house. If the house does not hear a speech anyway there would be no loss, and there would be a gain because we would save time. Let us file some of our speeches as representing the views presented by an hon. member of parliament. A member would bring them in and present them to the Clerk of the House. They could then be put in *Hansard* as though they had been spoken here. Nobody would interject, nobody would find fault, nobody would ask questions. In this way they could be recorded in *Hansard* and sent home to his constituents, and we would save a great deal of time and a great deal of boredom.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, it was not my original intention to speak on the measure presently before this house. In fact the record will show that I did not participate in the rules debate last December. Other members of the Official Opposition participated in the deliberations preceding the tabling of the special committee report. They spoke ably and well on behalf of my party, and it was not necessary therefore for me to participate at that time.

You will recall that during that debate the government showed at least a measure of reasonableness. The bulk of the report was acceptable and good. We in the opposition objected forcefully to the infamous 16A and its restrictions on our rights. It was this objection which eventually caused the government to reconsider its position and decide that 16A should be sent back to the committee.

We were pleased that this course was followed because at that time all of us were concerned with national issues. We were looking forward to debating several measures of fundamental importance to the physical well being of Canadians, including the housing report and legislation stemming from it, and I was expecting momentarily the presentation of legislation designed to assist fishermen and the fishing industry. Since I have a special interest in those measures I looked forward to reviewing the provisions of this legislation and hoped to suggest some improvements to the minister when it was brought forward.

At that time we were also looking forward to reviewing the estimates of the departments in committees in order that we might determine the strengths and weaknesses of the government. As a matter of fact it was my understanding that the committee system was to be the cornerstone of the Prime Minister's, (Mr. Trudeau) concept of the just society, a place where duly elected members could take part in the new participatory democracy, and freely express their viewpoint gleaned at the grass root level in respect of matters of national importance. The government would then know the feelings of Canadians in general in respect of legislation placed before parliament. We have since learned otherwise.

There was much to be done and the committees set out on bold new voyages of discovery. For example, the External Affairs Committee went to Europe and returned with its report, a report I might add which was significantly ignored by the Prime Minister and his colleagues. The Agriculture Committee also reviewed at close range the serious difficulties facing the west. Another committee, the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, studied the problems of particular interest in the Atlantic provinces, and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry travelled to the west coast to study the problems of the fisheries and forestry industry in that area. At that time those of us on the committee learned that there is more than the Rocky Mountains separating and dividing British Columbia from the rest of Canada.

As we looked forward at the beginning of 1969 to participating in the work of these committees, many members in the house did not speak on the special committee report last December, leaving consideration of these matters to members more practised in procedure, and at that time the government bowed to our objections. However, on this occasion it would appear that the one ingredient necessary to provide good government, namely, common sense, has been thrown out the window. Therefore I feel compelled to speak out about the government's unacceptable and objectionable attempt to ram 16A, by another name, down the throats of members of this house.

It is necessary that I speak out against the implementation of rule 75c because my constituents take strong exception to compulsion of any kind. My constituents are rugged individualists. In a free democratic society, they believe they should have the right to choose or reject any government program or policy. They did not like, for example, the compulsory aspect of the Canada Pension Plan. I received numerous letters attesting to that fact. They did not like the compulsory aspect of the federal medicare plan, and again I had numerous letters attesting to that fact. They do not like the idea of their member of parliament being compelled to sit silent on the order of the President of the Privy Council, or of any other cabinet minister, while legislation is introduced in this house which may not meet with their overall approval.

I believe it is necessary for me to speak out against rule 75c. If this rule should be approved this may well be the last opportunity open to me to speak on any legislation of a controversial nature debated in this house in the future.

• (4:10 p.m.)

This rule seeks to throttle parliament. It will limit and destroy the rights of members of this house whose sole purpose is to represent the views of those who elected them. I believe that what I now say represents accurately the opinions and concerns of some 63,000 people who reside in my constituency. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, they do not expect me to speak on every measure brought before the house, because if all members did so legislation would be bogged down in this chamber. But my constituents expect me to reserve the right to speak on any issue. It is that right I hope to preserve by participating in this debate.

My constituents are also concerned that the government should try to muzzle parliament instead of turning its attention to the real problems of Canadians. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), who preceded me, pointed out that his party at the last federal election received a majority and not us, and this gave them the right to determine the time that would be required to debate issues brought before the house. I remind him and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) that they represent the government and the government has a majority in the house, which gives them the privilege of sitting on the right hand of the Speaker and bringing down legislation for consideration by the house. But the rules under which legislation is to be examined are, in my view, the prerogative of the house. They are not the prerogative of the government. They are not the prerogative of you, Mr. Speaker, whose duty it is, in my opinion, to interpret the rules and act as a referee.

Therefore, the rules can be effective only if they are established by agreement among all parties in the house. As an example of what can happen when there is no agreement, government members need only look at the record of events as they occurred in this chamber since June 27, the day on which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated parliament would adjourn. If he were to look at the record, even a man as bull-headed as the President of the Privy Council would get the picture.

Just what is happening at the present time? The Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to which the matter of time allocation had been referred, worked with all parties to formulate 75A and 75B which would provide for an allocation of time for government legislation on the basis of consensus and agreement. But this was too orderly for the President of the Privy Council. Since we were nearing the Prime Minister's cut-off date for this session, he rammed 75c through the committee, supported only by government members. Then he sought to bulldoze it through this house, not through discussion of the committee report but by introducing a government motion.

Why did the President of the Privy Council follow this course? I submit that he made a mistake when he drew up 75c and had it incorporated in the committee report. Having noticed this mistake, he wanted to make a few minor changes to the report of the committee, changes which are so slight that you must read very closely the committee report and the minister's motion in order to detect the differences; but changes, nevertheless, which would make Mac the Muzzler the all-powerful czar of this chamber. After the shameful display on the part of the Prime Minister in this chamber on Friday, July 11, I can never agree, and my party will never willingly agree, to the implementation of 75c or to the placing of this kind of power in the hands of the present government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: The Prime Minister has by his words and actions lowered the dignity of the high office to which he was elected. He has shown contempt for this chamber and its elected members by his arrogant, childish, petulant and intolerant remarks.

Why is the government following this course? We have heard a number of speakers on the government side of the house say they need 75c so they can plan and program their legislation. What arrogant nonsense; what gall! Rotten wood cannot be carved, neither can it be glued nor nailed. We who live on the east coast know that you cannot build the hull of a ship with rotten or faulty materials. You cannot make a co-operative and productive House of Commons, our ship of state, with rotten or faulty rules. This government can get through a substantial legislative program only with the co-operation of the house based on an allocation of time which has been achieved by agreement among all parties in the house.

If the opposition does not co-operate, whether or not 75c is in effect the government cannot hope to get through as much legislation next session as it did in the first session of the 28th parliament. I am not threatening the government when I say this. All I ask hon. gentlemen who sit to the right of the Speaker to do is consider what is happening in the Post Office Department. Your Post Office Department has had rules laid down by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), and they are working to rule.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is only one rule I would remind the hon. member of, and it is that he should always address the Chair.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it very interesting when government supporters complain about the length of debate in this session, because there is nothing that indicates more clearly their lack of knowledge about past events here. I am not implying that I am an old, experienced member, but I was first elected to this chamber on June 10, 1957. This represents six federal elections and quite a number of sessions, starting with the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent and the Liberal party sitting on the opposition side of the house.

Mr. Bell: He was a great Liberal.

Mr. Crouse: It takes me through the progressive years under the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), through the uncertain years—these are not my views but those of former cabinet members who have written books on the subject—under Mr. Pearson, to the year under the Prime Minister. In all the sessions which I have attended, no government has received more co-operation in the passing of its legislative program than the present government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: There has been too much co-operation. We have spoiled them.

Mr. Crouse: Some hon. members who support the government have already referred to the rules debate as a filibuster. If they want to read about real filibusters I suggest they read some of the drivel that was put on the record during the years 1957 to 1962 by Mr. Pearson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Pickersgill. If wishing could come true, the men of Apollo 11 would not be the first men on the moon, because I sat here many times and wished these four men would leave this house for another place. In one way or another I suppose my wish has come true.

Let me review the record in that respect. The second session of the 24th parliament in 1959 opened on January 15 and prorogued on July 18 of that year. The third session of the 24th parliament opened on January 14, 1960, and prorogued on August 10 of that year. The fourth session of the 24th parliament opened on November 17, 1960, and did not prorogue until September 29, 1961. These were filibusters carried on by four men. If hon. members look at the record they will see that at one time one of these men filled seven pages of the *Hansard* Index, while the other three filled six. Heaven only knows how many thousands of words those four men put on the record during that time.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the government have received outstanding co-operation during this session from the opposition in regard to the passage of their legislative program. To substantiate that statement all one has to do is to look at the record. According to my recollection only two of our debates were lengthy. First of all, there was the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code. Quite naturally this measure took considerable time since many members were opposed, as I was, to the clauses dealing with abortion and homosexuality. These clauses went to the very basis of moral behaviour and to the very roots of our Christian beliefs. Since it was the government that introduced this kind of legislation to the house, I do not believe that this self same government should have had the right to limit the views of any member who tried to express his objections and the objections of his constituents to the legislation.

The second piece of legislation that took some time was the official languages bill. However, it was also an important piece of legislation, the implementation of which will have far reaching effects throughout the length and breadth of the country. Surely the President of the Privy Council is not going to state that the rights of members to express their opinions on these matters, in what to date has been a free parliament, should have been curtailed.

Quite frankly, if the government have important legislation that they wish to implement, why do they not bring it forward at this time? As I have just pointed out, the house has sat through the summer on other occasions. I would point out that it was not the Official Opposition that suggested that the Commons adjourn on June 27; this was the cut-off date that was set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We of the Official Opposition agreed to sit extra hours, meeting in this chamber at ten o'clock in the morning, in order to facilitate the passage of government legislation.

It is the bull headed stupidity of the present government in arranging their own program that has brought us to the present situation. Since we will never agree to the acceptance of 75c. I suggest to the President of the Privy Council that he withdraw it. And since most of the summer is now over, let him bring on any important legislation that the government have so we may deal with it now. The Prime Minister has called our fight to protect the rights of parliament a stupid filibuster. He has already prejudged 80 per cent of members' questions as sheer hypocrisy and therefore the room that is left to manoeuvre in this parliament is becoming limited.

We as members will insist on our right to be heard. If the Prime Minister and his cabinet are bored with parliament, if it is interfering with their vacation or entertainment plans, or if parliament no longer interests them, then they should at least have the courage and decency to stand in their place and to tell their story to the people who elected them.

Mr. Kaplan: It is your people who are having the vacation.

Mr. Crouse: It is now evident that rule 75c is, on second thought, no longer acceptable to the government or to the President of the Privy Council. The interjection by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) is unworthy of comment, since it was the members of his party who were counted out in the house for non-attendance last Thursday.

We have seen two retreats already in this debate. The first was made by the President of the Privy Council when he agreed to a debate on the report of the committee rather than on his motion. The second retreat occurred on Friday when the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), the television specialist on filibusters, brought in an amendment to the motion moved by our house leader. It was obvious that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra had the sanction and support of the President of the Privy Council for his action, but it was not found acceptable to the Chair.

Since the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council move members up and down like a yo-yo on a string, it will be interesting to see which member the spider next entices into his web of intrigue to try to trap the opposition—in the words of the Prime Minister—into accepting that which to us is unacceptable.

I say to the President of the Privy Council: Withdraw 75c and bring on your legislation. Parliament and the official opposition have been prepared for months to deal with some of the major problems facing this country. However, it is the government that has been dilatory, ineffective and uncertain about the course that it wishes to follow.

Rule 75c would not do for the government what it suggests it would, even if its adoption were the desirable course to follow. It would not enable the government to bulldoze a large legislative program through this chamber. It would simply enable the government to cut off debate, at a time when it may be vitally necessary to continue debate so that the voice of the people, through their elected representatives, is heard on the matter.

I cannot help but wonder what the government is up to. Just what are those schemers in the cabinet planning? What secretive, cunning, destructive legislation is in the making that requires the type of control that is vested in 75c?

The record to date in this session indicates that this rule is definitely not required for the orderly conduct of the proceedings of this house. In all conscience I ask the government what in the name of heaven are they planning for the next session? What are the government planning for the future that they deem it necessary to have this type of club, this muzzle, this guillotine for silencing parliament? What important program has parliament delayed?

Every day we hear of increasing interest rates, increasing inflation and higher prices. In what manner has parliament held up the government in its so-called fight against inflation? The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) has been asking for months about the commission on incomes and prices, and after almost a year the government finally got around to naming the personnel of the commission. And during all this time prices went higher and higher.

In what manner has parliament held up government action on the housing problem? We have plenty of land in Canada. There is all kinds of lumber, bricks, cement, stone, and lots of unemployed men who could usefully be occupied in putting these materials together to build homes. This being the case, why is there a housing shortage in Canada? Why was it necessary for a minister of the Crown to resign in disgust over the policies of the present government?

Surely the President of the Privy Council cannot accuse us of preventing him from bringing forward legislation to deal, for example, with the mounting torrent of water pollution in this country. The problem is national in scope and frightening in its over-all effect on the health and food supply of Canadians. Last year the federal Department of Fisheries opened a $3.5 million salmon hatchery on the Saint John River, only to find that thousands of smolt have died in the hatchery this year owing to polluted river water.

In Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, man made pollution has destroyed thousands of tons of fish, as well as the income of hundreds of Canadians, and the federal government has still not embarked on a national water quality program. Such a program was promised by the right hon. Lester Pearson in 1967. This is now 1969 and still there is no leadership in this regard given by the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member because I am afraid we will get into a pattern whereby hon. members are more inclined to discuss general problems in the country than the proposal that is before the house. I think it is an abuse of the rules of the house if members take half of the 40 minutes that is reserved to them, perhaps even longer, to discuss the aspects of all of the 18 or 20 departments of government. I suggest to hon. members that what they are discussing at the present time is essentially the motion before the house and the amendment thereto. The Acting Speaker reminded

the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings of this a moment ago, and I am in full accord with the opinion he expressed at that time. Certainly I intend to invite hon. members as often as necessary to observe the rules. Since we are debating the rules it is elementary that hon. members observe this fundamental rule in particular.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your advice. I know you will understand our confusion and difficulty. It is hard to know where to cut off debate—how to apply your comments strictly, while at the same time ignoring the tremendous problems which Canadians are facing in the absence of government action to deal with them. I might mention the shipbuilding industry, the fishing industry, the failure to deal with the Woods Report concerning veterans—the list goes on interminably but I will abide by your ruling and avoid getting into a lengthy discussion about these matters.

To suggest that the government needs rule 75c in order to respond quickly by way of legislation to some of the problems to which I have referred is nothing but hypocrisy in high places. The government is aware of these problems but the only action it has taken to deal with them is to set up task forces or royal commissions, or to take them under review. We know the previous Liberal administration left a mess to be cleaned up; the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said it would take some time for him to get his house in order. But he cannot lay the blame, or even attempt to lay the blame, on the opposition for the government's failure to deal with problems which are causing widespread concern and dismay.

When the Prime Minister was minister of justice he was asked when he would decide whether a defeat was not a defeat—before or after a vote. He replied: Before or after the vote; we are the masters of this house. I submit that by this answer the Prime Minister showed us his true colours; he displayed his arrogance and his contempt for parliament. He is now seeking, through the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), to ride roughshod over the rights of private members—not only those who sit with the opposition, but also those who support the government. I ask hon. members who belong to the government party: what opportunity do you believe you will have to take part in debate if, through some miscarriage of justice, rule 75c should become a reality?

[Mr. Speaker.]

When the people in my constituency went to the polls they gave me majority support intending that I should come to Ottawa to speak out on their behalf whenever necessary. This statement applies to every constituency in Canada and to every member of this house. The government of the day will only remain the government of the day as long as it obtains the support of a majority in the house. In my view this places a responsibility on the cabinet for putting their heads together, analysing Canada's needs and coming forward with suitable legislation to satisfy them. If the legislation is well thought out, if it is constructive and beneficial to Canada, no responsible opposition will unduly delay its passage, as has been evidenced to date during the present session. Should the government reach a point at which it is faced with intentional obstruction and wilful delay in the passage of legislation, it has the right to use Standing Order 33, with its power of closure. Then, at the next election, the public can decide whether or not its action was justified.

It is most unfortunate that the cabinet and Prime Minister should have decided to force rule 75c through the house. This decision has already done violence to parliament by lowering the morale of its members and lessening the mutual respect and tolerance which has been built up among representatives of all parties. When passions are aroused and when angry words are exchanged across the floor of the house, how can a rational decision be reached, particularly as it was the stupidity of the government which provoked the row in the first place?

As a Member of Parliament, the only power I have is the right to be heard in this chamber. Any government which seeks to rob me of that power is treading on dangerous ground. The very essence of democracy is the right to debate—the right to speak out and be heard. I am not prepared to abrogate this right to the present government, because those who sit on the front benches opposite have not shown by their actions that they are humble enough to govern Canada; they have not shown that they have enough respect for our parliamentary traditions; they are not kind enough in their views with regard to the major problems facing Canadians, and they are not just in their program of priorities for dealing with these problems.

For all these reasons I ask the President of the Privy Council to seriously consider withdrawing rule 75c so that members may direct their thoughts and energies not toward a debate on the rules but rather toward solving

some of the many urgent problems presently facing Canadians.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to have an opportunity to take part in one of the great and important debates which occasionally arise in this house. In my humble opinion the debate which is going on now is the most important one in which we have engaged in the present session of parliament. We are debating the real essence of parliamentary procedure, the very institution of democracy. This is why members on this side of the house have made up their minds to debate the subject fully and do their best to persuade the people of Canada that a rule of the type now proposed should never be written into the Standing Orders of this house.

I should like to examine for a minute or two several of the points raised by previous speakers. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) said that a year ago the present administration was elected to govern Canada. No one disputes this. No one disputes the right of a majority party to bring in legislation and get that legislation through parliament. But then the hon. member made another statement. He said that the job placed on the shoulders of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today required that a change in procedure involving 75c be made.

I ask the hon. member for Bruce, as I have asked other hon. members, to name one piece of legislation which has been held up in this chamber, or which could not have been processed prior to the adjournment date on which we had agreed, namely, June 27? No member of this house can rise and say we have held up government legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Harding: Yet the government is determined to bring in rule changes which will gag not only opposition members but members on the government side as well. We do not change the rules, Mr. Speaker, because we are looking for some immediate gain. That is not the way we ought to operate in parliament. We bring in rule changes because they will enable hon. members of this house to process bills democratically and, possibly, quickly. But we do not need these proposed changes. Nothing that has happened in the past few years indicates that we need rule changes as drastic as these.

It concerns me to think that a number of freshman members, they are scattered throughout all parties but predominate in the Liberal party, should demand that there be a gag which will be effective in cutting off debate on some of the most important pieces of legislation that could come before this house. Surely the hon. member for Bruce was speaking with tongue in cheek when he said a few moments ago that four days debating time is ample for the Canadian people to learn what is happening here. How foolish and unthinking hon. members are when they make statements like that. I appeal to hon. members of the house to send these rule changes back to committee. There are 12 men on the standing committee—let us call them reasonable men—who can examine these changes again. Let them wrestle with the problem and bring it back to the house later on. The opposition is as anxious as the government to see Canada well governed. We want good legislation and good government and we are not here to obstruct good legislation. All of us are sent here to do a job, but we do not need the guillotine that is contained in rule 75c to help us do our job.

I wish to refer to something the Prime Minister said in this house last Friday. He said that this debate on the rules change is a stupid filibuster. I have great respect for the Prime Minister, as we all ought to have. The Prime Minister especially should give guidance and leadership at all times to the people of Canada. If anyone is to act like a statesman it ought to be the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harding: It was with a sense of shock that I heard him describe this debate as a stupid filibuster. I want members on the government side to pay attention. For how long have we been discussing these rule changes? It may seem a long time, because most of us had hoped to go home on June 27. Actually, the amendment before us was introduced last Tuesday. Yet on Friday morning, after three days of debate, the Prime Minister told the Canadian nation that this is a stupid filibuster. I have looked carefully at the record, and I think my figures are accurate. Why did the Prime Minister of this nation say, after we had had three days of debate, that this is a stupid filibuster? We know why you want proposed rule 75c. The government is going to guillotine every major piece of legislation coming before this house. Let us see what has happened since last Monday.

Last Monday we were not discussing rules. We had a hassle about whether the government house leader or committee chairman should have the honour of beginning this debate. That hassle took the whole day, so on Monday we were not discussing rule changes. And what happened on Tuesday? The government house leader withdrew his motion in order to allow the committee chairman to proceed with his report. On Tuesday ten members took part in the debate which lasted approximately five hours. The lead off speaker, the chairman of the committee, began talking in this rules debate at 2.50 p.m. last Tuesday. Altogether three Liberals, three Conservatives, two N.D.P. and two Creditiste members took part in that debate, one Creditiste member carrying over into the following day. As I say, we had five hours of debating time. On Wednesday five speakers, one of them being the carry over Creditiste member, spoke for three hours. The other speakers included two Liberals, one Conservative and one from the N.D.P.

On Thursday we had two hours of debating time, the house rising early because there were not enough members here to constitute a quorum. There were four speakers including one Liberal, two Conservatives and one from the N.D.P. Altogether up to that time there had been ten hours of debate in the house, and the Prime Minister got up and announced to the nation that this was a filibuster.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Harding: I say to hon. members opposite, it is about time you understood what is going on and did something about it. We are hearing talk today about a filibuster being in progress. Last Friday we debated the rule change for one hour and 55 minutes. If we ignore debating time for today, we have spent less than 12 hours in debating these rule changes, and government members from all parts of Canada are talking about a rules filibuster. I say that if this is your definition of a filibuster—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member to remind him that he should at all times address the Chair.

Mr. Harding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this is the government's definition of a filibuster then I am afraid that in future debates this house is in for a lot of trouble.

In summarizing, may I point out that until the end of last Friday's sitting 21 speakers had taken part in this debate. There were seven Liberals, eight Conservatives, four from the N.D.P. and two Creditistes. Although there has been much talk about a filibuster in this chamber, no one group in particular can be accused of having carried it on.

I support the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). He proposes in his amendment to send this matter back to committee so that it can deal with 75c.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Rule changes in any parliamentary democracy should be made by agreement and not by force. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, agreement can be reached on sensible changes required to make a modern parliamentary system work effectively. We have had that agreement. We saw it last fall when major rule changes were made in this house by agreement. It must be obvious to everyone there will never be agreement by the opposition parties to the dictatorial powers proposed by this administration in rule 75c.

I believe this parliament for the most part is made up of reasonable members. They are found in every party. Despite their various political philosophies most hon. members want to make our parliamentary democracy function efficiently and well. I suggest to the house and to the government house leader in particular that rule 75c should be withdrawn by the government and sent back to the committee for redrafting.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Harding: I will be very happy if Mr. Speaker will permit it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member has suggested that it be sent back for redrafting. He therefore opposes the motion of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) who proposes its deletion altogether.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment to send this draft back to the committee. I believe changes can be worked out. That is why this debate has been good. We have been trying to convince the government house leader and others that if these rule changes are to be effective and co-operatively used in the house, they must have the endorsement of all groups. Again I urge the government house leader to consider sending it back. Members are not unreasonable. If the Special Committee on Rules had been com-

posed of unreasonable members of parliament, we never would have had the vast changes that were drafted, brought in, and accepted by this house last December.

As I have read rule 75c, it seems to me that the most objectionable feature is the fact that it could effectively gag the opposition on major and controversial legislation. It is not good enough to have the government house leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), or someone else stand up in the House of Commons and say, you can trust us, we will make certain this is only used on those rare occasions when debate has exceeded the limits to which we think it should go."

That is not good enough. You do not draft laws that way. You do not draft procedures that way. What would happen if the laws of this country were left wide open in this manner? You must legislate or make changes that cannot be circumvented by people who might want to use them for their own purposes. That is one of the obvious reasons why this particular piece of legislation should go back to the committee.

As I understand 75c, Mr. Speaker, if it becomes operative it will make legal the right of any government to plan and carry out closure in advance. I feel this is a dangerous and dictatorial move that will boomerang on the present administration. It is not worthy of any Canadian political party which is supposed to be based on democratic ideas. It is difficult to imagine how it fits into the government slogan of a just society.

Parliamentary freedom is above both the party and the individual. No one group should ever have the right indiscriminately to deny this basic right to others under our parliamentary constitution. I am surprised that the Liberal Party have asked for this dictatorial power. I am more concerned that not one of their elected members has had the courage to speak out against what is obviously a blatant attempt to gag opposition spokesmen in parliament.

Provision for closure in advance of adequate debate is an insult to every Canadian citizen. It is an insulting defiance of every elector who cast a Liberal vote in the federal election of one year ago. It is another crystal clear sign of the contemptuous attitude being displayed by the government and its leader to our parliamentary traditions.

Again I urge the house to turn down the proposal made by the committee and the government, and to send it back for further discussion with other parties. Reasonable members in all parties can work out any procedural differences if enough effort is put into resolving them. If a solution cannot be found by these members, then our nation is in a bad way. Perhaps a paragraph from a recent editorial in the December 12, 1968, issue of the *Globe and Mail* will best illustrate the point I have mentioned, and I quote:

> Nothing is more fundamental to democracy than the belief that society is composed of reasonable men. They will have their irrational moments and a system of checks and balances will be needed. And there will be occasions when reason seems forfeited to hysteria, opportunism, malice or any number of things. But if faith in the reasonableness of men is lost, then so is democracy. For government must then become authoritarian. It must cast aside all pretence of governing according to the wishes of the people. At its most enlightened, it will govern according to what it considers is best for the people. Although it may be benevolent, it can never be democratic.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our differences on procedure can be ironed out in committee. I fully support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River. The proposed amendment asks that the house refer the report back to the committee with instructions to delete proposed rule 75c.

There is no objection from any of the opposition parties in the house to 75A and 75B. At least I have not heard any objection during this debate. In fact the members of the opposition groups helped to draft these changes in committee and will endorse them now. However, 75c is the undemocratic creation of the government. It is their suggested method of gagging the opposition parties in the House of Commons. The mere fact that the present government, with their large group of freshmen members, insist on this dictatorial rule is a fair indication of their dismay and panic at the loss of prestige suffered in just one year by their administration. They seem to have lost all sense of history and feel that by muzzling the opposition their troubles will go away.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The fact is that this government is in trouble. It is in major trouble, and that trouble is nation wide because of a lack of policy and direction seldom before seen to the extent it has been displayed by the present administration. We have all heard the old theory of the divine right of kings. It was a belief that the king could do no wrong. It would seem to me there has been a rebirth of this old idea so far as the present administration is concerned. The Liberal group in parliament feel that Pierre can do no wrong. This blind faith,

as exhibited in the proposed rule changes, will lead to political oblivion for most of them.

The proposals by this administration to muzzle free speech, and slyly to attempt to initiate rules which will force closure in advance of adequate debate are a sure sign that those leading the government are totally unaware of the mood of our present day society. More than ever before those in our society, especially the young people, are demanding more discussion, more information, more answers and more participatory democracy.

These cannot be obtained when those in power try to gag a democratically elected parliament which should give the lead to our people in discussing fully those major problems which will shape the future of the nation. In parliamentary terms, closure is an odious word. It is something that should be used rarely. Closure in advance of adequate debate which proposed rule 75c could well bring about is no credit to those in the present administration who advocate its acceptance.

Complete and utter disregard for our parliamentary democracy has been the earmark of this administration. It was first demonstrated last December in its abortive attempt to foist rule 16A on parliament. It is demonstrated again in its attempt to force rule 75C, which is very similar to rule 16A, on an unwilling House of Commons.

It is interesting to note that last December, when the government was forced to withdraw rule 16A because of Canada-wide opposition, the Prime Minister indicated that the government did not really want it. He claimed that the opposition had been trapped and tripped by the government. He told the press that the opposition was forced to focus on rule 16A so that all the other rule changes would be accepted. He implied that the government had never really wanted to put 16A into effect and that it was used only as a ploy to fool the opposition. However, in view of the introduction of 75c we might well question the credibility of the Prime Minister's statement on the December debate.

If the government did not want another closure rule in December, why does it want one now? As I mentioned before, not one piece of legislation requested by the government had been held up from passage through the House of Commons by the June 27 adjournment date. The only delay in important legislation this session is due to the fact that the various ministers have not prepared and brought into the house for consideration some very important legislation promised to the Canadian people many months ago. This government, not the opposition, has delayed legislation. I need only mention the Canada Water Act, the Canadian Development Corporation Act and the proposed legislation on the Woods report recommentations, so desperately needed by the veterans, as fields in which there have been government promises but no action.

We are told that the government needs 75c so that it can program its work. I suggest that the best parliamentary system in the world could not work effectively if an inefficient government were doing the programming. Evidence of inefficiency in programming so far as the government is concerned is to be found everywhere. This current debate on parliamentary rule changes is the most important issue with which this particular parliament will have to deal.

The key issue before us today is a simple one. It is the right of all elected members to speak fully and freely in the house on the issues affecting our nation, and our whole system of parliamentary democracy revolves around it. It is difficult to believe that in Canada today any party or any minister, would dare to ask for the sweeping and restrictive powers outlined in section 75c. It is equally difficult to understand how any member of this house could support this obvious government move to muzzle the opposition.

If rule 75c is passed, private members—we are all in the same position, with the exception of those who sit in the cabinet and the leaders of the various parties—could be effectively gagged in major debates from presenting alternatives to government proposals. The opposition could be denied the opportunity effectively to make the nation fully aware of contentious legislation. The citizens of our nation could be denied the right to hear all sides of contentious issues and might not be given time to make their views known to those who sit in the parliament of Canada. This is the crux of the rule change.

By including this rule we might well eliminate all the citizens of Canada outside the house from participating in the workings of parliament. If rule 75c is passed the government could by law force any piece of legislation through parliament with only four days of debate, including the second reading stage, the committee stage, the report stage and third reading stage. All the talk in the world by government members cannot change that fact. This is evident from a reading of the amendment.

It would be possible for major legislation to receive only cursory examination, and entire legislation could be passed through parliament before the Canadian public had any opportunity to express its opinions. In fact, a major piece of legislation could, if the government so desired, receive less than 10 hours of actual debate in the House of Commons, and this would include every phase of a bill.

We could see an unscrupulous government, with the use of 75c, start second reading on a major piece of legislation, perhaps on a Wednesday, when the House of Commons sits only four hours. As usual debate would start after the question period, and in three hours or less the debate on the principle of the bill would be over, with only a handful of members having participated. Surely rules allowing such obvious abuse of our parliamentary democracy will never be enacted by our Canadian parliament. Surely the members on the government benches will never allow rules of this nature to become law.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Once through second reading, the bill in one day could be forced through the committee to which it had been referred, again without full discussion. It would then come back to the House of Commons where another three or four hour debate could take care of proposed amendments and other criticism, and at the end of the day this stage of the bill would be completed, regardless of what remained to be discussed.

The third and final reading of any bill could again be completed in one day, and could be a repetition of the above, with only a three or four hour debate. A total of ten hours or less in the House of Commons could see major legislation ready for the Senate and royal assent. I say again that regardless of the good intention of any party it will be a major political and democratic blunder if the members of this house ever make this proposed rule change legal.

Rule 75c is a dangerous, a vicious and a foolish proposal. It strikes at the very roots of democracy. It gives the ruling party the legal power to effectively gag those who oppose its policies. It could only be the creation of a party which has become contemptuous of both our democratic parliamentary tradition and of the general public. It is another example of the political blundering and inept manoeuvering of the Trudeau administration. It shows how thoroughly Liberal backbenchers have been whipped into line, for none of them dare to raise their voices in protest. If this is a part of the Liberal plan for a just society then our nation is in real trouble. If this Liberal administration needs the type of rule change as proposed in 75c to govern this nation, then one is justified in asking what type of legislation does it have in mind for the future which would require the use of such restrictive measures?

The minister talks about the committee report which was brought in by the chairman, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). Let me put on the record the composition of the committee so that no one will get the idea that 75c was part of any joint report in which other parties participated. The procedure committee is proposed of 12 members. There are 7 Liberals, 3 Conservatives, 1 N.D.P. and 1 Creditiste. The Liberals have a clear majority in the committee. The only members of the committee voting for 75c were Liberals. All the other members were opposed.

To put the whole problem of parliamentary procedure in its proper perspective I feel that a short review of our efforts in this field is necessary. Again I am going to take us back to the fall of 1968 when the first session of this Parliament started.

All parties agreed that some major changes had to be made. An all party committee was set up and a report was brought in. Over 95 per cent of that lengthy report was adopted by the House of Commons. Only one section was rejected, and that was the infamous 16A which is somewhat similar to the measure we are debating today. These major rule changes received the full support of all the members of the house. The opposition parties helped to draft them, and we tried to make them work. We have streamlined much of our parliamentary procedure. We have already drastically reduced the debating time spent on legislation in this chamber. However, we cannot agree to accept the changes suggested by 75c, and no democratic government should insist on proceeding with these changes when they are so unanimously and vigorously opposed by members of all the opposition parties in the house.

We are told by the government that 75c is needed in order that parliament can respond quickly to an emergency situation. This is a complete farce. A closure rule is already on the books and it has been there for over 50 years. We have also heard from the Liberal members that legislation was unduly held up during this current session. Again there is no

indication of this, and no member of the government side can point to one piece of legislation that has been held up or stopped from passing because of the work of the opposition in this house.

I spent some time in a provincial legislature and I know the problems which opposition parties have in putting their views forward. I say to the members of this house that this government has had full co-operation from all the parties in the House of Commons in making rule changes and in trying to process the work of this parliament more efficiently and more effectively.

We found last June, or earlier, that a plan had been made to adjourn this house on June 27. All groups agreed that this was a proper date to adjourn and we worked towards that adjournment date, co-operating fully. We sat longer hours in the latter part of June, and we worked out an agreement with the government house leader on private bills. We agreed to limit debate on a number of measures. There is only one group which has broken the co-operative arrangement which had been set up, and that is the government group under the government house leader.

As I said before, if there is any party in this house that has held up legislation it is the government, particularly on major issues some of which have been enumerated by other speakers this afternoon. I do not intend to cover them again.

I should like to point out in closing that all across Canada the feeling is becoming more evident every day, through editorials, newspaper and radio comment, that the people of this nation do not want restrictive measures such as 75c to become legal in the parliament of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement?

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because I feel I must, as a member of parliament honoured to represent thousands of citizens of Canada who live in Ontario. I cannot see how any man who is determined to make a real, honest effort on behalf of those he represents could in any way support, to any degree, the measure outlined in 75c. That is why I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I have been impressed with the high calibre of speeches we have had this afternoon from two hon. members, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding). You will find that they have pointed out in no uncertain terms what would happen to parliament, and what could be the outcome in respect of the rights of members should such rule changes be passed.

The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) indicated that all members of parliament should accept proposed rule 75c. The fact that backbenchers on the government side of the house have in the main accepted the gag rule is no reason why we should follow suit. As a matter of fact it is one of the things that makes me very suspicious about 75c. Hon. members opposite speak only when they are allowed to speak. I witness the humility of ministers who come into the house only when they are allowed. It creates great awe in the House of Commons when, by order, ministers absent themselves from the chamber. They, too, are members of parliament. They, too, have the responsibility of representing their constituents. I would never call myself a member of parliament if I allowed anyone in the house, except Your Honour, to order me to vacate my seat for even a moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Danforth: Why are we suspicous? It is because we know the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has not enough confidence in his members to allow them to carry out their responsibilities, and sets up regional desks to find out what is happening in their areas. These commissars report on what government members are doing and how they are doing it. Is this what we want in a democratic Canada?

A great deal has been said in this debate about committees and the government members who serve on them. We know that if they have dared to oppose the wishes of the government they have been quickly removed from membership of the committee.

Mr. Deakon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would draw the hon. member's attention to the justice committee, and for his information—

Mr. Danforth: What is the point of order?

Mr. Deakon: —the members of committees can speak their own minds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth).

Mr. Danforth: The hon. member who has interjected says government members on committees are allowed to speak their minds. I would believe this if it were done in the quiet of a committee room without members of the press being present so that the rumour would get back to the government only in a committee report, handed down five weeks late in some cases. I have grave doubts about our committee system when chairmen of committees appointed by the government are not allowed to make a report to the house until it is convenient to the government to do so.

Mr. Deakon: You should come to the justice committee sometime.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): What did Steve Otto say about committees?

Mr. Danforth: As my colleague has pointed out, the *Hansard* record shows that instructions have been given to government members of committees. How can we have confidence in a government of this calibre? As a member from Ontario I have the right to oppose in every way possible a measure which I believe would make it impossible for members from that province to put forward adequately in the house the wishes and views of the citizens they represent.

So far we have had in this parliament harmony to a degree that I have not before experienced in the years I have been here. I was amazed and gratified to see how much work could be accomplished when there was a measure of agreement among the leaders of the parties. I believed this was the dawn of a new era. Although many of us were suspicious, we were delighted to see what could happen by agreement. But this harmony has gone. We now have a House of Commons that is ugly in its attitude. Why is this? It is because the government has introduced a measure that we believe will make it impossible for us to perform our duties in the way they should be performed. On every occasion the government asks us to place confidence in it, and breaks that trust. How can we then have confidence in it? The government reiterates that this measure will never be imposed except in extreme circumstances. How can we possibly accept this?

I have always had the greatest respect for the office of the Prime Minister. I still have that respect, but I now have very little respect for the man who holds that high office. Any man who stands in this house and calls a debate on such an important matter as rule changes a stupid filibuster either does not understand our parliamentary system, or cares nothing for it.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): He cannot be bothered with it.

Mr. Danforth: The Prime Minister says that 80 per cent of the questions asked by hon. members are sheer hypocrisy. As far as I am concerned, that statement is the ultimate in hypocrisy. The government has said there is need for rule changes, that we must increase the efficiency of the house, that it has a majority in the house and therefore represents the wishes of the people. I agree that it received a mandate. The members of the opposition have always accepted the fact that the government received a mandate, but it was to bring in legislation and to lead this nation. When the government introduces a new rule which provides that the right of opposition members to speak will be removed, it no longer represents the majority of people in this country.

Mr. MacInnis: They do not represent the majority.

Mr. Danforth: By way of this legislation the government is asking the opposition parties to agree to leave 12 million Canadians voiceless in their parliament. We can never accept laws of this type which deny the right of Canadians to be heard in their parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: The government talks of limiting debate to four, five or six days. We know that four or five hours a day are devoted to debate. There are 264 members in this house. Each one of us represents a different area of Canada, sometimes a different ethnic group. Does anyone believe we could limit debate to four, five or six speakers a day, from members representing all parties in the house, and adequately express the views of this great nation to the extent that we could form a consensus and vote on important issues?

• (5:30 p.m.)

What do the new rules mean to me? I try to be reasonable in my approach to parliamentary activities. I agree with those who

believe we should conduct ourselves on a businesslike basis. I have watched with uneasiness the continual infringement of the rights of the ordinary citizens of Canada by this parliament to a degree that makes me fear for the future of this country. I have seen bills passed by the government majority in this house giving rights to government appointees that are greater than those given to members of the R.C.M.P. I have seen government appointed individuals protected by statutes to the degree that if anyone challenged these officials they would be liable to fines and a penalty of up to two years in jail. Their power is such that if a Canadian citizen disagrees with a particular decision his only recourse is an appeal to a government appointed arbitrator. Canadian citizens have to appeal a government decision to an appointee of the government. What I particularly object to is the provision that the decision of the arbitrator in question is final, that there is no appeal to, or review by, any other court. In other words, Canadians are losing their right to appeal to the courts of the land.

Under the provisions of another statute, which I shall not identify, an appointed official of the government is given what I as a layman feel are rights that are greater than those given to a Supreme Court judge. Under this statute a deputy minister can issue subpoenas, require oaths to be taken, demand that witnesses give evidence, and accept testimony that would be inadmissible in any court of the land. This power goes beyond the courts and to me is an infringement on my rights as a Canadian, in the same way as this proposed rule is an infringement on my rights as a member of parliament. This is why I cannot and will not accept the approach taken by this government.

I respect the hon. members of this house. I learned long ago that wisdom does not lie within any one particular political party in this house but that all political parties have men of great knowledge and wisdom. Together they form a great parliament. I feel the time will never come when only one party will present the best legislation. Certainly, this cannot be achieved by denying contributions from one half of the members of the house who collectively have wisdom, knowledge and experience. Such a suggestion does not make sense.

As one who has enjoyed the harmony and co-operation that has been evident in the house, I am now beginning to realize what is meant when members declare that, if they are compelled by sheer weight of numbers to accept this particular measure, we must work to rule. This was not a threat; it was said in desperation, after they had pleaded with the government to be reasonable in their approach. This was said after it had been pointed out that 75A and 75B are the tools that have been used to make progress thus far in this parliament. These provisions have made it possible for us to deal with hundreds of issues.

Having listened to hon. members declaring they cannot accept 75c, that they will not accept 75c; that they will find ways of circumventing it if it is adopted, all I can say is: God bless these men for being men, and thank God for Canada that they are in this house. Only in this way can this parliament survive.

We must have the right to speak in this house. It is not good enough for members on the government side to tell me that I have ample opportunity to speak in committee and to discuss bills.

Mr. Deakon: We cannot.

Mr. Danforth: The hon. member is right; they cannot tell me this. Having sat in committees for years and seen the committee system in operation under different governments, I would say that the present committees are hamstrung to a degree unprecedented in parliamentary history. Having said that, I will also admit that there are some committees sitting today for which I have the greatest respect, because the membership of those committees have divested themselves of partisanship and are trying to work for the good of the country. We need more men with this approach.

Other committees have but one thing in mind, that is the promotion of government measures irrespective of their value or their weaknesses. This is why I cannot accept the present committee structure. Committees are told that they have the right to summon and hear witnesses, to ask for papers and documents and to travel from place to place, and this sounds good and is well meant. But I have sat in committee meetings dealing with government legislation at which the minister in charge has stated we could summon only government officials. When this happens the committee defeats itself. There are men of learning and experience other than government officials who can improve legislation put before this house. Either we are going to have a democracy or we are going to have a dictatorship. I say this country is not ready for parliamentary dictatorship.

This matter first came before the house last December. I thought at that time that the government showed wisdom in accepting the will of this house. But when it was inferred immediately after a decision had been made that the opposition had walked into a trap, I began to lose respect for this government. Up until that time I had thought their proposals were honourable ones. I had thought they were willing to accept the will of the house with regard to proposals presented to the House of Commons. Instead, I became very suspicious, and the measure before the house today proves that my suspicions were well founded.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I cannot, and I will not, accept the implication behind 75c. This is why, as a member of parliament representing the citizens of a riding in Ontario, I support wholeheartedly the amendment moved to delete the proposed rule 75c and to send the report back to the committee. As a member of Parliament, a man who took on the obligation to represent to the best of his ability a large number of citizens of this country, I cannot accept the fact that I shall not be allowed to speak in this house; I cannot accept a situation in which my propositions will not be endorsed by a committee; I cannot accept that the Parliament of Canada must deteriorate because a few individuals in high places so desire.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate some two hours and sixteen minutes earlier than I had expected. I was hoping the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) would continue until six o'clock. He owes me a supper for making me get up before I was ready, though I hope this will not be too obvious to the house in the time remaining before six o'clock.

I am another of those who did not take part in the debate on the rule changes last December. However, I listened to almost everything that was said during that debate, and I carefully read the rest. I was impressed by the arguments put forward from both sides of the house, though I did not agree with those advanced by speakers from the government side. I am sure all hon. members felt greatly relieved that the government was wise enough in the end to withdraw its proposed rule 16A. I thought that would be the end of the matter. In fact, I was convinced it was the end as far as a rule along the lines of 16A was concerned.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated at that time, as my hon. friend and deskmate, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) has reminded us, that the opposition was trapped. This caused me to believe that the government had decided against bringing in the equivalent of such a rule, certainly not in the present session and probably not during the lifetime of this parliament.

In any case, if a government felt the need for a rule of this kind it could be expected to produce overwhelming evidence to show it was completely justified. As sincerely and seriously as I can, I ask all hon. members who support the government: why do you need this change? What evidence do you have as to the need of such a rule as this? Why do you feel this rule is a proper one for a government to use? Several hon. members have pointed out that the government has failed to provide any evidence of obstruction or failure to co-operate. There has been no evidence that the opposition has deliberately or otherwise delayed the passage of legislation, or engaged in filibusters.

Speaking of filibustering, I hope that following the remarks of my hon. friend from Kootenay West, some hon. member on the government side will give us a definition of a filibustering from his point of view. I think my hon. friend did an excellent job of exposing the remark made by the Prime Minister last Friday. If, in fact, the government's definition of a filibuster is a 12-hour debate, I am all the more convinced that rule 75c has to be opposed all summer and fall if necessary. If this is their definition of a filibuster we can easily see what is in store for us should 75c be passed.

The degree of co-operation forthcoming from opposition parties in this session has been immeasurably greater than in any previous parliament in our history. There is good reason for this. There are more than 100 new members in this house and all of us, as new members, regardless of party, had been feeling parliament was too slow and that its actions were sometimes irrelevant. All of us hoped we could play a part in improving parliament in terms of the speed with which it handles business as well as in terms of the relevancy of its debates.

Since legislation so far has not been unduly delayed or obstructed, the question arises: why does the government feel it must have this rule? There is plenty of evidence to show that opposition parties have co-operated.

There is plenty of evidence to show that an imposing amount of legislation and other matters has been dealt with in this chamber since September. It is certainly no fault of the opposition if much of this legislation has not been of great national importance. Some of it may have been valuable in itself, but a lot of it was not legislation to deal with the major problems confronting our country. At any rate, the legislation which was brought forward was dealt with more speedily than similar legislation in previous parliaments.

In some 190 sitting days to date there have been 100 government orders on the order paper. A few have been withdrawn, but all the rest have been dealt with. There are about 18 orders remaining on the order paper now, which means that 85 or so have been dealt with. Abut 50 bills have been passed.

During the debate on the Speech from the Throne last fall, a debate which under the rules can last for eight days, the four house leaders were, I am sure, somewhat nonplussed to find that after five days they were running out of speakers. They were surprised to find that new members of Parliament were not anxious to get up and speak, on the ground that enough had been said already. As a result, the debate lasted only six days. Many of us felt this was enough. The additional two days were made available for the government. The budget debate which took place in the spring could have lasted six days under the rules. Opposition parties agreed that it should last only four days, thus providing two additional days for the government. Counting six days spent on the address, four days on the budget and 16 opposition days among the total to be subtracted from the number of sitting days available, we are left with 150 or 155 days for legislation. During this time some 50 pieces of legislation were dealt with and passed. I submit that is a very good record. How good the legislation is, is another matter. When you consider the number of items that have been dealt with, no one in this country can say this parliament has not been productive.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Proposed rules 75A and 75B have been arrived at by consensus and agreement. I suggest to the silent 66 members in the two back rows on the government side that these two rules ought to be enough to make parliament function more efficiently. But we can only find out if these rules work if we try them for a while. I urge the government, and those occupying the two back rows on the government side, to withdraw proposed rule 75c. Let us adopt the motion of the hon. member for Peace River and try to work under proposed rules 75A and 75B. If there is evidence that opposition parties are obstructing parliament, carrying on a filibuster or hamstringing the government I, for one, will not be nearly so vociferous in objecting to the introduction of 75c. But I am prepared to take my chances.

If the opposition obstructs parliament, it will deserve to work under rule 75c. But is it not reasonable for us to see whether we can work harmoniously under the other two proposed rules first? The government has not made out a sufficiently strong case to show that a rule like 75c is necessary. It has not brought forward evidence that might prompt the people of Canada to say, "Go ahead; with an opposition like that you need 75c." Hon. members may talk about debates in previous parliaments, but this is a new parliament. This is supposed to be a new Liberal government. Let us see how it performs. Let us not refer to past history. In this parliament there are many new members who are anxious to see parliament performing its functions more efficiently.

Ever since I was a small boy—we lived in the middle of the Saskatchewan dust bowl—I remember people talking politics and saying that there was a chronic ailment in the Liberal party. For many decades the Liberals have been convinced that they are the only ones who know how to govern and who are fit to govern. They really believe this. This belief constitutes a chronic ailment within the Liberal party and is one reason that party, despite its choice of new leaders, has continued to be called an old time party.

It has been said many times in this debate that the rules of parliament are the rules of every member of parliament and not of the government alone. No reasonable member of Parliament, particularly if he is in opposition, will acquiesce to rule changes such as are proposed. People are asking how long this debate is to continue. Employees of this house come up to me and ask that question. My answer is that it may continue until September, October or November. We may be here until then and we shall continue talking, Mr. Speaker, until this obnoxious rule is withdrawn. I notice that the government is seeking to hold a club over our heads. There is a motion on the order paper to extend sitting hours. Although I may be out of order in my remarks, may I say briefly that it does not matter whether we are to sit four hours a day

or fourteen. We shall all be here for quite a while. On this matter no one in opposition is bluffing, and I wish to emphasize to hon. members on the government side that we are not bluffing.

Although it is not quite six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, may I, since I wish to draw up some more notes for further comments, call it six o'clock at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before we call it six o'clock, may I advise hon. members of the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment. They are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office Department, Vancouver—dissatisfaction of letter carriers with five day delivery; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—Unemployment Insurance—government policy respecting modification of operation; the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner)—Water Resources—diversion of waters from Hudson and James Bays.

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I must confess I was still struggling. I hope that during whatever time I have left I will not appear to be struggling, even if I am. First, I wish to apologize for my sore throat. It is what is called convention throat or preacher's throat. I just returned from a New Democratic Party convention in Saskatoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I imagine the house is not interested in that at this moment. Speak to the amendment.

Mr. Benjamin: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was afraid that by the time I was through Your Honour would have wished I had given an explanation.

At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was asking when and if a government speaker would get up to present some evidence to this house of opposition obstruction, deliberate or otherwise, to their legislation in order to present a concrete case for their need for rule 75c. None have yet done so. Previous Liberal speakers have failed to present any argument or evidence to support any contention for their need of 75c.

Earlier this evening I quoted some figures concerning the performance of this house to date. If I may, I would like to amend those figures slightly. We have sat for 188 days. We have not taken all the fixed days that are permitted under the rules. Six days in September were used for the throne speech debate instead of eight. The other two days went to the government for their use. Six days in October were spent on the budget debate, the full time. Four days this spring were spent on a budget debate, two less than the rules provided for, which meant two more days for the government.

There were 16 opposition days, Mr. Speaker, instead of the 19 to which we were entitled. We agreed we would use 1 of those 19 days as an extra day, so that we might have two days on a NATO debate. The other two days we are still entitled to and have not yet had. We agreed to hold over these two days until, the next session. I have my doubts that we will get them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to make a little bet with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that we will not get them. There are two more opposition days which we gave up. That is a total of six extra days for the government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker; I voted against public lotteries!

Mr. Benjamin: I wonder if the Liberal backbenchers are aware of this kind of co-

operation? Has the government house leader told them, particularly the new members in the backbenches, about all these things? Are they aware of this? I would like to disclose something which may or may not be a secret not disclosed to the caucus of other parties. Some members are beginning to feel we co-operate too much and that we were not elected to provide all this co-operation to the government. How much further are we to go before government members consider that they are receiving co-operation from the opposition?

The case for the need for rule 75c has yet to be presented. No evidence has been provided of opposition obstruction or delay. Until such time as irrefutable evidence is presented, this government, be it majority or any other kind, has no right to expect this opposition, the public of Canada or the news media to accept their case for the need for a rule such as 75c. There may be some reasonable argument, although I do not agree, that debate on two items of legislation in this session lasted an inordinate length of time. It could be argued by some that the debate on the omnibus bill took too long. I happened to feel, at one stage, that debate was taking too long. I have some reason to think the majority of opposition members felt the same way. Rule 75B, Mr. Speaker, would have taken care of that situation very nicely.

I would not for one moment say that the members of the party to my left were not entitled to express their opinions as fully, and as often as they could on matters on which they spoke out of their own conscience and beliefs. I could be wrong, but it seemed to me that the three other parties in this house felt the debate had gone on for long enough. Rule 75B would have taken care of that situation quite well.

It could be argued that, at one stage, the debate on the language bill took too long. I have a feeling that 75B would have taken care of that very nicely. In my opinion, these facts add more weight to the argument I am trying to put forward to the effect that rule 75c is not needed by this government. Until such time as they can provide the evidence that it is needed, the government has no business bringing it into this house.

The government forgets that the opposition in this parliament is very diverse. It is seldom that we have a united opposition. The debates on many of the pieces of legislation so far brought into this house in this session have surely shown this. The three opposition parties have taken turns voting with the government on various amendments or stages of legislation. This opposition is diverse, but on this issue it is united. Rule 75c is neither needed nor wanted. It is not necessary. The fact that this government brings in 75c indicates to me, and I believe to many people in Canada, a fundamental weakness in this government. They cry; they are born losers. They have their majority, but they are afflicted with something else; they have the imagination of a doorknob. They have yet to bring in legislation which no opposition would dare obstruct or delay. Most of the legislation they have brought in so far was not worth obstructing or delaying. There are two indications of the weakness of the government. The Criminal Code bill and the languages bill were old Pearson stuff, hangovers from the former Minister of Justice and from the Criminal Code debates in several previous parliaments.

• (8:10 p.m.)

These two weaknesses are illustrated by what has happened. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gets up during the question period and cries that the opposition are not presenting alternatives. He wonders what the point of view of the opposition is. Hell's bells, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite are the government. Why do they not present legislation to this parliament? We are still waiting, and this country is still waiting. We have been dealing with a lot of things that were not too important to the national interest, legislation which, by itself, may have been important in a very small area. We are still waiting. Bring in these bills. Where is the legislation in respect of subsidized interest rates for low income families? The government would be surprised how fast that legislation would go through, and the amount of co-operation they would receive. How about dealing with a silly, little old thing such as the box car situation? Such a little old bill would go through in a day, with unanimous consent. They would not need 75c in order to do something about that problem.

If this government would bring in legislation to do something about all the problems that confront this country now, they would not have to worry about the length of debate. Such legislation would go through so fast that most members over there would not have an opportunity to speak on it. In essence, what I am suggesting to the government is that they should try us, and they should try the people of Canada. Give us a chance to see what the

government can do. Give us a chance to have something to say about what the government intends to do. If members of the government would bring in legislation to cope with the cost of living and inflation and show they are prepared to act, we would be anxious to help them tackle these problems. We would not necessarily agree with them. We would have alternatives to present. Any opposition worth its salt would have some alternatives to present. But at least let them bring in something. Instead of doing this, they indicate their fear and inability to deal with the problems of this country. How worried they are! They must be worried to resort to rule changes, something which takes up the time and effort of the members of this chamber unnecessarily. Mr. Speaker, where the devil have government members been for the last twelve months?

There is something else I should like to say to my parliamentary colleagues in the Liberal government. In a parliamentary democracy nobody wins them all. Some day they will be in opposition. They may feel, Mr. Speaker, that I will not live long enough to see that day. That does not matter. Some day they will be in opposition. Last week end I spent some time reading *Hansard* from 1958 to 1962. It is interesting to read what the Liberal speakers had to say then. When proposals were brought in for a rule change and the majority Conservative government threatened to impose closure, you should have heard those Liberal speakers. They forget that in a democracy nobody, no matter how right he may think he is, wins them all. I hope those on the government side who are younger, like myself, will recall, several years hence when they are in opposition, what they are doing now.

May I also ask members to think about what would happen in respect of 75c in a minority government situation. This situation can occur as a result of any election. What kind of situation would be we in with a minority government and rule 75c? Both the government and the opposition would be faced with terrible choices. If the rule were enforced, the government would be defeated. A minority government could use the rule for the worst purpose. I should like to invite members of this house to think about that. Of course, they could seek the co-operation of the opposition to avoid having to implement 75c, and to that extent there would be an emasculated government and an emasculated parliament. I should like to invite members of the house to think about that as well. I submit this is another reason no government, no party, and no parliament even with some very good evidence should ever want to have a rule of this nature. When a parliament misbehaves, and particularly when an opposition misbehaves—I mean that in the worst sense of the word—in the final analysis those who will decide the issue will be the people with the X's. This government has its majority and if it brings in legislation which this opposition obstructs, then the government has the final choice to make and the people will decide with their X's.

The people have the final decision and I submit that is another reason no self-respecting democratic party, democratic government or democratic parliament would even countenance this kind of rule. I do not often quote someone who is living, but I should like to quote from a speech of a member of this house who all members will agree, even though they may disagree with his political philosophy, represents what is best in Canada's parliament. I refer to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who has made many speeches outside this chamber which were not necessarily mailed to his constituents about the rights of members of parliament and the responsibilities of oppositions. He has made these speeches oftten, particularly since 1956. The hon. member has spoken to many organizations, but since I am running out of time I will not quote his remarks but will leave that to one of my colleagues.

• (8:20 p.m.)

May I close by saying, as a new member, to government members who are also new, you cannot do this; you must not do this and you do not need it. Surely, you have sufficient evidence of co-operation from opposition parties to assure you that whatever proposals the government may bring forward, even if the opposition does not agree with them, they will be dealt with well and competently. Until such time as you have irrefutable evidence that the opposition in this house is obstructing, you should not bring in 75c. Only at that time would I, for one, sympathize with you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak, for a few moments only as I should not like to hold up proceedings, on the matter now under study.

I will speak this evening in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and especially on proposed Standing Order 75A and B which

would reduce from 20 to 10 minutes the time allotted to each member.

I should like to quote only a few excerpts from this Standing Order to show to what extent I agree with it.

I feel that a solution cannot—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I see from the last words of the hon. member that he is drifting away slightly from the topic under study, namely the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River which reads as follows:

> That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c.

I therefore ask the hon. member to limit his remarks to this amendment.

Mr. Beaudoin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In my opinion, an amendment was submitted because a bill or part of a bill must have been discussed. If a bill or part of a bill is to be studied, it must be mentioned according to the rules. As far as Standing Order 75c is concerned, I suggest—and this cannot be repeated often enough—that we must know its contents in order to discuss it sensibly.

I shall revert, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order 75c, to say that I support the amendment providing for the deletion of the following words from the said Standing Order:

> A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting has stated—

It is intended to allot a specified number of days and hours for the consideration of each legislation.

I wish to congratulate the government for having considered, while working out that legislation, reducing from 20 to 10 minutes each member's period of time allowed for discussing any bill affected by this procedure. However, I am not at all in agreement on one point—and that is the reason why I feel that the amendment is absolutely necessary—that fact that this section of rule 75c grants so much power to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) or to a minister.

Why should hon. members be gagged by means of rule 75c? Is anyone toying with the idea of becoming a dictator some day? Whatever the government in office, if a man is entitled to decide for how long an hon. member should have the floor and discuss a bill or part of it, I believe that this is the end of democracy.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

What are we going to do to democracy with such legislation? What will become of the undeniable parliamentary rights of the hon. members in the house? What will they represent if this motion is voted without any amendment?

As for us, from the opposition, do we not represent part of the Canadian population? What does the government think of the opposition, be it Créditiste, New Democratic or Progressive Conservative? Are we not as important as the gentlemen of the Liberal party? Have we not as they have, been elected by the people?

What on earth are the ministers and the cabinet members thinking about when they want us to adopt Rule 75c? Do they imagine that they alone have seen the light, do they think that they have the monopoly of truth and that the spirit is upon them?

Standing Order 75c, in my opinion, alters everything that has been done, and destroys all friendly and sincere relations established between to government and the opposition.

If the government does no longer want to co-operate with the elected representatives of the people, I believe that democracy is becoming an empty word. The President of the Privy Council, should, in my opinion, bring in an amendment to protect the basic rights of hon. members or future governments. He should do so right now or support the amendment under consideration this evening, and for the past three weeks, in order to come frankly to a cordial, charitable and equitable agreement, for the good of all hon. members and the Canadian people.

I wanted earlier to congratule the government for having reduced the time limit on speeches from 20 to 10 minutes. I shall immediately apply rules 75A and 75B and speak only for ten minutes.

I therefore conclude my speech. This way, I will not be accused of holding up the business of the house with idle speeches. Moreover, I shall be proud to have co-operated in saving time so that the house may adjourn as soon as possible as all hon. members wish.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Bell: No, Mr. Speaker. You could not see our speaker who was behind the curtain.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer my comments on the motion now before the

house. As a new member and a party backbencher I become more and more concerned each day I sit here with the repeated attempts by this government to camouflage democracy. As a matter of fact, there is blatant evidence of disregard for democracy. I wonder how I am supposed to believe the words of the Fathers of Confederation that the fundamental importance of parliament comes from its representative character. It can speak as no other body in a democracy can, for the people.

• (8:30 p.m.)

The House of Commons is supposed to be the great democratic agency of the government of Canada, the great inquest of the nation, the organized medium through which the public will find expession and exercise its ultimate political power. Proposed rule 75c, permitting a time limit on parliamentary debate, strikes at the very base of our democratic system, namely, that there must be full and open discussion of issues in parliament. It means, instead, an end of free speech and free debate.

Just one year ago the Liberal cry was participatory democracy and the need for public involvement and dialogue. So what kind of camouflage is this? The administrative record of the Liberal régime for the past year makes a mockery of any belief that this policy was ever intended by them to be operative. The Prime Minister has sought to downgrade parliament's role, not only in the rule changes intended to upgrade committees but in the other rule changes already implemented.

Just look at what is happening under the government's closed system of constitutional review. What does it do to confirm government's concern for public involvement? Neither the people of Canada nor their representatives have had a voice in the constitutional review process. With the introduction of rule 75c, the government has once again shown its contempt for our form of parliamentary democracy. Rule 75c is merely another indication of the arrogant elitism of the régime of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau); it is nothing more than an attempt to establish once and for all the dictatorship of the establishment over the House of Commons. The present grab for power under rule 75c has the effect of emasculating parliament. Ultimately, the people of Canada will be the main victim of the rule if it is passed. The proposed rule permitting a time limit on parliamentary debate strikes at the very base of our democratic system, namely, that there must be full and open discussion of issues in parliament. It means an end of free speech and free debate.

Four parties are represented in the house, and since they reflect differing points of view each deserves to be heard. Moreover, parliament is a national forum and spokesmen from the different regions of the country must be given the opportunity to be heard. It must be remembered that regionalism is an integrating force if accommodated to a certain extent, but if allowed to run wild it quickly becomes a potent divisive force. Rule 75c cannot help but stifle regional voices.

The critical function of parliament is to keep the executive in touch with public opinion. By giving guidance, encouragement, advice and support to the government as well as disparagement and criticism, parliament alerts the government to the opinions of the people of Canada. This presentation and interchange of views makes possible a more exact appreciation of the nature of popular response to government policies.

The companion function of parliament, and one which can scarcely be separated from the first, is to keep public opinion in touch with the problems of government. In this respect the House of Commons is much more than a mere mouthpiece repeating and advertising the views of constituents; it is also an educator and opinion-maker. Many questions are debated in the house on which voters have no certain convictions, or on which they may need further information and guidance. Discussion radiates from parliament in waves; arguments are transmitted, presented, simplified and perhaps distorted, but a common opinion develops and creates new waves which find their way back to parliament.

Rule 75c undermines the basic right of the opposition parties to debate legislation for an adequate time. "Adequate" in this connection means long enough not only to point out any mistakes or dangers in legislation but to make the country aware of them. Unless the opposition that faces an autocratically controlled majority can challenge the government in debates lasting long enough to alert the public to potentially harmful legislation, and to create an opinion throughout the country, parliament itself becomes meaningless and useless. If rule 75c is not defeated, democracy will be replaced by tyranny.

The present régime offers as justification for the acquisition of these tyrannical powers the need for efficiency in parliament. Once again we warn the government that we are not going to fall for this political soft-sell.

The new parliamentary rules and regulations used during this session have resulted in one of the most efficient and productive sessions we have ever seen. Besides, the purpose of parliamentary reform is not solely to serve efficiency. As one author has said:

> The purpose is to work out a process consistent with the democratic values of the Canadian people. We do not simply need a process for passing laws. We need also a process that passes the test of free and adequate debate.

We agree with the government that there is some need for a provision regulating the allocation of debating time, but we insist on a reasonable consultative procedure and refuse to accept the government's insistence on arbitrary imposition of closure in advance of debate whenever agreement cannot be reached. A closure rule for cutting off debate is still on the books. It can be invoked when the government feels the right of debate is being abused or that the public interest is suffering; therefore rule 75c is unnecessary.

Government spokesmen have estimated it will take a minimum of ten days to get a bill through the house if rule 75c is applied. Ten days may be adequate for the leaders of the opposition parties and their chief speakers to express objections to a bill. However, it is far from adequate for the public to become concerned about the implications of a proposed law and to start writing their members of parliament. It is far from adequate to ensure public involvement in our democratic process. Only such public involvement, triggered by debate in parliament, can stop the passage of objectionable legislation when the government has a substantial majority. If there is cause for alarm in respect of any piece of legislation the government may bring down, there must be plenty of time for the people of Canada to be alerted; hence, rule 75c must be defeated.

I was elected to represent some 78,000 men, women and children in my district in the province of Newfoundland. I was sent here to represent them by bringing forth their problems. They elected me because they had confidence that I was capable of being heard. The only way I can be heard to present their problems, and to remind the government of Canada of its neglect, is to stand on my feet and speak on their behalf.

I am completely dismayed and disgusted that the representatives who sat in this House of Commons for some 20 years since Newfoundland entered Confederation were silent and complacent. That is why they were known in Newfoundland as the "Silent Seven". They were forced, by an order from beyond the reaches of the federal government, to keep their mouths shut. But you can only fool some of the people some of the time. The people of Newfoundland were fooled long enough; that is why there had to be a change, and they voted for a change.

The people of Newfoundland are blessed with honesty, sincerity and common sense. They reacted by showing their disappointment and disgust during the election of last June; they were not overcome with flowers and kisses. They now believe in involvement, and are showing they mean business by organizing into associations and councils to protest the neglect and disregard for their welfare. They are shouting out to become involved; they are shouting out to participate. The only manner in which they can become involved is by their member of parliament finding out why they are neglected with regard to common, ordinary public services that the rest of Canada enjoy.

I am expected to do a conscientious job of representing the people of my district, and I cannot do it by wasting my time in this House of Commons because the government is determined to further neglect and disregard the people of Newfoundland. I cannot, and I will not. I must stand on my feet and keep reminding the government that they had better mean what they say when they expound continuously the pledge of equality of opportunity, regardless of where Canadians live, and regardless of race, creed or colour. The government continues to camouflage its dictatorial ideas to its own backbenchers, though I fail to see why these back benchers continue to stand for this complete degradation of their conscience.

But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is an opposition in this country. The past year's events have shown the government's disregard for sincerity and democracy. Rule 75c will for a long time to come represent "C" for "contempt" for parliament and for the people of Canada. And let there be no misunderstanding of what will remain in the government's conscience for many years to come.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, there are several arguments that I want to make in my remarks on the proposed Standing Order 75c that I hope are of a positive and constructive nature. The attitude of this house throughout the session has, I think most members will

agree, by and large been reasonable, constructive and loyal. I hope this debate will not too severely detract from that fact, for that acknowledged truth belies any possible merit that Standing Order 75c might have possessed.

Standing Order 75c is an amazing proposal. It would seem to be almost a postcript for a dubious and chaotic assembly of fanatics. This resolution—perhaps I should say this fetish of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and/or the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald)—is in essence an usurpation of the independence of the House of Commons. It is an idea so unparalleled and significant as to be justified in its imposition upon a deliberative body only as a certificate of immaturity. For this parliament such certification I hardly think is proper and correct.

I think we as parliamentarians have been responsive and strong in an ongoing society. The ancient role of our parliament as the forum for, and safeguard of, our citizenry has been tempered and modified by accepting the increasing and complex obligations of a democratic and twentieth century statesman. We in this country have shared a desire for an opposition that is constructive, not an opposition that is alienated. Therefore, we have been positive in our approach to the business in this session.

I do not think there is anyone in this assembly who could question the reasonableness, the responsibility and the good faith of the leader of any of the opposition parties. Together with our countrymen we felt the exhilaration of our centennial year. We feel a mature concern toward the increasing spoliation of Canada's environment, the shame of persistent regional and vertical inequality, and the embarrassment of a confused and ambiguous policy toward the rest of the world. My colleagues in the opposition parties are in politics not, as some would believe, to stop things from being done, but to get things done. Throughout the first session of the twenty eighth parliament we have conducted ourselves in accordance with that sentiment.

Although Canadians are a generous and patient people, their problems are becoming more complex and entrenched. Therefore, all of us are concerned that the House of Commons become more immediate, or business-like if you wish, in executing its affairs and in its applications to the national interest. Thus we all agreed that parliamentary reform was vital.

The historic rights of parliament are not absolute in form and have, with our support, been significantly tempered and modified in order to make this house more expeditious in its despatch of public business. This circumstance is a matter of record that defies contradiction. It is also an achievement in which we of the opposition take pride.

Clearly we of the opposition parties supported the vast majority of the proposed changes which were implemented on January 1 last. Our representatives on the all-party committee on procedural reform suggested many of the proposals and, indeed, helped to draft them. Further, we agreed to cut in half the number of days available for supply. We moved to refer the Biafran issue and the postal bill to parliamentary committees, thus saving the house several days of time in order to expedite further government measures.

Let us agree that the attitude of goodwill on our part has helped make this a uniquely positive and efficient parliament. This fact is pretty generally acknowledged. To the present proposals before the house I suspect most of us are not hostile per se. I support proposed standing order 75A and 75B, knowing that in supporting them I waive important privileges that I have as a member of Parliament. They also imply certain perils, particularly for the members of the Official Opposition.

Considering all this, and remembering that the reforms now undertaken make available an additional 50 to 55 days per session for government business, which amounts to 10 to 11 parliamentary weeks, and this at the cost of opposition time, I think our flexibility and goodwill have been clearly demonstrated in no uncertain terms.

We did not agree to make these reforms because we were naïve or childish in our attitude. I think that our reasoning has been practical. Although the vitality of the opposition in democratic parliaments since the birth of industry and the formalization of political parties has seriously waned, in this session alone we have allowed our slice of the time and our traditional privileges to be diminished; there is no question of that. We have concluded that the opposition has had to make this sacrifice in order to revitalise parliament as a whole. The House of Commons has to meet the challenge of society more competently and in a more immediate manner.

• (8:50 p.m.)

If our society is to be vital our parliament must be open, and to me, the central issue is

whether the House of Commons is to remain open to our society. I do not think we should let this government have its way without at least putting up a fight. I ask, is the openness of this deliberative body critical to the health of Canadian society I feel that the essence of 75c, with its bizarre journey from government policy to bravado and back to government policy answers these questions quite simply. It says, "The House of Commons be dammed; put parliament in saran wrap and take it away. We don't need it any more." Furthermore, I suspect that this ignominious proposed rule 75c forms the basis of this government's whole approach to parliamentary reform. We glimpse that approach in the government's attitude towards the question period, in the fancy roster of ministers and in the way in which they deal with the serious question of the integrity of committees.

The intention of the Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council seems to be that this assembly shall be one that is not open to the vicissitudes and concerns in our society but amenable to the slavish dictates of the executive. They think the behaviour of the house must be absolutely and utterly predictable. For instance, on Monday they want to know everything that will take place on Friday. They want to know that in advance, and that is not parliament. That is what this government wants to make of parliament.

If because of our present responsiveness to questions affecting Canada's interest we postpone, as a result of our discussions, 10 or 15 government bills the government turns around and says, "This parliament is sick; it needs rule 75c." That is why there is this attempt to have the executive branch orchestrate our legislative enactments via the President of the Privy Council. I bear little malice towards this government, nor do I fear it. I find the President of the Privy Council, with his Napoleonic airs, only amusing. At present we are discussing the future of all parliaments to follow us. We are discussing the fate of open parliament, and therefore it is proper and right for us to discuss this resolution within a wide context embracing the historic dilemmas of protection of the individual, the nature of representation and deliberation and the very contribution of the polity to our life and culture.

Personally, I have long believed in a viable and open parliament as a bedrock necessity if a society is to maintain democratic responses to these questions. This, however, is a practical question and this debate has brought it into the open. We, of the opposition, have been seemingly challenged to restate the efficiency of the House of Commons as a critical political institution. If this is so, by the time this debate is resolved the case for a strong House of Commons will have been thoroughly made. In the time left to me, however, I wish to discuss only what I consider the necessary requirements of a viable House of Commons for our federal politics. Openness, Mr. Speaker, is the encompassing requisite which I see as most seriously imperilled by proposed rule 75c. The openness of parliament seems to have two aspects.

The first aspect is the negative power of the opposition primarily to examine, restrain and dissent in order to resist the arbitrary exercise of governmental power. This is the power to protect the interests of the people against abuse by a majority government. In operation, this means that we must have the ability to alarm and exercise our people, and it is here that 75c would have its most vicious consequence. Even the hypothetical minimum of ten days of debate on a government order is insufficient time for us to rally public support. This is our conclusion and that of most newspapers which have commented on this resolution. Their opinion on this matter after all is worth knowing, for the journalist understands the requisites of communications. May I be permitted to read into the record a short editorial that appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of July 4, 1969. It is headed, "Rights imperilled—Closure rule is too drastic". The editorial reads:

> It is no accident that the government decided to wait until the dying hours of the present session to introduce its new closure rule—and that is what rule 75c is.
>
> The apparent fatigue of all members might help the government slip it through. But the weapon will backfire if the opposition remains determined to fight.
>
> No parliamentarians can become as intractable, as unwilling to compromise, as those who are tired, who want to go home, but can't because they feel put upon and must stay to do battle. Much of the good work accomplished in gaining opposition co-operation to speed the work of Parliament may be undone if the government keeps to its course.
>
> When a majority of the House leaders cannot agree on a time limit for debate on a bill, rule 75c would permit the government to impose a limit of one day at each stage. The result could be a mockery of Parliament's rights.
>
> The opposition should be given reasonable time—perhaps two or three weeks—to rally public opinion against legislation it considers iniquitous. If, after that, the public is still unmoved by opposition arguments, further debate becomes wilful obstruction. Closure can then be imposed without the taint of dictatorship.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peddle: I think that short editorial ought to be contained in the records of this house.

The second role of an open parliament is its power in helping to legitimize and make more tangible our polity; that is our central government. This power is more subtle and more hypothetical; it is difficult to speak of but is equally serious. What I term the evocative power is the responsibility of the whole house, and the stakes within the political system are primarily those of the government.

It is now generally admitted that one of the vivid dangers of the large administrative unit of the state or economy stems from an individual's sense of participation or power. Men come to see themselves as instruments or as statistics. Some accept this view, and are thereby emasculated. Others retreat to a life of private happiness, while some reply and are more likely frustrated and in this dissatisfaction alienation is born.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Many of us have asked ourselves whether we want a society whose government systems consistently alienate its people and make them unproductive and hostile. I believe many of us in this house are in politics to help avoid such a fate for the Canadian people, yet this government does not seem to want our help. If we try to revive a sense of integration and dignity for our people, one of the most difficult problems we will have to face will be the alienation of the individual from the political process.

The term "participatory democracy" is not ours. Participatory democracy is healthy. A creative relationship between the state and the citizens is absolutely essential. However, as democrats we believe this evocative and legitimate power cannot adequately or safely be allowed only to the executives. Nevertheless, if this present government feels this power needs to be shared with the legislature to assure its potency and avoid tyranny, then what in the name of heaven is the reason for 75c? For this assembly to have the strength and evoke the trust and commitment on the part of our people, it must be representative in the full sense of the word.

The House of Commons must be allowed to remain a human institution of representation. This seems too costly to this government because if parliament were like that, it could not be fully predictable. The government would not be able to tell on Monday every word that would be spoken or every action that would take place on the following Friday. That would not do for this government. It would be completely and utterly unpredictable. The business of this house cannot be only the business of Treasury Board and frontbenchers because, to be trusted and noticed, it must represent and reconcile the passions, ideals and even the prejudices of the people. That must take place here and it is necessary.

The unity of our country will not be found in business practices or procedures. What is the danger to this and future governments if this house is forgotten and loses its evocative power? In a free society where the commitment of its members requires trust and understanding, due process and power are inter-dependent. If commitment and trust are lost, government loses a great deal of its power. For a positive government the power of its measures is not found necessarily in royal assent, but with the assent of the people governed.

Last fall the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spoke of the obligation of our public men to avoid the kind of civil disaster for Canada that is being experienced in some parts of the United States. Unfortunately, he has learned a few lessons from this nearby tragedy. Was not the essence of the United States crisis that her Congress was allowed to become irrelevant? Was not the Viet Nam issue forced from the councils of government to the streets of the cities of the United States? I argue that in a democratic society the imposition of rule 75c imperils the strength of government and also the strength and quality of national life.

Among us here, many of the young and all the glib, have decided that business procedure is the one and only measure of parliament. Certainly there is an anxiety to accomplish more. I think we all share this feeling. We have all proven our concern for this objective. In appealing to the positive ambitions of the government, I ask hon. members to deeply reconsider rule 75c to save this government from its arrogance so that it may begin to govern with some degree of wisdom. The government talks about streamlining, Mr. Speaker. They say parliament has to be streamlined but, as an hon. member brought out very pointedly this afternoon, this is a big thing to streamline. Canada is a very large sprawling country, Mr. Speaker, with different regions, races, geographical locations, religions and ethnic backgrounds. How far can they go toward streamlining a parliament of 264 members, bearing in mind the

concessions that the opposition have already made? Just how far can they go?

Frankly, I cannot see why this government is so obsessed with its streamlining procedure in view of the degree of co-operation that has already obtained in this parliament from all the opposition parties. It is very interesting to note, and this does not escape many people, the times that the government chooses to try to ram such measures through. First they tried when everyone was starting to be imbued with the Christmas spirit. The bells were ringing, there were jingle bells all over the place and the government brought in its infamous rule 16A. The opposition at that time showed in no uncertain terms that they were responsible. They were not sent here to leave at a certain time, even though everyone is tied up in the custom of Christmas. We flexed our backbones and decided to stay.

At that time the government decided they would not push it through, but would try again at the next opportune moment. They decided to wait until they had the heat of the sun with them. Even though they would not have the Christmas spirit, they would have the holiday spirit as well as temperatures of 80 and 90 degrees. They decided they would push it through in the latter part of June, when house was scheduled to close. Here again, Mr. Speaker, there is too much at stake. This country has a long future ahead of it. The opposition will not capitulate when they feel so strongly about this. We know we have to put up with a little bit of discomfort. Most of us had holidays and other things planned. We had planned tours of our ridings. We have had to change those plans. We had things to do, but those things are insignificant compared to what the effect of 75c would be.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peddle: That is the position our party has adopted. It is the official position adopted by the other two opposition parties and, so far as I can understand, it is the position we will continue to adopt until the government comes to its senses. I say that for such a measure to be introduced at such a time is an insult to the integrity at least of every member of the opposition. Do they assume that we do not take our duties any more seriously than that, for the sake of getting home with our families, we would jeopardize the future of this country and this parliament? If so, they have another think coming.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Peddle.]

Mr. Peddle: Parliament is not something archaic which was established some years ago and not heard of since. Parliament has evolved through the years through the process of trial and error. Something has been taken away from it and something has been put in during the process. Through this evolution, we have parliament as we see it today. As I am reminded, may I say that coming from the province of Newfoundland I know about dictatorship.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Peddle: Even though the numbers in the opposition in the province of Newfoundland are small, I hate to think what would happen in the province without them. This House of Commons is the parent parliament of all Canada. I hate to think of Joey Smallwood trying to copy a page from the book of this government if this rule should go through. There would be no legislature.

I realize that the press is often maligned, but I often wonder if we truly appreciate the real service the press renders to this country. If a government with a great majority were allowed to go its way in this assembly with no one watching them except the opposition, and if there were nothing going out to the people of Canada on which they could formulate an opinion in respect of what was happening, I hate to think what the result would be. The press, in its own way, tends to slow down the process of parliament. If rule 75c were to pass, then someone might get the idea of streamlining a little more. Someone might say, let us get the press out of the gallery up there. They might say, "We do not want too many questions being asked; get them out of here." That could be the next step; there would be a creeping paralysis. Those are the things which worry me and which I think should worry any responsible member of this parliament.

The last member who spoke on behalf of the New Democratic party mentioned the type of government measures which had been introduced in this parliament. Almost the highlight of this parliament was a measure to make homosexuality and abortion legal. Someone said the government was suffering from a hangover. Maybe this is the problem. I think before the summer is over we might supply the cure. The Prime Minister, the hon. gentleman who is retreating and backshrugging every day, vanishes following the question period. I have not seen him since the debate started. The other day he said he had no intention of listening to a foolish filibuster.

When did he listen to a filibuster in this parliament? Unless he has it piped up to his office, he certainly does not listen to a filibuster in this assembly. Now he has gone, as someone said, to mend fences. Maybe he cannot even do that.

Let the government bring in some responsible legislation, as a previous speaker said, and see how much obstruction will be forthcoming from the opposition parties. Let the government bring in a meaningful bill to help lessen the housing crisis in this country and at the same time take off the 11 per cent tax. Then, government members will see how much opposition there is from this side of the house. Never mind bills which contain a few things the government wants to get through or the sugar coating of a lot of decent measures, after which members are informed they must accept the whole package. This reminds me of when we were kids and had to take our cod liver oil with orange juice in order to take away the taste. Many things are bundled into a bill the size of the Ottawa telephone directory, and then we are placed in the position of voting against some sensible measures because they are contained in one bill.

A lot of sloganizing was carried on during the last election campaign in respect of participatory democracy and a just society.

An hon. Member: Just for the Grits.

Mr. Peddle: Obviously just for their own party. The majority of the people of Canada are represented on this side of the house. What about the people of Canada whose representatives to a man are willing to sit here all summer, if necessary, in an effort to talk sense into the government in respect of this insidious rule 75c! This is a question I would like to hear answered. Where is the example of participatory democracy? The only way in which the people of Canada have been able to participate in democracy has been by sending 264 members to this parliament. This is the way they participate. They do not participate by buying a ticket for a $50 a plate political dinner. That is participation for those who have 50 bucks. The only way in which the people of Canada can participate in our democracy is by sending their duly elected representatives to this parliament and, as I say, the representatives of the majority of the people sit on this side of the house and object very very strenuously to the adoption of rule 75c.

When there is a government with a big majority, I suppose it is natural to expect that sometimes it will get carried away by the sweet taste of power. More craves more. Once in a while, however, such a government should be reminded that the opposition has a role to play. Our system has evolved over the century by taking away a little and adding a little. In this way we have come to our present system of parliament. Now, the members on the government side of the house want to take the hatchet to this system and chop away almost every right the opposition has. They would place us in the position of being ineffective vegetables which stand up once in a while when called upon, then sit down and shut up. This is not the type of role I envisaged when I sought a seat in this parliament, and it is not the type of role actually that I will tolerate in this parliament notwithstanding 75c. As some member mentioned, if the government insists on voting this thing through, we will find some way to circumvent it and don't you forget it.

We know that the opposition has a role to play. A few days ago an hon. member of the N.D.P. called the attention of the house to the fact that there was not a quorum. Let me call to your attention the magnificent attendance of hon. members since that time. The opposition is doing its part to revitalize parliament.

My time is just about up, but since we are playing by the rules I will probably use the whole of it. I say today that this government, as mentioned by another hon. member, is suffering from a hangover. Does anyone take seriously the statement made a few days ago by the Prime Minister that 80 per cent of the questions asked by the opposition are hypocritical? This means that 80 per cent of the members of opposition parties are hypocrites who engage in stupid, foolish and hypocritical filibusters. The Prime Minister could not stand it, so he went west.

An hon. Member: He will get his there.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Peddle: I expect he might face a filibuster out west. We are discussing 75c and I cannot emphasize too much the statement made by my friend in the N.D.P., which I repeat. Let the government withdraw this rule. Perhaps they may not like to do so, but they might look more like statesmen than at any time since the opening of this session. Let them withdraw this rule and bring in some sensible, sound and acceptable legislation. I would almost take the chance of speaking for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), and that is taking quite a chance, by saying there will be no real opposition from this side of the house.

Procedure and Organization

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that after one year of a new parliament the government is permitting this session to end on such a sour note. It could have co-operation in the house right to the end, just as it has had co-operation from the time we gathered here after the election last year. As a matter of fact, it has been one of the most productive sessions ever enjoyed by a Canadian parliament. I have consulted with our law officer, Dr. Ollivier, who tells me that his biggest problem now is whether they are going to print the statutes we have passed during this session in one or two volumes, so great has been our productivity.

Why are we now meeting a demand from the government for a rule such as 75c? Later on if I have time and the opportunity to use my full time—I will use that time and come back on another occasion as long as we are here—I will outline the co-operation we have given.

This whole matter has been scouted before, and it is obvious to everyone here, as I think it is becoming obvious to all Canadians, that nothing has been left undone that we should be doing before we recess for the summer. There is legislation on the order paper, some of which was introduced in order that the public might get a look at it, and some of which has been left on the order paper for reasons only known to the government.

Great occasions bring forth great speeches. Of all those I have listened to during this debate, and when the topic involves an issue that is fundamental one can expect that good speeches will be made, I think the accolade should be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). That hon. member has been in this house since 1940, with a short hiatus. In other words, he is marking a quarter century of service to his country in this institution. It ill behooves this parliament that a person who did not even have the grace to listen to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and other members who have taken part in this debate, should label the message of that hon. member as sheer hypocrisy. That is what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has done.

The Prime Minister has not stayed to listen to the debate up to this time, and of course he will not be here to listen to us this week. Perhaps he will have to listen next week or the week after, as long as something such as 75c is before us. Let us look on the year we have gone through. We have had more committees and more committee meetings than ever before. More legislation has been produced than ever before. Members have been working to the extent that they have had almost no spare time, particularly those who served on two or three committees. We realize the amount we have done, but we must know that the committees cannot work efficiently unless members of the opposition work as hard as members of the government. The record has been a good one for both the opposition and the government. We hammered away at the proposed legislation and we got through it. Some of the committees were not all they should have been and others were absolutely superb. They turned in a job of which we should be proud.

[Mr. Peddle.]

Now, in the final moments of the session, why should whatever carrots were held out before us to lure us on be withdrawn and a whip applied instead. What kind of reasoning is that, and what kind of people are directing the affairs of a once great political party who could believe this is a proper tactic to use in the House of Commons? What kind of people are these who could graciously withdraw rule 16A, which we were considering before Christmas, and then bring it back as a Frankenstein monster dressed up with a little bit of make-up in order that it will look different, right at the tail end of a session? I suppose they thought we were all tired at this point and after a perfunctory shaking of the fist at this rule we would go our way to visit our constituencies. We will not do that until 75c is slain and is as dead as 16A. It must be slain in the same way.

The latest issue of the *New Yorker* contains an imaginative article about our Prime Minister. I should like to quote something he is reputed to have told a young reporter, Miss Edith Iglauer. The article quotes the Prime Minister as having said:

> I've always dreamt of a society where each person should be able to fulfill himself to the extent of his capabilities as a human being, a society where inhibitions to equality would be eradicated. This means providing individual freedoms—

• (9:30 p.m.)

Individual freedoms to whom? This is the thought that puzzled me when I read this sugar-coated confection in the *New Yorker* magazine. This article is not critical at all. It is not even a good, basic piece of reporting, because it does not attempt to examine all of the rather interesting facets of our Prime Minister. I can only conclude that Miss Edith Iglauer is one of that stable of neurotic young women who are rapidly becoming the reporting staff of the *New Yorker* magazine. During this interview she was having either dinner

or lunch with the great man, and while they gazed at the spire of a church on the Quebec side of the river he plied her with a very pleasant, dry, light wine. I suspect that the young lady went back to New York still with her mind floating around cloud nine.

There comes a time when traditional liberalism, or the philosophy of that great political party, should be set forth for the benefit of those who up to now have perhaps forgotten the great heritage they enjoyed in the past. I think logically one starts with John Stuart Mill. In this article in the *New Yorker* the Prime Minister is quoted as saying he does not read very much of John Stuart Mill. John Stuart Mill was a man who worked for the India Company for a long time. He had a great deal of practical experience. He was one of the most gifted minds of the 19th century. He served as a Liberal member in the English parliament for one term. I suppose that explains why the Prime Minister does not read him. If he does not listen to present Liberal members of parliament, there is no reason why he should read the words of a former Liberal member of parliament who is now dead.

The Prime Minister's reading, as he told the young woman reporter of the *New Yorker*, is of writers like Dostoevski, whom he enjoys. I suppose those Liberals who wondered why they were called idiots might find consolation in reading that great Russian's works. He enjoys reading Stendahl and Tolstoy. Stendahl's work "The Red and the Black" tells the story of a young man on the make. I suppose it offered useful instruction to a middle-aged, single Prime Minister. But in so far as John Stuart Mill is concerned, the Prime Minister has not read much of his work. I suppose the fact that Mill had served at Westminster, and with the Liberal party, made him suspect.

But one of the great works, one that probably should be on every parliamentarian's desk—and I suppose none of us have it there; we all have to run to the library if we want to read it—is J. S. Mill "On Liberty, Etc." I shall read excerpts from that work because it is important to give a refresher course, even if it is to be only 40 minutes, to my hon. friends on the Liberal side. J. S. Mill, dealing with the principles of the liberty of thought and discussion, has some very interesting observations. I quote from chapter II of his work on the liberty of thought and discussion:

> In speaking generally, it is not, in constitutional countries, to be apprehended, that the government, whether completely responsible to the people or not, will often attempt to control the expression of opinion, except when in doing so it makes itself the organ of the general intolerance of the public. Let us suppose, therefore, that the government is entirely at one with the people, and never thinks of exerting any power of coercion unless in agreement with what it conceives to be their voice. But I deny the right of the people to exercise such coercion, either by themselves or by their government. The power itself is illegitimate. The best government has no more title to it than the worst.

In other words, interrupting the flow of that great English writer's thoughts, the argument that the power would never be abused amounts to nothing. It does not go to the heart of the problem with which we are dealing, because it may be abused at some time. It could be abused not at all. It could be abused 100 per cent. But it is not germane to the argument. Continuing with Mr. Mill:

> It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion, than when in opposition to it.

Later in this speech, the next or the next, I am going to make the point that the Prime Minister has gone around following a consistent policy of denigrating the institution of which he is supposed to be the greatest champion and upholder. I give him that great line of William Lyon Mackenzie King and say "in spades" on that one, because to me this is the most horrible characteristic the Prime Minister shows, namely, to shrug and pretend he is the great white champion between the people and the House of Commons. But I must not get too enthusiastic about the speech after the next one, and shall continue with the quick refresher course to be obtained from Mr. John Stuart Mill's work:

> If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind. Were an opinion a personal possession of no value except to the owner; if to be obstructed in the enjoyment of it were simply a private injury, it would make some difference whether the injury was inflicted only on a few persons or on many. But the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.

Can we not think of examples in this parliament, and more particularly in the last one, where we had more loose fish—I think that was an expression used by Sir John A.

Macdonald and my hon. friend from Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), the great expert in this house on Sir John A., agrees with me—flying around? One of them is now off promoting separatism in the province of Quebec. I do not suppose many of us thought highly of his opinions. Probably few of us found very much sense in those opinions. But certainly the Speaker of the last parliament, and the members of that parliament, gave Mr. Grégoire every right to express his opinions. In that respect he enjoyed a greater advantage than those who stayed within the recognized political parties in this house. Continuing with this brilliant chapter by Mr. Mill on the liberty of thought and discussion, he makes these points:

All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility. Its condemnation may be allowed to rest on this common argument, not the worse for being common.

That is a key point to remember when dealing with the Prime Minister, the government house leader and the people promoting this iniquitous doctrine. They and they alone are the great repositories of truth. The rest of us in this chamber just go along for the philosophic ride.

I should like to put some more quotations from John Stuart Mill on the record which may awaken memories of times before these Liberals came to Ottawa to become part of some great sausage making complex:

But I must be permitted to observe, that it is not the feeling sure of a doctrine (be it what it may) which I call an assumption of infallibility. It is the undertaking to decide that question *for others*, without allowing them to hear what can be said on the contrary side. And I denounce and reprobate this pretension not the less, if put forth on the side of my most solemn convictions.

This whole volume is well worth reading and I commend it to my Liberal friends, because sooner or later as this debate goes on they will have to examine their consciences. Our freedoms will in large measure be determined by the stand they take in caucus. We do not expect miracles of them or that they will bolt the party line, but perhaps they will force an early caucus tomorrow and ask themselves whether they are Liberals at heart, whether their ancestor Liberals always fought for freedom of discussion rather than the choking and gagging of the opinions of others. Perhaps the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants, they will say, did have a point to make when he read what John Stuart Mill had to say on liberty of thought and discussion.

[Mr. McCleave.]

• (9:40 p.m.)

Let me put on record some more thoughts for them to take to their caucus. John Stuart Mill continues:

We have now recognized the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion, and freedom of the expression of opinion, on four distinct grounds; which we will now briefly recapitulate.

First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested,—

Is that not what debate is all about, the vigorous and earnest contestation of ideas?

—it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension of feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct; the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground, and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience.

Those are the words of a great Englishman. But even though he was a Liberal member of parliament the Prime Minister does not heed his doctrine.

Where have abuses crept into parliament during the 12 years I have been here? The latest alleged abuse arises from the debate on the Criminal Code amendments, when our friends to the far left put up a battle over the modernization of the law dealing with abortion. I did not share their opinions. Neither did I share the government's formula. But I will certainly defend their right to get what they had to say off their chests. Perhaps the argument was repetitious and overly long, but at least their constituents can now say that the measure that passed is the law, and that it was well and truly considered in parliament. The issue was fought until it could be fought no more. Every argument that could be adduced was put forward in this chamber.

Then, there was the flag debate. I was not here at that time but I would have joined my colleagues and doubtless spoken at some length. The house was then dealing with an

issue which to many Canadians struck at the very heart of Canadianism, at their cherished belief in a flag that has now gone. They felt that their representatives were in parliament to express their views and to fight the matter as hard as it could be fought. I am sure that those who wanted a new flag felt the same way. After a lengthy battle, the issue was resolved and the new flag was unfurled. No one can say that the issue was not properly or fully debated and fought to a conclusion.

Another of the alleged abuses that has been spoken of occurred during the era of the four horsemen of the "eclipse"—Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Martin. One suffered a certain weariness and dreariness while listening to them as they made their points. I felt some of the sting of many of these points, and in one election campaign they made their points well. Gentlemen on the Liberal side of this chamber say that the lengthy debate in which those people engaged were in the cause of liberalism, though this is not to be permitted when members of other parties do the same thing for some party cause.

The only abuse I can think of at that time, apart from the great waste of parliamentary time, was when Mr. Pickersgill deliberately talked out a motion to appoint several new judges to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia which would have allowed that court to modernize itself by creating both an appeal division and a trial division. This step had to wait for some months because of the deliberate action Mr. Pickersgill took. He took this action not for any great or noble cause; he took it for sheer political reasons. He did not like to think that any Conservative would be appointed to the Nova Scotia bench. I do not know how he gets along now with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), because he has now redressed the inequitable stand that was taken by Mr. Pickersgill.

I should like to go back to an abuse by the Liberal government of the day, one that could be perpetuated time and again if Standing Order 75c where adopted. I refer to the pipeline debate. This debate reflected the quintessence of some gentlemen's ideas about how parliament should be run, how it could be turned into a superb sausage making machine. When closure was imposed the clauses of the bill under debate were rammed through one after the other. The only legislation I might be particularly concerned about, in so far as 75c is concerned, would be the amendment to the Indian Act. I would not permit any government, so long as I can stand up here and speak, to have those powers which 75c would confer on it. If the Indians went on the war path and right thinking Canadians joined them on the war path, parliament would have to act. I would not like to think what would happen if, through invoking rule 75c, the amendments to the Indian Act were to be disposed of in 11 days or so. After all our Indians have the right to expect the white man to keep his word, and the time permitted under 75c would not be sufficient for us to arouse public opinion. That is the basic issue before us.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We do not trust the Prime Minister; let us be frank, Mr. Speaker. We have no reason to trust him. We trust some members of his cabinet, but we do not trust the Prime Minister. We must resist 75c if we are to maintain a modicum of respect for ourselves and if we are to maintain parliament as a viable institution for those members who will follow us.

I wish to correct an unjust impression that may have been left about the government house leader. He had his knuckles wrapped by various people on this side of the house last week with respect to statutory instruments, as will be seen at page 11035 of *Hansard*. There was a failure of consultation. We had agreed to allow the measure to go through and if there was lack of consultation, it was through my fault. I did not get around to seeing everyone I ought to have seen. I wish to put my apology on record since at present, when we are all tense and when we all tend to quarrel with each other, it is a good idea to vindicate the house leader. I therefore wish to make that correction, Mr. Speaker.

Having dealt with Liberal spokesmen of the nineteenth century, may I now deal with Liberals of the twentieth century. Let us turn to the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the great Liberals of this country, surely.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That's good reading, Bob.

Mr. Bell: Something has gone wrong in the present century.

Mr. McCleave: I am reading from a book entitled, "Political Pamphlets, 1912-15". On the cover is the word "Liberal". I am sure hon. members opposite will think my reading is to good purpose.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is a great improvement in the hon. member's reading habits.

Mr. McCleave: It will have been an improvement if hon. members opposite heed the words of Sir Wilfrid. I quote:

> Sir, these rules are to be swept away, they are to be ridden over rough shod; they are to be put aside, and we are to have the gag substituted for them. And what is the pretence? The pretence is that there has been obstruction in the House. Sir, if obstruction be a fault, if obstruction be an offence, I call upon the man on that side of the House who is without guilt to cast the first stone. I read in some Conservative newspapers that obstruction was the murderer of parliamentary government. I do not here now challenge the statement; but if obstruction be the murderer of parliamentary government, the murderers are on that side of the House, and not on this. My right hon. friend has experience, and he will experience still more, that as you sow, so shall you reap; and Sir, it does not lie in his mouth or in the mouth of his followers to say that there has been obstruction in this House by the parliamentary minority.

May I also read from a book with the notation on the cover, "Political Pamphlets, Liberal, 1919-35". This book no doubt has been maintained in the library at the taxpayers' expense. I do not know how it was compiled but it is heady reading, as I am sure the Minister of Justice will agree.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Absolutely.

Mr. McCleave: It may not be amiss to re-echo the starry cries of the 1919 Liberal convention. I quote from this book as follows:

> Liberalism is essentially progressive and open minded. It has a history and traditions of which it has reason to be proud. But that does not mean that it is to rest upon tradition and to become stationary. It is not a dead thing, but a living, growing organism. It thrives in an atmosphere of freedom, and especially of liberty of thought and of speech.

An hon. Member: They don't want free speech now.

Mr. McCleave: May I now quote the words of another great spokesman for Liberalism. These were spoken on the night of October 14, 1935, a night the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) will long remember. That was the night he was first elected to this chamber. Mr. Mackenzie King had this to say:

> The individuals and the nations which discard Liberalism, pay by losing their liberty. When liberty goes, little else remains. Today the task of Liberalism is two-fold: it is to maintain what we have already gained of freedom in many spheres, and to gain for our fellowmen more in the way of economic freedom. That battle will not be won by individuals putting their own present and material interests before all else, or by Canada putting her present material interests before all else. In the realm of individual freedom, it will be won by each seeking to gain a larger liberty for others as well as for himself. In the international sphere it will be won by international co-operation and international good-will.

Although I have a few words more, Mr. Speaker, I must end on that note.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under standing order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—VANCOUVER—DISSATISFACTION OF LETTER CARRIERS WITH FIVE DAY DELIVERY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question was prompted by sit-downs in the Vancouver and Burnaby areas on the part of letter carriers obviously dissatisfied with the single mail processing which was consequent upon the imposition of the five day mail delivery. The reaction of the letter carriers of the western metropolis was typical of that which has been revealed throughout the country. Of all the failures which the minister has chalked up in his year of office that in the field of labour relations is certainly the most gregarious. His threats of prosecutions, his failure to consult adequately before making sweeping changes in employees' work routine, the story of the locked washrooms—all of these are now well known. They have been dramatized by the type of actions which were taken in Vancouver and Burnaby and by other indications of dissatisfaction in other offices. Happily these, while significant, were not sustained and in general the postal workers are to be congratulated for their restraint in the face of what chief adjudicator Martin has described as arrogance and highhandedness on the part of the employer.

It is regrettable that for reasons which still appear mysterious, the report of Mr. Martin was not revealed to the public until July 4, nine and a half weeks after the date of his decision. The suggestion that while the chief adjudicator signed the decision on April 30 he worked on it after that date is an intriguing one, especially since the two other reports dated May 15 and 16 bear his signature as adjudicator. The unusual delay in the production of such an important document is all the more disconcerting in the light of the Postmaster General's (Mr. Kierans) revelation that

he had been pressing almost weekly since May 1 to have the reports. Far more serious than the failure of his detection efforts was the fact that for many weeks this vital question of employer-employee relations in this trouble-rent department could not be discussed in this house since the subject matter was before the chief adjudicator and therefore sub judice, as hon. members know.

• (10:00 p.m.)

What happened in Vancouver, and elsewhere, is the visible symptom of a condition which was so scathingly detailed by Mr. Martin in his report of April 30. I have in my political and student career perused many documents commenting on the administrative performance of ministerial and governmental bodies, but never have I seen a verdict so decisively rendered. The indictment of the Post Office is searing and scathing as but a few excerpts will indicate.

> It is quite clear that... management's conduct has resulted in creating unrest, the undermining of morale, and the development of hostility between the parties.
>
> An assessment of employer attitudes... shows that the employer position is characterized by arrogance and high-handedness.

Lest anyone be tempted to suggest that the adjudicator made an even division of his criticism, it should be noted that he stated:

> The employer by its unilaterial conduct, must assume the primary blame for the failure of the consultative process—

But what I am interested in now, as I presume are the letter carriers of Vancouver and elsewhere, is the response to the stinging criticism in the adjudicator's findings. I trust the minister this time will break his usual custom and admit that just possibly something might be wrong in his department. He may be no genius at labour relations, nor any speed artist in getting the mail through, but in the field of rationalization the Postmaster General is in a class by himself. Failure? He salutes them all! Black is white! I can imagine him hailing the retreat from Moscow as a trimphal re-entry into western Europe or recommending the Captain of the *Titanic* for a gold-headed cane for his speed and accuracy on target.

But here is a subject too important for even skilful rationalization. Nor is anything really to be gained by blaming the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) or others who preceded the present minister in the Postmaster General's chair. Sir William Mulock can hardly be blamed for the kind of conditions which brought on the Vancouver sit-down or the adjudicator's report.

I would like to know what has been done since Chief Adjudicator Martin found the department so lacking in this aspect of employer-employee relations. What changes have been made? What new personnel have been put to work? Have any transfers been made? Have any new policies been adopted? Has there been any last minute willingness to desist from the stubborn insistence on the five day delivery and the straight-through system where the whole trouble began? Without tangible evidence of a change from the deplorable situation now chronicled for us by an expert and respected adjudicator, there is cause for grave anxiety in reference to this vital part of the public service.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Merry Monk from Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) rides again! The hon. member for Hillsborough has reverted to his June 9 question dealing with wildcat strikes in Vancouver to continue his scolding of, and nagging harangues against, the Post Office. Since there have been no strikes in Vancouver or anywhere since that time, one would normally conclude that both management and their union colleagues were working out solutions, but not the hon. member for Hillsborough. He prefers to continue to berate the Post Office with a repetitious rehashing of any incident, even weeks and months old, in order to downgrade the service that is provided by the 48,000 loyal and dedicated employees of the Post Office.

He has the ear, and he knows it, of those publishers in this country who want the Post Office and the taxpayers of Canada to subsidize their operations and their customers secretly, under the guise of what they call freedom of the press. If the press of this country want subsidies, and will repeat incessantly the statement of the hon. member for Hillsborough, let that hon. member present their demands to this house.

This government is determined that the 48,000 postal employees shall have security of employment and the better working conditions, facilities and training to which they are entitled. They know this. Both unions know this. This government is spending 40 times the puny amount of $15,000 that the last Tory government spent on management training for 41,000 people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Kierans: That is how we will modernize and improve our service, not by the mean and undocumented attacks of members such as the hon. member for Hillsborough. He cites incidents and refuses to discuss the general situation. He knows full well that 99 per cent of the people in this country for 99 per cent of the time receive their mail within 24 hours.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let us have another round.

An hon. Member: Are there any more fairy tales?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING MODIFICATION OF OPERATION

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that neither I nor the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Labour are likely to exceed the performance we have just witnessed.

I should like to direct the attention of the house to a question I asked on June 26. I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) whether he had any statement on government policy or intended modification of the administration of unemployment insurance which he might be able to give to the house. I think perhaps I put the point of my question a little more directly earlier in the session when I asked him if he had in mind doing anything about what I called the dehumanizing of the administration of unemployment insurance.

The point of the question I raised arises out of a situation which goes back to early 1967 when a policy was adopted which involved the closing out of many of the local unemployment insurance offices. two of these were in my constituency. Incidentally, the adoption of this policy involved a decision not to proceed with the establishment of a third one which had been regarded as being necessary in the community of Campbell River. In connection with the question I asked the minister on June 26, I sent across to him a copy of a petition containing some 40 pages of signatures of the residents of the community of Campbell River. It was worded in this fashion:

> We the undersigned, vigorously protest the complete lack of facilities at Campbell River to handle applications for Unemployment Insurance Benefits.
>
> We request that the Federal Government immediately open and maintain office facilities at Campbell River to serve the public in this area.

I might point out that this petition actually has two variations. The formulation I have just read I think presents the thinking of the people in a more positive way, but the original version under which some of the signatures were obtained states:

> We, the undersigned, wish to discontinue payment and endorsement to any and/or all public services who are no longer of public service, namely, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, 66 Front Street, Nanaimo, B.C.

In other words, the people who initiated this petition were so exasperated they wanted to take the matter in their own hands and cease making payments of premiums to the Unemployment Insurance fund. I believe usually, in circumstances of this kind, we know that a certain number of people will readily attach their signatures to petitions without giving too much thought to them. Nevertheless, when there is smoke to this extent there must be fire lying somewhere underneath.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I should say I have a file on this subject which goes back to early 1967. Let me quote briefly from a letter which I received from the secretary of one of the larger unions in my area. It is dated February 13, 1967 and in part it reads:

> The present system of a central office in Nanaimo covering all of Northern Vancouver Island is not working out at all. People have to wait for over a month for their claims to be processed and in talking to the manager in Nanaimo, he informed me they are snowed under with claims and away behind in processing same.
>
> There is not too much wrong with the mailing system—

I should point out that this letter was written long before the present incumbent in the office of Postmaster General suggested that we mail our Christmas cards now for next Christmas. Let me quote again from the letter as follows:

> There is not too much wrong with the mailing system, but there are many people who do not understand the forms and since they have no office in the immediate area to go to for assistance it is making it very awkward for these people—

There is a suggestion here that an unemployment insurance officer be situated in the municipality in the manpower office and should assist people in processing their claims. Following that, there was quite a long series of correspondence with the then Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Nicholson, and with the director of unemployment insurance. There was a great exchange back and forth of letters from the union officers and the administration. An attempt was made to clarify the situation, and admissions were also made that there were delays but that the commission

was taking steps to iron out the bugs which had developed initially in this operation.

I attempted not to be dogmatic about it. I think all of us are willing to have our public services administered with the least possible overhead cost, but I did express, during some discussion I had with the then Minister of Labour, very serious doubts that this system could actually function properly, certainly in the area with which I am familiar. I must say, for reasons I will not go into here, that I had a rather extended opportunity of travelling around the area of Vancouver Island earlier this year and last fall. At times I was not very far from the office of the unemployment insurance commission in the city of Nanaimo, but I had preoccupations which prevented me from going in and discussing this matter with the local management.

I must say that if there was one single subject about which I received a continuing refrain of complaints, more than any other, it was about the undue delay and awkwardness of the present system of trying to administer unemployment insurance by mail from a central office as far away from the places of residence and work of the people as is this office in Nanaimo. It may be ideal for some of the constituents of my friend the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), but there is no single office of the unemployment insurance commission in my constituency, which embraces roughly the northern three quarters of Vancouver Island.

I am not necessarily suggesting that we should go back completely to the old system of local office operation, but I am suggesting that there should be competent people to whom those desiring to make claims could go in convenient localities, and certainly in communities with a population of 20,000 or more, such as Port Alberni, or 10,000 or 12,000 such as Campbell River.

Hopefully the people are not going to have to apply for unemployment insurance all that often. I have received a continuous barrage of complaints about people being denied the benefits resulting from the premiums they have paid because the processing of them in some cases was delayed so long they were back to work before they received the benefits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked concerning the intention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) to make a statement prior to the recess on government policy in respect of modification to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the minister does not intend to make such a statement.

The second part of the same question refers to a document received from the residents of Campbell River. This document has now been received in the office of the Minister of Labour. Apparently it is a petition from some local residents to have an office of the unemployment insurance commission opened in Campbell River. Actually the Unemployment Insurance Commission has been aware for some time that such a petition would be forthcoming. Special statistics have been maintained for some months which show the use that would be made of such an office if it were located in Campbell River.

The figures show that, based on the standards in use by the commission on a Canada-wide basis, there is no justification for a permanent office when one considers the use that would be made of such a permanent office in Campbell River. In the past six weeks there have been less than 150 claims from persons living in Campbell River. This is far short of the standard of about 12,000 claims per year that is used as the commission's criteria for establishing an office. It is, therefore, obvious that the volume of potential work from Campbell River does not warrant a full-time office.

I would like, however, to make it very clear that on the basis of a review of current claims residents of Campbell River do receive adequate service from the commission through the use of postal services. The forms they must complete in order to claim unemployment insurance benefit have been so simplified that anyone with minimum education can complete them without difficulty. The actual process of claiming benefit can then be carried out quickly and efficiently by mail with the Nanaimo office which is only a few miles away.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A few miles?

Mr. McNulty: Despite what I have said, and even though the commission believes it is providing an efficient service to the persons living in Campbell River, it is prepared to further review the situation in the area. The work associated with the unemployment insurance in this locality is somewhat seasonal; at certain times of the year, due to weather

conditions a number of persons become unemployed at the same time and claim unemployment insurance. When these lay-off situations occur, it might be possible for the commission to temporarily station staff in Campbell River so that claim processing could be shortened a little. The possibility of operating in this manner will be examined.

In addition, the commission will continue to maintain statistics on the number of applicants for unemployment insurance benefit living in Campbell River, in order to keep the situation under continuous review. The commission will reconsider its decision if it should ever develop that the workload in the area warrants maintenance of a full-time office.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that persons living in Campbell River are receiving good and fast service from the Unemployment Insurance Commission, as is the case everywhere in Canada. However, the commission will re-examine its operations in the area to determine whether it would be possible to expedite the system somewhat at periods of peak claim activity by providing some kind of temporary special service at such times.

WATER RESOURCES—DIVERSION OF WATERS FROM HUDSON AND JAMES BAYS

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, last week in the house I raised a question which my people in Thunder Bay view as being of the utmost importance and urgency. I contend also that it is of considerable significance to the whole nation. I asked the minister who is responsible for energy and water resources, the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan, whether the federal government in co-operation with the province of Ontario is planning a proposed massive diversion of fresh water from the Hudson and James Bay watershed southward into Lake Superior. My immediate concern, of course, is for the people of the region and the changes which would be brought about in their environment as a result of a massive water diversion program.

• (10:20 p.m.)

The consequences of such a scheme have national ramifications as well, and it is time for the matter to be openly and thoroughly discussed before we make a commitment to sell our birthright. The effects of such a diversion program would certainly be drastic, in that thousands and thousands of acres would be flooded in the creation of vast water storage basins. Timber resources, trap lines, wildlife, fish and game would all be affected.

[Mr. McNulty.]

The balance of nature would certainly be upset. The Indian people who live on the reserves and settlements in the area, as well as the tourist camp operators, want to know what is likely to happen to their homes and establishments if and when such a plan is implemented.

There is in existence a report entitled "A Proposed Water Diversion Program Out of Northwestern Ontario into Lake Superior" dated June 25, 1964. Since this report was written, there have been six consecutive progress reports, the last of which is dated November, 1968. This last report contains sweeping plans and recommendations in detail for the diversion of the Winisk and other northern rivers.

All these reports have been submitted in restricted quantity to a federal-provincial co-ordinating committee on northern Ontario water resources studies and to a few officials of both the federal and Ontario governments. The entire study has been conducted under a veil of tight security and almost complete secrecy. I am asking the minister to table these reports in the house, so that we may know the goals and progress of this study.

The report states that the total cost of such a diversion program would be about $2.1 billion. It stresses the need for replenishing the water supply of the Great Lakes basin, and predicts the basin will have a population of 200 million within 100 years. We know many United States cities in the Great Lakes region are anxious and concerned about future sources of fresh water for domestic and industrial consumption.

What will this policy mean for our national sovereignty, Mr. Speaker? Once our northern rivers are diverted southward, we will become even more securely tied to the United States economy. The exporting of such a resource can never be curtailed once the flow begins. We in northwestern Ontario want to know: Is our government going to proceed with plans and proposals for the exporting of our fresh water to the United States?

An official of the Ontario Water Resources Commission said last Thursday that the federal and Ontario governments are conducting a study which could lead to diversion of some northern Ontario rivers and the sale of fresh water to the United States. If such is the policy of the government, Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I wish to be told about it. After all, fresh water has now become our most treasured natural resource. We in Thunder Bay once thought that gold, iron ore and

pulp were our major resources, but now we see that our fresh water is even more valuable. Our thousands of unpolluted lakes, streams and rivers are viewed with envy by many, particularly our neighbour to the south.

I am asking the government to lift the veil of secrecy which surrounds this study. Let the people of Canada in on those plans and proposals which will affect them so significantly. We in northwestern Ontario have plans and proposals for our economic development which may be restricted or helped by a water diversion program. I ask the government to consult with us. I ask them to practise participatory democracy, to take us into their confidence. Let them cast some light on the subject and thereby remove so much of the uncertainty, anxiety and apprehension that we feel when we contemplate the overwhelming alterations that are going to be made to our landscape.

Continually, my constituents are wanting to know what all this activity in northern Ontario is directed to and what is involved in all these hydrographic studies. We are asking the government to assure us that our national sovereignty is not in jeopardy. Show us that conservation and concern for nature is part of this over-all proposal.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, some days ago the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) first raised the question of the diversion for export of water from northern Ontario in a way which revealed that those in his part of the country are deeply concerned about the issue of water. Water, of course, is a most important resource and it is our experience in this country that our people are very concerned about this resource, about plans and discussions pertaining to its use, and how they will be affected by that use, particularly when water is to be diverted for export. I think the hon. member for Thunder Bay has done a great service to his constituents by raising this matter in order that this issue and the nature of the study now under way can be discussed, and in order that the fears of his constituents may be put aside.

The studies under way, of course, are exercises in analyzing the nature of the resources in question and what can conceivably be done with them. It is a most difficult problem to consider and it is most difficult for the government to study all the factors tied to the use of water and all questions arising from the effects of water diversion.

The hon. member mentioned problems relating to timber, wildlife and general ecological circumstances that would prevail in the area in the event of a diversion. I wish to assure him, and the people of the watershed being studied, that before any question of diversion or export arises the fullest kind of consultation with the people of the area and the people of this country generally will take place. The full effects and impacts of any decisions will be thoroughly examined. I assure the hon. member and the people of his area that these are merely technical studies into questions of costs and possibilities, and that they in no way indicate that any decision has been taken by government; nor do they indicate what will be or should be done. Before any decision can be taken all aspects of the matter so eloquently referred to must undergo a great deal of further examination.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 15, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRIVILEGE

MR. STANLEY KNOWLES—CONFEDERATION—MANITOBA'S ONE HUNDREDTH YEAR AS A PROVINCE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, one in which I am sure all members of the house will be happy to concur. It so happens that on July 15, 1870, 99 years ago today, the first four provinces of Canada were joined by the province of Manitoba, the first province to enter confederation after it had been established. This means that today we are entering our one hundredth year as a province of Canada. As members must be aware, plans have been made for appropriate celebrations of this important occasion. Established by a previous government, a commission headed by Mr. Maitland Steinkopf has been working for some time to make plans for the celebration of our centennial as a province. We in Manitoba hope that many thousands of Canadians will visit us during this year, particularly as we approach the historic date of July 15, 1970.

I am sure hon. members will pardon me if I add one footnote, namely, that it is a particular pleasure for me to note that we are entering this historic year with a new provincial government. I am sure all hon. members will want to extend best wishes to our former colleague, who until a few weeks ago was the hon. member for Selkirk, but who today has become Premier Schreyer of Manitoba.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Sir, you sometimes say to a member who has raised a question of privilege that he has neglected to follow it with a motion. I do not have a written motion but perhaps it could be assumed I have moved, seconded by all the other members from my province, that the house is happy to extend its best wishes to the government and people of Manitoba as we enter this historic one hundredth year of our being part of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as one who was born in Manitoba and as one who received his education there may I be permitted, although a member from that great city of Toronto, to join in supporting the motion put forward by the hon. gentleman. It is a great pleasure for me to know that my native province is now entering upon the celebration of its one hundredth anniversary. I can say on behalf of the government that I hope we will be joining in that celebration of the accession of such an important province to our confederation.

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, as a member from Manitoba I wish to join in extending to other members a welcome to Manitoba as it is about to enter its second century as a province of Canada.

• (2:10 p.m.)

TRADE

WHEAT—REQUEST FOR CONSENT UNDER S.O. 43 TO MOTION RESPECTING PRICE, CASH SHORTAGE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the house under Standing Order 43 to make the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski):

> That the Standing Committee on Agriculture be instructed to examine immediately the consequences for prairie grain producers of the failure to restore the minimum International Grains Arrangement price; to consider and recommend measures to ensure a satisfactory minimum price to the Canadian producer; and to consider and recommend measures to alleviate the critical cash shortage facing western farmers.

Under Standing Order 43 I believe I am entitled to give a very brief explanation of the urgent and pressing necessity for this motion. I am sure it is unnecessary to make any such explanation to hon. members who have the interests of the prairie grain growers at heart, as we all have.

The International Grains Agreement is, in effect, a dead letter. Not only has the floor price been effectively abandoned but the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), is not even confident that last week's conference has served to stave off another crisis.

Reports are that the price for top quality Canadian wheat may drop by 20 to 25 cents per bushel. Under these circumstances, given unprecedented surpluses of wheat in Canada and the critical cash shortage, the fall-off in retail sales throughout the prairies and the consequent serious threat to the prairie economy, and in view of the failure of the government to announce a policy to meet the emergency, I am sure that no hon. member will dispute that this is a case of urgent and pressing necessity as called for under Standing Order 43, and that no hon. member who is concerned would refuse unanimous consent to proceed with this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members have heard the proposed motion by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

An hon. Member: Wait until they hear about this in Winnipeg.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: How will the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) answer that one in Calgary?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He will probably answer it very well.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

TRADE

WHEAT—LACK OF SUPPORT PRICE UNDER INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the collapse of the International Grains Arangement in guaranteeing a minimum international price support for wheat, as announced yesterday in the house by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), the absence of any government policy for maintaining a minimum wheat price support, and the resultant unprecedented danger facing the entire western economy.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 26 the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) has given due notice of his request to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing th matter outlined in the motion which has just been read to the house by the hon. member. There is little doubt in the mind of the Chair that the matter raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar is of great concern and of the utmost importance to the country as a whole. However, the question before the Chair is one of a procedural nature that must be resolved in accordance with the intention and the provisions of Standing Order 26.

The statement made yesterday by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) and the communiqué tabled by him dealt with a matter that has been before the house for many weeks. For example at pages 6740 and 6741 of *Hansard* for March 18, 1969, a number of questions were posed to the minister dealing with compensation for the shortfall of prices under the International Grains arrangement. Again, on May 8, 1969, at pages 8467 and 8468 of *Hansard,* a number of questions were posed concerning difficulties in the international wheat market. On May 16, 1969, as reported at page 8779 of *Hansard,* the minister was again questioned concerning the adherence of Australia to the International Grains Arrangement.

The latter part of the hon. member's statement deals with "the absence of any government policy for maintaining a minimum wheat price support". It is suggested to the hon. member that the latter portion of his statement raises a question which, raised in other terms, was resolved earlier this session by decision of the House of Commons. May I refer hon. members to pages 981 to 983 of *Votes and Proceedings* for May 1, 1969, where a supply motion by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth), seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), was proposed as follows:

That in the opinion of this house the government has failed to deal with the seriously deteriorating net income for Canadian agriculture,

as a result of which farmers in all parts of Canada are unable to obtain necessary operating capital to finance the 1969-70 crop year.

In amendment thereto the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, seconded by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), proposed as follows:

That the motion be amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Canadian agriculture", the following words:

"which in the prairie provinces is due in the main to declining grain prices and reduced delivery quotas."

This motion gave rise to a far-ranging discussion which in my view covered fairly well the grounds raised in the proposed motion of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. It is suggested to hon. members that the situation brought to the attention of the house by the hon. member who proposed the motion relating to the International Grains Arrangement is not of recent occurrence. It is, rather, in the nature of a continuing problem. The minister's statement of yesterday, commented upon on motions and examined at length during the question period, does not appear to reveal such new circumstances as would justify a debate under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

AGRICULTURE

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO MEASURES TO ASSIST WESTERN FARMERS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a very direct question for the Minister of Finance. I hope he is able to give me a yes or no answer, preferably yes. Is the government now actively considering any special measures on an emergency basis to meet the critical cash position of western grain farmers?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the government's policy in this regard will be announced in the house in the usual manner.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Scandalous!

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the seriousness of the situation and the present cash shortage on the farms, especially grain farms, and the fact that this has caused farm machinery sales to fall by some 30 to 50 per cent this year, with the accompanying problems, does the government plan any action to meet the emergency that is developing so rapidly?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the government's policy will, as normal, be announced when it is determined.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have one further question in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the replies of the Minister of Finance. Has the attention of the minister been drawn to the statement of the Saskatchewan Implement Dealers Association concerning the serious drop in sales and the very critical condition regarding inventories? If so, what is the attitude of the government of Canada in this regard? Has it, for example, any plans to meet the responsible leaders of the governments most immediately concerned? Has it any plans at all?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, the Prime Minister is at the present time in the west meeting the heads of the provincial governments there. It is the intention of the government to do all within its power to assist the people of western Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nothing has been done.

Mr. Benson: What did you do in the seven years you were in office?

GRAIN

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENT TO FARMERS OF I.G.A. FLOOR PRICE—RESTORING OF PRICES—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who is on the roster today but is unfortunately absent. Therefore may I direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Inasmuch as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce indicated yesterday that there will be a further decline in wheat prices and as the present crop year ends in about two weeks, and since the farmers have a right to know what prices they will obtain, does the government intend to pay the farmers through the Canadian Wheat Board on the basis of the floor price under the International Grains Arrangement?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is in Winnipeg today having discussions with the Canadian Wheat Board upon many of the matters that are being discussed here. So far as I know it is not the intention to fix the initial price at the

minimum under the International Grains Arrangement. That international agreement unfortunately is not working as we would like it to.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the government of the United States has announced that in order to meet the wheat price war it is prepared to subsidize wheat prices to United States farmers, does the Canadian government intend to subsidize our farmers for wheat delivered in the 1968-69 crop year?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the policy of subsidizing wheat exports from the United States is long-standing and is a policy against which we have often protested because it is inimical to the interests of our western farmers. So far as our policy of assistance to western agriculture is concerned, I merely repeat what the Minister of Finance said. When that policy has been determined it will be announced.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since we have had similar replies for some months, will the Acting Prime Minister tell the house when we may expect this statement of government policy with respect to assistance to western agriculture?

An hon. Member: After parliament has risen.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, it will be necessary for the government to make decisions on some of these matters very shortly because of the opening of the new crop year.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who is absent today, promised me yesterday that he would produce the schedule of prices that the Wheat Board is charging for wheat, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister if he will table this schedule?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As my hon. friend knows, this information is published every day and there is no difficulty in obtaining it. He can obtain it by inquiring but I will be very happy to see that it is tabled.

Mr. Harkness: Then why didn't the Minister of Trade and Commerce give it to us yesterday?

[Mr. Sharp.]

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it has been announced that the purpose of the initiative of the United States is to restore prices under the International Grains Arrangement, is the government of Canada going to associate itself with the United States in a concerted and joint effort to restore these prices? In other words, has the government of Canada any plans to support the reported efforts of the United States to restore these prices?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Leader of the Opposition that it was on the initiative of Canada that the ministerial meeting was held.

Mr. Stanfield: Come, now.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of developments which have taken place over the last few years, does the government intend to formulate selling programs that will enable us to move back into the position we occupied previously when we had 25 per cent of the International Grain Market?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is the aim of the Canadian Wheat Board to restore this country to that position. That is one of the reasons why the government and the Canadian Wheat Board have emphasized the importance of remaining competitive. Of couse, it is our desire to be competitive at a higher price level but when our competitors lower their prices we must meet their competition.

Mr. Gleave: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the International Grains Arrangement was negotiated under the auspices of the Kennedy round initiated under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, has the government considered asking the responsible countries to meet and review the present position of this agreement?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is within the context of the Kennedy round that all these discussions have taken place. We are very much aware, as the hon. member has pointed out, that the International Grains Arrangement was an intrinsic part of the Kennedy round and that the balance of advantage has been upset because certain countries have failed to comply with that agreement. We have these factors very much in mind in all our negotiations with our customers and fellow members in the agreement.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer given by the Acting Prime Minister to the previous question and in view of the fact that the I.G.A. was negotiated within the context of the Kennedy round, is it the view of the government that this now negates every Kennedy round agreement to which Canada is a party, and does the government plan to take any countermeasures in retaliation for what has happened to the I.G.A.?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, our general position is that under the Kennedy round the balance of advantage was very much with Canada apart from the International Grains Arrangement, though this was an added benefit. Therefore we are striving mightily to retain as much of the agreement as can be salvaged.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the uncertainty and the vacuity of the answers that have been given in regard to the situation in western Canada, which is serious beyond words, will the Acting Prime Minister say whether the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday that what the western farmers should do is to cut down their production of wheat represents the consensus of government policy?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister of Canada speaks he speaks, of course, for the government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Acting Prime Minister say whether the government has any intention of bringing in something in the nature of acreage payments? Can we not get an answer from this government? When we are dealing with the western farmers, all we receive is contemptuous disregard.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether that deserves an answer, but I do know that I should point out to the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert that great objection was taken to the Prime Minister going to western Canada at this time. I think it is most important for the Prime Minister to be there and to come with direct answers. I know of no one in Canada who is more concerned about the people and farmers of western Canada than the Prime Minister.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Acting Prime Minister say whether the fact that there are only three western ministers in the cabinet has made it impossible for the government to know what is going on?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Prime Minister. Has the Acting Prime Minister now reconsidered statements made by himself and others of his colleagues in past years in which the western farmers were told: "You grow the wheat and we will sell it"?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair has been as lenient as possible in allowing these supplementaries in view of the importance of the matter, but having now reached the area of debate I think we should pass on to another subject.

OIL

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPE LINE RESEARCH, LIMITED—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FORMATION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources would be among the ministers present today, but there are only eight ministers in the house. In any event, since the ministers' parliamentary secretary is here I might give him something to answer.

Will the minister shortly make a statement in the house relative to the formation of Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research, Limited, a consortium of four leading oil companies, whose purpose is to determine technological and other feasibility studies on a large diameter oil pipe line from the north slope of Alaska and related Canadian Arctic areas along the Mackenzie River valley to Edmonton, and on to the North American market? As a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The question will only be taken as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member cannot ask a supplementary question now; perhaps he might ask it later. The question as asked by the hon. member is acceptable under the rules, as he knows, only to the extent that the hon. member is asking the minister when a statement will be made on motions.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, since this question falls

within my area of responsibility I will dare to answer it by saying no. However, since hon. members may not remember the beginning of the question, may I say that we certainly welcome this development and will watch it with great interest. I think—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remember the beginning of the question.

INQUIRY AS TO SECRET AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang). Now that a prominent senator has publicly stated that the 1967 secret oil agreement between Canada and the United States is illegal, will the minister tell the house whether a more recent secret and illegal agreement has been negotiated?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure whether the question as asked is in order.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALEUTIAN ISLANDS—PROPOSED NUCLEAR TESTS—INQUIRY AS TO CONSULTATION

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the misgivings expressed by wildlife conservationists about the possibility of triggering earthquakes along the Pacific coast, has the government of Canada been consulted about the proposed massive underground nuclear tests at Anchitka in the Aleutians next October?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the hon. member's earth-shaking question is in order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the matter I wonder whether I might have permission to restate my earth-shaking question. Has the government of Canada made any representations to or received any information from the government of the United States concerning the possible ramifications of the proposed underground nuclear tests in the Aleutian Islands?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, personally I have not. It may be that my officials have and I will make inquiries.

[Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt).]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

RAPIDITY OF MAIL DELIVERY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the congenial Postmaster General. It is based on the minister's recent pronouncement to the effect that "99 per cent of the people in this country for 99 per cent of the time receive their mail within 24 hours." Considering that for the majority of Canadians there is no mail delivery on Saturday and Sunday, a 48-hour period, can the minister advise whether his statement on speedy mail delivery means that only one per cent of Post Office patrons—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is 99 per cent argumentative.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED STATEMENT BY BRIGADIER GENERAL HAMILTON RESPECTING STARVATION AND WAR

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister undertaken an investigation into the report that Brigadier General Charles Hamilton, Canadian member of the international observer team in Nigeria, is alleged to have stated that, from all the chronicals of war and personal experience, "starvation is a legitimate weapon of war"?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have had a report and I can deny that Brigadier Hamilton said the things he was accused of saying.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister made any protest to the government of Nigeria, an officer of which is reported to have attributed this remark to the Canadian general?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker. I did not know the Nigerian government was involved. What I received was an account of what the officer had said and it was said in the presence of witnesses. I therefore have no hesitation in saying he was misquoted, but I did not know that the Nigerian government was involved.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): A supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Did the officer say anything

at all about starvation and its relation to carrying on a war? If so, what did he say about it?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to obtain the text. I do not know whether it would be appropriate to give it by way of reply or to send it to the hon. gentleman. Mr. Hamilton was being cross-examined by a reporter in a general way. When it came to questions on whether he considered starvation was an appropriate method of ending the war in Nigeria, he said he had nothing to say about it.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask Your Honour's permission for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to table the record of the interview to which the minister has made reference so that all hon. members may see it?

Mr. Sharp: I would be happy to do so.

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED FLIGHT SAFETY COMMITTEE—AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport I wish to direct my question to whoever is acting in this capacity today. Can the Acting Minister say what reply has been made to the Canadian Airlines Pilots Association brief in which it is suggested that a national flight safety committee be established? Will the Acting Minister also say whether the Department of Transport has any plans to form a departmental flight safety committee, either internally or at the national level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport I will undertake to refer the question to him. I understand the minister will be in the house tomorrow and will probably furnish the answer.

Mr. Forrestall: I wish to pose a further supplementary—I ask that notice be taken of it—to the President of the Treasury Board who is also supposed to be here today but is absent. In light of reports that the Department of Transport flight safety committee has not been formed because Treasury Board has not authorized funds, will the minister say what the intention of Treasury Board is in regard to this very important matter?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): I will be glad to bring that question to the attention of the President of the Treasury Board.

INFORMATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF TASK FORCE

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Acting Prime Minister. Has the government received the report of the task force on information, and will the minister advise when it will be tabled in the house?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the first question. I will make inquiries. I have not personally received it. It may have been received in the Prime Minister's office. However, I am not certain.

Mr. Paproski: Are allegations of patronage and news management the reason the government is hiding this report?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Sharp: May I add a little more accurately to my reply to a question asked earlier. The report of the task force on information was received in the Prime Minister's office last week. I think the Prime Minister has already given some information to this effect, and I would not want there to be any difference of opinion between him and me.

Mr. Paproski: Would the Acting Prime Minister give the assurance that parliament will have an opportunity to review any changes in government information services, particularly in light of the government's notorious disregard of the rights of a free parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES AND YUKON—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. May I say first that the Secretary of State for External Affairs assumes the post of Acting Prime Minister admirably. Has the government come to a decision about self-government for the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question of the constitutional future of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon is under study. No decisions have yet been made.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Howard (Skeena): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as this matter was presented to cabinet last January, can the minister tell us how much longer it may be before a decision is reached or whether he intends to impose closure in the cabinet in order to get the matter through for debate?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RESERVE FORCES—INQUIRY AS TO COMPLETION OF REVIEW

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Has the government completed its review of the reserve forces with a view to determining what their strength will be in the immediate future, and did the government seek the advice of the Conference of Defence Associations on this important matter?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): The answer to the first question is no, Mr. Speaker. This is because we have been consulting with the Defence Associations and we are going to meet again, I believe, early in August. We expect that after that our plans will be clarified and we will be able to announce them.

POWER

MINAS BASIN FEASIBILITY STUDY—INQUIRY AS TO AVAILABILITY

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I gave the minister notice of this question last week. When does the minister expect the feasibility study on Minas Basin power will be available?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as previously indicated in the house, the report is in its final stages of completion. It is being prepared and is expected some time in the autumn.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When this report is made available to the government, will the minister and the government undertake to make it public as quickly as possible?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the report is available, that will be given consideration.

[Mr. Sharp.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SAC BOMBER SITES—POSSIBLE LOCATION IN CANADA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of National Defence whether there has been any request or approach on the part of United States officials with regard to the possibility of dispersing SAC bomber sites and locating some of them in Canada?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I believe, but no decision has been taken in that regard.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. He will recall that last Thursday I asked him some questions with regard to a program for student employment this summer and he said he would undertake to make a progress report to the house on the subject. I wonder whether he has it today or when he intends to make it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I assure my hon. friend I will carry out the undertaking and will either table a report or give it verbally before the house closes or as early as possible.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether it is possible for the minister to indicate the date on which he will be ready to make this report? Surely it has been under discussion for some time.

Mr. MacEachen: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be certain to give my hon. friend advance notice so that he will not be caught off guard.

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

MARITIMES UNION—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN HEARINGS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, since the dates for the hearings on Maritimes union have been announced, can the Acting Prime Minister say whether the federal government has given any consideration to holding a watching brief or making an appearance in another form during the course of these hearings?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I will take the suggestion of the hon. member under consideration.

Mr. Bell: Because of the direct federal involvement in many aspects which may develop and also the fact that a lack of federal interest may be misunderstood, would the Acting Prime Minister give this matter active consideration and even consider telephoning the Prime Minister out west?

Mr. Sharp: I thank the hon. member for his suggestion.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

"MANHATTAN" PROJECT—REMARK BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Was there any implication in the remark of the Prime Minister last evening on television when he referred to the *Manhattan* project operating north of Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Prime Minister's comments and certainly as Secretary of State for External Affairs I find myself in full agreement with what he said.

Mr. MacInnis: Does it have any bearing on the sovereignty of Canada in the north?

Mr. Sharp: I perhaps misunderstood the subtlety of the question put by the hon. gentleman. May I say that I agree entirely with what the Prime Minister said to the effect that the voyage of the *Manhattan* does not reflect at all on the sovereignty of Canada.

Mr. MacInnis: In view of the fact the Prime Minister indicated last evening on television that he expects to accomplish nothing on his trip west, does the minister consider it a stupid trip?

HOUSING

URBAN RENEWAL—COMMITMENT RESPECTING HAMILTON PROJECT

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing. In light of the fact that the minister met with representatives from the city of Hamilton when I understand there was a discussion with regard to urban renewal projects, would the minister advise what transpired at that meeting and whether a firm commitment was given with regard to the Hamilton urban renewal project on York Street?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): No firm commitment was given except that a decision would be made as soon as possible. I hope to announce decisions in respect of urban renewal projects shortly. I had hoped to be in a position to do so today but I find I need further information both within government and from some of the communities. I hope to get on with it as quickly as possible because I realize the delays are causing some difficulty.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, may I take it from that that the minister does not intend to visit any urban centres prior to the time he makes his announcement but rather will be meeting with the representatives of the urban centres in Ottawa?

Mr. Andras: I do not see how any such inference can be taken. It may be necessary for me to visit some centres but, on the other hand, several representatives of the municipalities have been coming to see me. We may work in both ways.

Mr. Alexander: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me. May I take it then that the minister will not be able to hand down a decision until—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid I cannot bear with the hon. member to this extent. The question is not in order.

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN CANADA—INQUIRY AS TO STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON RETURN FROM TRIP

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of his earlier statement to the effect that the Prime Minister is in western Canada gathering first hand information about economic conditions there, can we be assured that the Prime Minister will be making a statement to the house upon his return regarding the government's intentions and policy in respect of the economic situation in western Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, as was said earlier in reply to a number of questions, there are certain decisions which cannot be long delayed such as a decision in respect of the

initial price of wheat, oats and barley for the new crop year beginning August 1. So I suggest there will be some decisions announced very soon.

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO MEETINGS WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister in charge of housing whether he has met with any or all of the provincial ministers who are his counterparts, as indicated on May 6 in the house?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, meetings are scheduled to start the last week of July and continue through the first week of August. I will be in a better position to report after these meetings have taken place.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS—PREFERENCE FOR OTHER UNEMPLOYED

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration which is really supplementary to that put by the hon. member for York South. In the minister's instructions to his officials concerning the summer employment program for students has he taken steps to ensure that jobs will not be made available to students which otherwise would have gone to unemployed men or women, particularly those with families?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult question to answer offhand. We are doing our best to find jobs for unemployed persons with family responsibilities whether they be students or otherwise. We are trying to meet the requirements of the labour market for both groups.

Mr. Broadbent: The specific question I asked is whether the minister gave instructions to his department that unemployed men and women should be given preference over students?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian manpower centres we have been operating for a good many years under well recognized international standards of selection. We do not intend to import any kind of discrimination.

[Mr. Sharp.]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DRAFT POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the minister in charge of housing. Would the hon. gentleman table the draft policy statement on Indian Affairs that he prepared when he held another position?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will have to give that question a great deal of consideration.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister why the Minister of National Health and Welfare is not in the house? He is outside the chamber answering questions on television when he should be in the house.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECRETARIAL STAFF—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PAY INCREASES

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting President of the Treasury Board which he can take as notice. Will he make a statement regarding pay increases for the house secretarial staff?

Hon. Eric Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I will bring this matter to the attention of the President of the Treasury Board.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FROM FARM UNIONS TO MEET PRIME MINISTER ON WESTERN TRIP

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he is in a position to answer the question I asked yesterday with regard to whether the Prime Minister's office had received a request from the farm unions to meet with them when he was out west and whether he had acceded to that request?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did make inquiries of the Prime Minister's office and he has received an invitation. I do not think he will be seeing these organizations formally but I am quite sure he will see many of their members who will make their views known.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NUMBER OF INFORMATION OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENT

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, having in mind the table presented yesterday indicating that the Department of National Defence has no less than 71 public information officers on staff, will consideration be given to introducing a measure of youth again in the services?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be afforded the opportunity of correcting this information. The number of 71 includes all personnel working in the branch and information officers would make up about half that number.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

MAINTENANCE OF EFFECTIVE PRESENCE IN ARCTIC

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence whether, apart from the intention to patrol the Arctic waters this summer, the government contemplates any measures extending beyond this summer to maintain an effective Canadian presence in the Arctic?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note that the Leader of the Opposition approves the policy of the government which is to extend coverage to maintain Canadian sovereignty all around Canada, including the northern Arctic waters.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not express approval or disapproval; I asked a question. The minister is one of a few who try to answer questions and I hope he will not lose that reputation.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MEMBERS OF ONTARIO COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to orders of the day I should like to call Your Honour's attention to a distinguished group of parliamentarians in the Speaker's gallery from the Ontario legislature, the members of the special Ontario committee on procedure. They have come to Ottawa—

An hon. Member: They have come to the wrong place.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —to see how we carry out the official procedures of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED ARRANGEMENT FOR MEMBERS TO ATTEND SUMMER GAMES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before you call orders of the day I should like to ask a question of the President of the Privy Council. I might say it is very difficult to get any information out of him in respect of both government plans and the business of the house. Will he consider working out a schedule for all private members on the government side which will enable them to discharge their responsibilities in the house and also spend some time at the first Canada summer games in Halifax between August 16 and August 25?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I might say that if the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are prepared to withdraw the filibuster they are now conducting we could carry out that suggestion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

SUGGESTED DEBATE ON COLLAPSE OF INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, now that we are discussing procedures and house business I wonder whether I might put a question to the government house leader. There has been expressed on several occasions, notably today, a desire on the part of many members to have a discussion of the collapse of the International Grains Arrangement. Would the government house leader consider trying to ascertain, through the usual channels, whether arrangements could be made for a day to debate this issue? I have no authority to speak for all the opposition parties but I imagine we could agree to the use of one of the two days still standing to us as opposition allotted days. Perhaps arrangements could be made to have such a discussion later this week or one day next week.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will undertake, as soon as the procedural changes have

been enacted by the house, to call that as the next order of business.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, first of all may I point out that this matter should be debated before the crop year is over. But the question I should like to put to the government house leader is, will he answer my question as to whether he will consult with other house leaders to see if such an arrangement could be made?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would be quite prepared to consult on that point if the hon. member would consult equally on bringing the present debate to an end.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That's easy. Just remove 75c.

REQUEST FOR LIST OF OUTSTANDING RETURNS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the government house leader whether he would mind getting someone on his staff to look at the number of returns which the house has ordered to be made as a result of questions and motions and to compile a list so that members can see which ones are still outstanding?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I should be glad to make inquiries in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Monday, July 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, in the remaining five minutes left to me may I first be permitted to bid a fond welcome to our guests from Ontario who, through some process, have happened to find themselves in the House of Commons to learn from our procedures. I think most of us here envy them. Perhaps nobody has ever put this on record to date. While they think they are underpaid in comparison with us, they have a great way of paying those who work on their committees during times apart from the ordinary sessions of parliament. This is unknown to us here.

I had intended to complete my refresher course for my very good friends opposite on Liberalism, the right of free discussion, and free opinion. Unfortunately the *Hansard* staff did not return a volume on Liberalism and important speeches made by Liberals between 1919 and the present date, so I cannot give them a very fine quotation from the late Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King in which he pointed out very succinctly, in one of the very best paragraphs I have read about this right of free speech, that when democracy obliterated itself things like Hitlerism were allowed to rise in Europe because people made very light of their parliamentary institutions.

This was a complaint I made yesterday about the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), that he was setting himself up as a poseur between the parliamentary process and all the people it is designed to serve and those people who had elected him last June 25. I repeat the argument I made last night by saying that the right hon. gentleman has done a great disservice to himself and to Canada by opposing with the might of his office that prestige and that leadership an important political party could have, by pretending this place was filled with idiots, oafs and buffoons. He has done a disservice, but the disservice will not rest upon our shoulders ultimately. We will have wit to escape this type of approach, and the disservice will rest upon him.

Rule 75c represents tyranny. It is tyranny doubled and compounded, because the right hon. Prime Minister and other gentlemen opposite as well as on this side chose to reject 16A last December. There is no difference between 16A and the new principle of 75c.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Frankenstein has recreated his monster. He has substituted a consonant for a vowel, made some facial changes, pruned the ears back a little more, and perhaps sharpened the teeth; but the fact is that 75c has exactly the same purpose as 16A. I reject it, my colleagues on this side of the house reject it, and we shall be here all summer rejecting it—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCleave: —until the conscience of those opposite, who belong to a party that

espouses the right of free speech, is reawakened and resurrected to the extent that this invidious and insidious rule will be thrown out.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): It will not be done under this Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many minutes I have left. I would like to make three suggestions as to how we can extricate ourselves from this problem. I shall make my remarks as short as possible but I think that perhaps for the first time in my parliamentary life I will ask the indulgence of the house to enable me to complete putting forward these three ideas. I promise not to trespass outside the few notes I have in my hand.

The first suggestion is simply that 75A and 75B be accepted by the house. Some people may have a caveat or rider to attach to that. However, I suggest that those two rules be accepted by the house on a year's trial.

My second suggestion concerns what is popularly known here as the *Globe and Mail* formula. In an editorial the *Globe and Mail*—I think even before we started our deliberations—suggested that the important thing about debate was to give the country a chance to formulate its opinions and make them known to members of parliament. That newspaper suggested that, perhaps not so importantly a member of parliament should initially state those opinions, but somewhere in the parliamentary process the opinions should have a chance to be stated. I think that is a valid point. I do not claim for myself the right to rise and trumpet an opinion that somebody else has put forward, but I think the opinion should be squarely in our minds when deciding collectively what legislation should be passed. I am not a great admirer of the *Globe and Mail*. I get tired of its sending people from Toronto to Ottawa who go back and do two things.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member, but I must bring to the attention of the house that the hon. member's time has expired. He may continue only with the unanimous agreement of the house. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleagues for their courtesy and I shall conclude my remarks as quickly as possible. I get tired of the peregrinations to Ottawa of reporters of the *Globe and Mail* because when they return to Toronto they do two things. The second thing is that they write about members of parliament receiving $18,000 a year. And the first thing they write is their expense account. They have the right to come here and charge their expenses, but they do not think members of parliament have the right to come to Ottawa from Vancouver, Halifax, St. John's, or wherever it may be, earn this salary and be paid a travelling allowance. I realize that these people probably solve the office space problem by placing two seats in one stall. However, they write their opinions about us. Now for once in my life I recognize that they have a valid point. When looking for a better way of dealing with our business we have to put it on the most orderly basis. In this respect I am in agreement with the *Globe and Mail*. To achieve this end means obtaining outside opinion.

I present my third suggestion without having consulted anybody, but in the hope we can resolve the situation in which we find ourselves, and leave shortly for a summer recess, although some of us will not have a summer recess because we have to attend committee meetings in August and September. I suggest that the problem of allocation of time and mustering of public opinion come together not really in the House of Commons but in our committee system. I think we can find the answer there. I make this suggestion to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), the Acting Prime Minister, all hon. members and you, Mr. Speaker, as a possible solution to the problem.

I suggest that we form a backbenchers' committee of this place, say of five or six members from either side of the house. In a moment I shall suggest the formula by which they be chosen. These members should consider ways by which the committee system may be made more workable. I am a great believer in the committee system. I think I have probably sat on as many committees as anybody else. I have given the system my all. I said last night, and I firmly believe, that it was of great credit to hon. members on both sides of the house that in the year since the last election we have done our best to receive any subject referred to committee, give it our best thought, discussion and deliberation, and come up with the best answer for the people of Canada.

I still believe in that approach. Nothing in the angry words that people on this or the

other side of the house say will ever change my mind in this respect. We can work together. We have proven that we can. We may have come off the track once in a while, but we can get back on it and forget about the little anger we have shown. We can work out a time allocation. A representative group of backbenchers can decide how best this can be done. This does not mean that the government will reach into the committee system. This point has not been dealt with very much in the debate. The fact is that a great many of my colleagues on the back benches are not the beautiful people of the House of Commons; we are not ministers, we are not parliamentary secretaries, we are not chairmen of committees, we are not deputies of this, that or the other.

Mr. Alexander: We are just the workers.

Mr. McCleave: We are the people who make parliament work. There are about 200 of us. We come from all parties and all provinces of Canada. I throw out this suggestion for the consideration of our important elders, the beautiful people to whom I have just referred. The opposition side should pick the three best committee people from the government side of the house. The government side should pick those they regard as the best three, four or five—whatever number is determined—people from the opposition side of the house. Those people should be given time to consider this problem. There should be consultation with everybody in the chamber. However, I believe this could be done in, say, two months.

The members chosen should be given time to work out some kind of formula for the conduct of committees. It should be a good formula so that anybody who feels himself, herself, or if an association, itself, aggrieved by legislation would at least have the opportunity to appear before us. This suggestion may offend those who think purism exists only in the House of Commons. I do not think it will offend those who believe the committee system is a very valuable part of the proceedings of this place.

This is the suggestion I make, Mr. Speaker. I make it in humility and because I believe that when committees are unfettered and allowed to reach a consensus they will go out and do the job required for the House of Commons.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before the hon. member resumes his seat would he mind if I asked a question? His second point, as I gather it, is taken from the *Globe and Mail* editorial. I gather the position of the *Globe and Mail* is that 75c would be acceptable provided there is a minimum of one month's time with respect to any bill on the order paper. Is that what the hon. member is proposing to the house?

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I confess that I did not read the *Globe and Mail* editorial as carefully as I should have, or as carefully as the President of the Privy Council appears to have read it. My second and third suggestions ought to be considered together. In some cases one month may be too long; on the other hand with bills like the Indian Act amendment one month might be far too little. The idea is that there must be enough time for us in parliament to inform the country what is happening and to enlighten public opinion. My approach to this matter, in a way of speaking, is the backbenchers' approach or the committee approach. Our opinions ought to be made known to the country. That is what I was trying to say.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I seldom take part in debates on the rules, usually being content to leave discussions on these matters to others who have become more or less experts on the subject. Some are experts on our complicated procedures and on the involved interpretations of rules as set out by Erskine, May, Beauchesne and others.

May I say in passing that I think part of the time which this measure is supposedly designed to save could be saved if less time were devoted to some of the more abstruse discussions on the rules which take place on occasion. Sometimes we may talk about the rules for several hours during any one week.

As has been pointed out by many in this debate, we can utilize many methods to save time in this house other than the one proposed by the government. In this case, however, we are not embarked on the usual kind of rules debate. This really is an effort by the government to emasculate parliament. It is an effort to take away from the representatives of the people in this chamber their right to discuss a government measure at sufficient length so that its weaknesses may be exposed and so that the general public may become aware of those weaknesses.

I think parliamentary histories and histories of countries demonstrate that only as a

result of considerable debate can the function of the opposition in parliament be exercised. Only that way can the beneficial results—and I think we all admit they are beneficial—of a proper opposition in parliament be secured for the people of the country.

One could point to many examples of what the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is pleased to call a filibuster. Generally people on the government front benches call them filibusters. In many cases far from being filibusters those proceedings ought to have been called debates, designed to alert the general public to the dangers of legislation being presented to the house and to secure a sufficient interest in the matter so that public opinion might be brought to bear, and in turn so that the government might be brought to realize that the legislation being proposed needed to be changed.

One could point to all sorts of examples in recent years of so-called filibusters, the two most outstanding being the debate on Mr. Howe's proposals to retain certain powers under the Defence Production Act, and the pipeline debate. There is no hon. member here who could not cite many other examples. They all show how necessary it is for opposition parties to be able to debate for a sufficiently long time measures brought forward by the government, in order to arouse public opinion. That such debate is necessary I think is self-evident, and any student or lover of the democratic process will readily admit that there is necessity for such debate.

The ostensible reasons the government has for introducing proposed rule 75c are to save the time of the house, to prevent obstruction in the house by the opposition, and so on. I ask hon. members on the government side who are putting forward this proposal, what obstruction are they talking about? What obstruction has prevailed in the past year that makes necessary a rule like 75c? If they answer that question reasonably and fairly perhaps the only measure they can point to in which there was any obstruction at all was the omnibus bill to amend the Criminal Code. In any event I think that proposed rules 75A and 75B would have been sufficient to deal with that situation, and there would not have been any need to invoke rule 75c.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the proposal to introduce rule 75c demonstrates that the government does not like parliament, that it looks on parliament as a nuisance, and that it is determined to undermine it and reduce its power as much as possible. Except in countries ruled by dictators, or that have been in the past ruled by dictators, one will generally find a conflict between the legislative and executive branches of government. The history of almost every country shows that the executive from time to time has tried to take unto itself greater and greater powers and get away from restraints imposed by the legislature.

In the United States system there is a division of powers which is designed to ensure that the executive is shackled by the legislative and judicial branches. In our system of representative cabinet government although it is theoretically possible for members of the house to control the power of the cabinet by threatening to vote its members out of office, in practice when one considers how party discipline has developed that is a practical impossibility.

Since it is almost impossible to make members of the government party vote against the government, we have lost within our legislatures the power to restrain governments. Unless the opposition retains the right to, shall we say, obstruct government if it feels the government is pursuing a course that is against the best interests of the country, public opinion may never become alerted to the danger, and action to correct the danger may not be taken. The legislation may go through parliament before the country is alerted to its danger.

Where is the evidence that this government looks on parliament as a nuisance, and that it seeks to undermine it, Mr. Speaker? One piece of evidence is the roster system for the attendance of ministers. The absence of ministers impairs the effectiveness of the question period, and by this method the government has shown its contempt of parliament. One of the traditional rights of members of the house has been the right to question in the house members of the executive with respect of government policy. Since at best only half our ministers are supposed to be here at any one time under the roster system, the rights of ordinary members have been impaired. But even more clearly does the government show its contempt for parliament when, day after day, only eight, nine, ten or eleven of the 28 ministers show up for the question period. Today, for example, there were eight ministers here for a time, and later nine. This can only be interpreted as thinking that parliament does not amount to anything, that the ministries do not have to account to parliament for their actions, thus generally circulating the idea throughout the

country that parliament is no longer an effective or useful body.

• (3:20 p.m.)

This general attitude on the part of the present government is demonstrated even more forcibly by the absenteeism of ministers and Liberal members during debates. Their absenteeism in this session has been notorious. Last Thursday the house had to adjourn for lack of a quorum. I think it was a very good thing it did, because attendance of ministers and Liberal members has been considerably better since than was the case before. In addition, there has been more life in the house. The house has resembled what it used to be 10 or 15 years ago instead of what it has been during the past months when generally it was dead. Few ministers were here and few questions went back and forth. There was no fight to the proceedings. Since the house had to adjourn last Thursday things have improved from this point of view.

In my view this action should and could have been taken long before. During the last six sitting days of June I noted at times when I was in the house that a quorum was not present, and I do not know how many other times there was not a quroum when I was not in the house. I counted between six to nine Liberal members present, and frequently no cabinet minister. Absenteeism has been going on for a considerable period, but I hope the action taken last Thursday will bring this extreme form of it to an end. I do not think there is any doubt that what this extreme absenteeism demonstrated was nothing but a lack of regard for this institution, the adoption of the attitude that what happens here does not matter.

An hon. Member: It happens with all parties.

Mr. Harkness: I will come to that. Absenteeism has been a problem since I first came to this house in 1945, particularly on Mondays and Fridays. In my early days here there used to be what was known as the Tuesday to Thursday club, people who came here for those three days, spending the remainder of the week with their law business or something else. This club comprised people who lived within a reasonably short distance from Ottawa. The quorum was maintained on Mondays and Fridays chiefly by members from the west and the maritime provinces.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Would the hon. member permit a question?

[Mr. Harkness.]

Mr. Harkness: Certainly.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): May I ask the hon. member how many opposition members were present in the house at the time the count was made last Thursday?

Mr. Harkness: I was not here at the time so I cannot answer that question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Harkness: I do not mind admitting that.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): We pulled out.

Mr. Harkness: My point is that there were only 6, 7 or 8 Liberal members. It is the members of the government who have the primary responsibility for maintaining a quorum in the house. They know they were very much at fault on that occasion, as they have been for months as far as attendance is concerned. They are now attempting to escape the odium that naturally falls on them as a result of what happened last Thursday by claiming that members of the opposition were not here in sufficient numbers either. As I said, the primary responsibility for maintaining a quorum rests with members of the Liberal party, not with the opposition.

I make no apology for, or condone for one moment absenteeism on the part of opposition members during the past year, though by comparison it has been much less than among the members of the Liberal party. Attendance of opposition members at times has not been as good as it should, and I would be the last to say that that was not the case. But it has been much better than attendance of government members, and anyone who has kept track must be appalled at how bad is the record of the Liberal party in this regard.

As I mentioned earlier, the excuse given for introducing rule 75c, and also the other rules that have been put into effect to curtail debate in this house during the past number of years, has been that it is necessary to save the time of the house and get through the great volume of work we have to handle. From my experience I contend this is a fallacy to a large extent.

In fact, it works the other way around. You might say there is a law similar to Parkinson's law, which is that debate is always prolonged to use up all of the time allotted. I think the President of the Privy Council and members of the Liberal party should keep that in mind. Since Parkinson's law is now

well recognized, I hope that this law, which is similar, will also soon be recognized.

There are plenty of examples I can call upon to show this law is true. For several years during my earlier period in the house there was no time limit on any debate except debate on private members' business. The throne speech debate could go on for weeks if members wanted to prolong it to that extent, and sometimes they did. Similarly the budget debate was unrestricted.

But in actual practice, if you look back over the record, Mr. Speaker, though debates were sometimes long they were also often quite short. On one or two occasions we dispensed with one or two days on the throne speech debate. Since time limits have been imposed on the throne speech debate and the budget debate, practically always the time is fully taken up. There are only two instances that I can remember when the time allotted to those two debates was not consumed. In other words, if time is allotted to a debate, there is a natural tendency to expand the debate in order to use up the time.

It is often argued that in past years there was not nearly as much business to deal with as there is today, and therefore in former days you could take time to have long debates on the throne speech, the budget, or anything else. It is claimed this cannot be done today because there is too much business to get through. The answer that I point to the first post-war session held in 1946. More measures were passed and business completed in that session than in any other session during the 24 or 25 years I have been here. Nevertheless there were no time limits on any of the debates. I think it was some time in February when the session started and it finished about the end of August. Considerably longer sessions than that have been normal in recent years since time limits came in with regard to debates.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The greatest example of the point I am trying to make is that if you put a limit on a debate it is going to expand it. There will not be any time saved at all. It is instructive to look at the question period before any time limit was laid down for it. I took a bound volume of *Hansard* at random off my shelves and looked to see what the question period amounted to in those years. I picked up volume V for the 1953-54 session.

Looking at the first day which is covered in this volume, Friday, May 7, 1954, we see that there were three questions asked that day. The questions and the answers take up one page in *Hansard*. The next sitting day, which would be Monday, May 10, four questions were asked. One page of *Hansard* was taken up with regard to the matter. The record continues: Tuesday, May 11, three questions, one and three-quarters pages of *Hansard*; May 12, seven questions, three and one-quarter pages of *Hansard*; May 13, three questions, three-quarters of a page of *Hansard;* Friday, May 14, four questions, one page of *Hansard*; May 17, two questions, half a page of *Hansard*; May 20, seven questions, three and one-half pages. This was typical of the situation with regard to questions and the amount of time taken up with questions for years and years in this house.

It was normal for the question period to take up five to ten minutes and very frequently only one, two or three minutes. One of the reasons for that was that the rules with regard to oral questions were enforced. A question had to be short and of importance. In my opinion the majority of the questions asked today would have been ruled out of order in that period. This, of course, kept the length of the question period shorter.

But when a specific time limit was put on the question period, allotting 40 minutes a day, what happened? Immediately the question period expanded so that it took up the whole 40 minutes. Last Friday is a good example. There were at least two or three dozen questions asked. The question period lasted the full 40 minutes. Possibly Your Honour was a little lenient and it even went beyond that. The questions and answers occupy ten and a half pages of *Hansard*.

When you start putting limits on debates and question periods, instead of saving time you do the opposite. You prolong debate. This is the point I am trying to make. If rule 75c were used to any extent, it would not save the time of the house. It would have the opposite effect. More time would be taken up in the house to debate the same matters. Every time an allocation of time would be made under this rule, undoubtedly the full time would be taken up. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the basic argument which the government puts forward that this rule is necessary to save time is a fallacy. It is based on a lack of study of what happened in the past, particularly the history of the question period, to see what the situation has been with regard to the throne speech and the budget debate which now have time allocations.

As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said in his speech last week, the real

purpose of the government in introducing this rule is to force certain questionable measures through quickly. It is simply a less blatant measure of closure and one which the government thinks it can use without contracting the odium which the use of our regular rule of closure might bring down on it.

The fact that we have a closure rule makes introduction of rule 75c superfluous and unnecessary. If real obstruction is taking place, of a nature which the general public disapproves of, the government can use closure without fear. When they cannot use it without fear is when public opinion is against them. It is for cases such as this that they want rule 75c, cases when public opinion is against them. When they are wrong, they want to use 75c. I submit it is a thoroughly undemocratic device and one which any government calling itself Liberal should be ashamed to be introducing into this chamber.

A further argument has been put forward against this measure. My time is getting short therefore I will not go into it. The argument is that this proposed rule is ambiguous. This in itself should be enough for the government to withdraw it. There has been a great deal of discussion and argument as to what this rule actually means, how it will be interpreted, and what the general result of it will be. If the government were a reasonable government this should be sufficient reason for it to withdraw the rule.

I believe rule 75c is a thoroughly bad and unnecessary proposal. I hope the government will realize this and end their efforts to force it through the house.

Mr. Hy Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be short, but I hope helpful. I have a suggestion to make which could possibly shorten this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chappell: I believe this suggestion has sufficient merit to warrant consideration by the government and the opposition. I look forward to hearing comment on it from some of the members of the Official Opposition now in the house. It is somewhat different from the suggestion reputed to be mine and put forward last Friday by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman).

Rule 75B provides that when there is a majority, that is to say, three of the four house leaders agreeing in respect to the allotment of time, the minister can implement that agreement by a motion. The logic seems obvious enough, namely, that a large or relatively strong majority cannot be delayed in their work by a small minority.

If the Official Opposition and the N.D.P. agreed with the government, the majority would be 248 over 14. If the Official Opposition and the Creditistes agreed with the government, it would be 240 over 22. No one argues in this debate that a group as small as 14 or 22 should hold up a large majority. If the Creditistes and the N.D.P. agreed with the government, there would be 190 in agreement and the other 72, members of the Official Opposition, could not hold up what the 190 wish to get ahead with in the house.

• (3:40 p.m.)

So far I follow that logic. But there is another combination which has been overlooked, namely the government and the Official Opposition. That would be 226 over 36. As 75B now stands the Official Opposition with 72 members does not have as much weight as the two small groups with a total of 36. Something is wrong. How do 36 members become more powerful than 72 members?

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) when speaking last week said all hon. members are equal in the House of Commons. I would like to agree with him but certainly it is difficult to do so when we see 36 members with more say in respect of allotment of time than 72 members

I say that our thinking is all wrong in two respects. First, we must recognize the importance of the members rather than their parties. There should be no premium or reward in this House of Commons because a member belongs to a third choice or a fourth choice party, or possibly in the future to a fifth, sixth or seventh choice party.

Second, as 75B stands we overlook the essence of democracy, namely, that the party with the greatest majority forms the government. But there is another party that is important, the Official Opposition, the Loyal Opposition, which has carried out that most important role for centuries. It is that party which stands ready to take over should we lose the confidence of this house. No other party in this house can possibly form the government except by a vague hope, and even then only after another election. The small parties may stand ready and hope sometime to become the Official Opposition but they cannot during the life of this parliament. The people elected us, the Liberals, to form the government, and the opposition stands ready to take over. I think we break

faith with the people if we do not give the Official Opposition its full responsibility in comparison with the two minor parties.

During the debate on the omnibus Criminal Code bill we listened for weeks to the tedious and useless repetition of the Créditiste filibuster. Just last week the other small party, the N.D.P., caused the waste of a total evening session by calling for a quorum count during the private members hour and then withdrawing themselves from the count. I can hardly comprehend an official opposition being so irresponsible as to waste time by destroying an evening. It is equivalent to a self-inflicted thrombosis in the life blood of parliament.

Then what should be done? There is a simple answer. I put the challenge squarely to the Official Opposition.

An hon. Member: Put it to yourself first.

An hon. Member: Who are you trying to kid?

Mr. Chappell: As 75B is drafted now the two minor parties can agree with the government. Then there can be an allotment of time. Why should we not add there that if the Official Opposition agrees with the government, that is it. Then there can be agreement. I say this with respect. The important thing is that the Official Opposition and the government would constantly share the responsibility concerning whether we would ever use 75C. The house leader for the Liberals and the house leader for the Progressive Conservatives would agree; they would have to agree because if they did not agree they would be called to account by the press who would ask whether the government house leader was unreasonable or whether the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was unreasonable. The Canadian public would constantly judge which one was unreasonable and made it necessary for 75C to be invoked. I submit that both being in a position of responsibility they would agree and seldom would 75C have to be invoked.

In any even 75C, at least from my study of it, is not so terribly vicious. It is a form of closure but I submit it is mild and there is an abundance of safeguards built into it. I think it is wrong that the Official Opposition does not have a position of responsibility here. Either they agree with the government on time allotment and that is it, or they say no and face the responsibility of forcing the government to use 75C. I cannot imagine the two minor parties not welcoming the Official Opposition having that responsibility.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house listened to the suggestion just made by the hon. gentleman and gave it the attention it deserves. It amazes me that an hon. member of the Liberal party would cast aspersions on the N.D.P., the former C.C.F., and speak of that party in such disparaging tones, because they were the nursery which gave the present government its Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and two ministers. That is an attitude which does not indicate that spirit of compassion and consideration which I would have expected of the hon. gentleman. I am sure he could not have been speaking on behalf of the Liberal party for certainly such views border on heresy of the worst kind.

Now, sir, I do not intend to traverse the ground which has been gone over during the last few days. I took the government at its word, very much in the spirit of the Revelation, "I, John, saw a new heaven and a new earth". This government was in power and all was well. The house was going to adjourn on, I believe, June 27.

Mr. Stanfield: June 26.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Everything indicated that conclusion. Then at the last moment that pathological disease that has affected the Liberal party for a period now of 13 years evidenced itself and along came the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), a man whom one would never dream would try to destroy or participate in destroying this institution. He occupies a high position. You can always find an appropriate reference to Shakespeare. As I look at that hon. gentleman I think of these words of Shakespeare:

> —but man, proud man,
> Drest in a little brief authority,
> Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd,
> His glassy essence, like an angry ape.

It is now the minister's turn to laugh again.

• (3:50 p.m.)

> Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
> As make the angels weep.

I cannot understand this government. I find it difficult to recognize in a government a desire on the part of its members to destroy this institution. What is the reasoning for this? I ask this of the ministers and I am faced by a galaxy of two—two ministers sitting across the corridor when parliament is discussing a matter that, if carried into effect,

will be the death sentence of this institution. They sit and they smirk. One of these ministers is the Minister of Veterans' Affairs (Mr. Dubé). While veterans all over this country are suffering he does not dare do anything because the Prime Minister has said that it must not be done.

Isn't it a strange commentary that ministers of the Crown today are unable to speak unless directed, and unable to arise unless it is their day to get out of the corral—and they accept it? They glory in it. What a government! Backbenchers talk of the rights of parliament. They cannot call their souls their own. They dare not speak in committee without permission and direction. We must thank the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto), who made it very clear what the instructions were that debunked this idea that the committee system was going to work free from any consideration of political bias or prejudice. He pointed out that the direction was, "You will vote as you are told." So much for the backbenchers and their power. I should like to see the backbenchers speak up but they are not allowed to speak.

When the cabinet is throttled, what happens to the backbenchers? All they have is the right to vote; all they constitute is the necessary membership to provide a quorum. I was not here last week because I took the government at its word. I am back because I do not want the government caught with its quorum down again.

Why do they act this way? I have done a little research and I have read a little about Machiavelli. The Prime Minister was asked shortly after he became the Prime Minister who was his model politician and statesman, and without hesitation he said "Machiavelli". I have a volume here which describes Machiavelli as having been a talented dissembler, a ready opportunist, a master in the field of human weakness, an accountant of forgotten sentences, a promoter of vanity, a skilful juggler, a lover of cunning and a worshipper of force.

He is the one who has been chosen as the guardian saint of the Liberal Party. I will deal in a moment with the promises made by the Prime Minister. I will not deal with them in a personal way as he is not here. He is out in western Canada and he is finding out what his ministers have not told him.

Just imagine the three silent ministers from western Canada. We have from Winnipeg the hon. gentleman who knows more about wheat, I presume, than any other person in this house if not in the country as a whole. Then there is the hon. member from Saskatchewan. He is a general factotum and has knowledge of almost everything, at least according to the number of portfolios he fills from time to time. Then there is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) from Alberta who, when he was sitting on this side of the house in the Social Credit party demanded action from the government in loud and stentorian tones till he got close to the point when he made a saltus; a turn over of views, and gave us a major performance when he finally saw the light and took his place. He was in favour of the two price system.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I always hesitate to interrupt the right hon. gentleman and I appreciate that what he is saying is by way of an introduction to his address to the house, but I have to remind him that we are dealing with the amendment to the main motion which has reference to proposed Standing Order 75c. I know that in due course the right hon. gentleman will bare his remarks and direct them to the subject matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I was just in the process of showing where the hypocrisy was, and where was the location of the stupidity. The Prime Minister made a statement the other day he ought not to have made, but I know that is the attitude of this government. They want this power for the purpose of carrying out their wishes regardless of the people of Canada. No tyrant could ask for more than this power.

The Prime Minister would go all through the form of having a parliament. He would have it sit, but whenever there was criticism that the government did not like in would come rule 75c to destroy the opposition. I say to you, Sir, that in order to build the argument and to show that this is so, I have the right, I suggest with deference, to point out what is being done here by this government.

Let me go back to *Hansard* of last fall, September 16, 1968, when the Prime Minister made a dissertation on parliament and revealed his views as to how parliament should act, and also indicated his ideas of parliament in so far as the opposition is concerned. You can read it in *Hansard* for September 16 at pages 72 and 73. After expressing doubt as to whether parliament is an institution that should be maintained, despite

the greatness of its past, he ended up with these words:

> It goes without saying that any proposal for procedural reform must assist both sides of this house to function more efficiently.

Is that what is going to happen if this rule comes into effect; that the opposition is going to be able to function more efficiently? He talks about hypocrisy. There was hypocrisy then, and there is now. All of this is happening while he is pretending that this proposed rule is to bring about a strenghtening of parliament. Parliament is being undermined and eroded.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The three who are gathered together and are united in this aim are those the Liberal party took over holus-bolus from the N.D.P.-C.C.F. The house will remember that early last year we saw the attitude of the government of Canada as revealed by the Prime Minister. This was after the government had been defeated. The Prime Minister was then minister of justice. The government was defeated. The opposition gave it opportunities for extra days, and so on. If the government had then gone to the country, as it should in carrying out its constitutional responsibility, it would not be in the position it is today. What did the Prime Minister say when he was minister of justice? These were his words:

> We are the masters of this chamber. We decide that we are the government.

I repeat, "We are the masters". As that statement finally appeared in the printing of the French translation, it read:

> We are the masters of this chamber in the sense that we should manage its business.

In the English version it read:

> We are masters of the house in the sense that we have to conduct the affairs of government.

If the statement "We are masters of the house" had been made in the mother of parliaments, it would have brought such a degree of resentment on the part of the government and opposition that it would have had to be withdrawn. This is the philosophy behind proposed rule 75c, namely, "We are the masters".

I quote from another minister to indicate the attitude of the government. These are the words of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), who received notice that I was going to deal with him. He is the conscience of the Prime Minister and the Liberal government of today. He is the man who represents the quintessence of the concept, "We are your masters". Very recently he was interviewed by Nathan Cohen on "Twenty Million Questions". I should like to read what this minister of the Crown said, because it indicates the attitude of the government when the Prime Minister says, "We are your masters. You over there are stupid. You have not the right to speak. We do not agree with you". These are the words of the Secretary of State:

> I was sitting in the house and listening to these people and I said: "if only the majority of Canadians could hear this nonsense being spoken openly as I hear it tonight, they would see how absurd it is".

These are our masters! He then went on to say that it was nonsensical. Mr. Cohen asked, "What makes their views nonsensical?" The answer was, "Because they are talking nonsense". The minister then revealed himself clearly in these words:

> This is a personal judgment, but I make personal judgments and I think I'm right usually when I make them.

There is the picture: the Prime Minister says, "We are the masters" and the Secretary of State says, "They talk nonsense". It must be shocking to the finer sensibilities of those who wander in the intellectual greatness of ivory towers to have to listen to opposition members advancing their views. It was pointed out that the Secretary of State is now responsible for the C.B.C., the National Film Board, the Canada Council, the National Gallery, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

Can you imagine a man having this power and those views? I will mention what he said about the C.B.C. He made it very clear where he stands with regard to that corporation. This is the man who was going to abolish the Queen. This is the man who voted for the principle of a republic. He does not hide the fact that this is where he stands. He said:

> Now, with the present management of the C.B.C. I must say that I can discuss with them very freely and I feel no resistance and (that) I feel that I'm in the company of people who want basically the same things that I want myself to achieve.

Is that not a frightful proposition? I have been away from the House of Commons. When I am away I always record my absence. I have been away because I trusted this government to do what it said it would. The

Secretary of State says with regard to the C.B.C.:

—I feel that I'm in the company of people who want basically the same things that I want myself to achieve.

How many reports on the C.B.C. has parliament considered? I have listened to the C.B.C. every night and have not heard anything on this subject; there has been absolute silence. You would not know there was a debate in the house that concerns the future and the greatness of this institution. Not a word has been said on the C.B.C. On the other hand the sycophants who praise the government find their way on to the channels of the C.B.C.—those who say the House of Commons is a bore, those who say there is here needless repetition, those who say this kind of thing should end, those who say parliament should be at the whim of the lust of power-grasping individuals. These people are reported; their statements are given on the C.B.C. Last Sunday, the report from Parliament Hill would indicate that everything here was boring. That is because these people have decided that something must be done to bolster up the government. The Secretary of State also said the trouble with us in parliament is that we have not the knowledge:

—I'm a little sick myself of hearing about understanding when knowledge is not even there. And you can't come to understanding without knowledge.

This is the man who sits over there, controls these various organizations, and says that he finds in the C.B.C. a brotherhood of thought and idealism. Is this one of the reasons why individuals come to our country for the purpose of stirring up trouble? I do not refer to all those who come to this country, but there are people who come here to stir up trouble, and they always seem to be able to find a place on the C.B.C. to voice their propositions to the Canadian people. And when they do not come here because they would be asked to leave, the C.B.C. arranges for their views to be broadcast. One individual spoke over the telephone from the United States; the C.B.C. arranged this. The C.B.C. representative said to him, "We are glad to have your views. Be sure to call me up."

• (4:10 p.m.)

This is what is happening here. The government house leader has said, "Oh, do not be afraid. We will not use this rule, except in 1 per cent of cases. In 99 cases out of 100 we will not use it." I ask what has the government in mind? Why is it endeavouring to foist this on us at this time? What is the purpose, what is the objective? Why the rush? Who wants what?

Over and over again in this house the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) and the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) have asked where the government was held up. The government has not been held up. Nothing has been done for the veterans or for the farmers. Oh, yes, the farmers are to have a visitation from on high. The Prime Minister is in western Canada but he is not there to consult the farmers. This attitude, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the government is the attitude of dictators.

This parliament is a sham. The hon. member on this side of the house who preceded me said that there have been changes over the years. This parliament is dead and if we carry on as we have been we shall become undertakers who are about to bury parliament.

It is the government that refuses to place legislation before the house. The opposition cannot propose legislation. Yet the government cannot point to one piece of legislation that is ready to be put before the house. Instead we hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in reply to questions from the Leader of the Opposition say, "We are not going to tell you what is going to happen. It is a secret. Some day we will reveal it." No doubt that will be in the great by and by. When we ask the government what it is going to do, the answer invariably given is, "We are giving thought to the matter." Indeed, it is impossible to understand what the government wants or what it has in mind.

On September 16 when the Prime Minister was speaking about parliament, he said, as reported at page 72 of *Hansard*:

—whether our systems of government have outlived their effectiveness,—

And, sir, he followed with these words:

—whether . . . new institutions are necessary—

What does that mean? Are we to do away with the parliamentary system and adopt the congressional system of government? Is that the new institution?

This government's attitude was demonstrated when on June 24 the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) directed, contrary to the rules of protocol, that no flag was to be flown at half mast over parliament hill in memory of one of the greatest soldiers of our time, and

our former Governor General. Then we discovered that we were blaming the Secretary of State unfairly, because the orders had come from the Prime Minister's office. That was another indication of the government's cavalier disregard for precedent.

The Prime Minister went on to say in his speech:

> There is abroad in Canada and elsewhere a spreading concern that the traditional techniques of governments are incapable of responding adequately and in time to the changing needs of society... We are given an opportunity in this place, in this session, which may not again present itself. It is the opportunity to prove to Canadians, ourselves included, that a parliamentary form of government is not only capable of meeting the demands of this complex age, but that it is more capable of doing so than is any other form.

That apparently is what is in the minds of the Prime Minister and his associates in seeking these powers.

Much was made of debates in previous years, but speeches were not read. I know the effect of strong debate on the part of the opposition. I have sat on both sides of the house. On one occasion when I was prime minister we brought in legislation we thought was good, only to discover after three or four members had examined it that something was wrong with it. You cannot have good legislation without debate, and it seems the government wants us to have a total of four days of debate only which is to be spread over a period of ten days. That is what the government wants.

The self-appointed prophets of radio, television, and the press say this matter is not very important. They talk about a mere 1 per cent of cases. It has been interesting to read Mr. Weasel—Westell, I beg your pardon. That was a slip of the tongue. But he and others like him certainly weaseled around and produced a eulogium on what is taking place here. They said to the opposition in effect, "What are you doing? You are boring us." Well, people like that must bore easily because you seldom see them in the gallery.

The attitude of this government has been one of wanting to trample on the rights of the opposition. The hon. gentleman who preceded me should have offered his remedy to the government. After all, it is the government that is all-powerful. The Prime Minister has said that this is a stupid filibuster. Well, the government cannot back up. It is caught in its own tangled web, and it must keep up appearances. The Leader of the Opposition has said that as long as 75c stands, so shall we stand against it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: That message is loud and clear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I say to the President of the Privy Council that while he may cow Liberal members, he cannot cow us.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): He tries to.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He will not get away with it. I want to be very fair with the President of the Privy Council. Only occasionally does he make a pilgrimage out in front of the house to tell the nation that he did not say what he is said to have said. Each day ministers treat this house with contempt, disregarding questions or answering flippantly. Sometimes, when they are caught and embarrassed, they rush out and in the ante-room of parliament tell the Canadian people what they did not say.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The government are making a caricature of this institution. They do not care about it. Tyranny has no conscience. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to drive this measure through, but they now find themselves caught.

I realize some hon. members sitting around me believed that all was going to be well in this parliament; that committees would be set up similar to those in the United States where partisanship does not always enter. But under our system of government they have found out that this cannot be. If Liberals on a committee voted contrary to what the government wanted, it would be a vote of non-confidence. Such cannot happen on United States committees.

I was particularly impressed by one of the hon. members from Nova Scotia who spoke yesterday. When mention was made of co-operation, he said that there had been too much co-operation, that we have spoiled the government. I told hon. members that if they fed these people opposite with power they would abuse it. If you compromise with them to reach agreement they will use that compromise as a method of denuding and deflowering the opposition. That has been the lesson over the years.

I like to see young backbenchers across the way laughing at my remarks, because that is about the only contribution they make. There are more young members of ability in this house than one sees in many parliaments. I read their speeches, and I could refer to two in particular that were delivered by Liberal members. Although I did not agree with their

views, I do agree that they will make unusually fine parliamentarians.

One of them, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome), in a moment of great exhilaration, said in effect that the committee system has been wonderful, that it has revealed the kind of trickeries of government. We now know, said the hon. member, what otherwise we would not have known.

Those of us who have been here for years have a deep and abiding affection for this institution and do not want to see it destroyed. We want to see it made strong and effective, but not by telling the opposition in effect that they have four days to discuss a certain matter and must go to it. That is an old threat.

I remember when the former prime minister, Mr. Pearson, tried to explain away in this house the sterility of the programs that he had brought before parliament. He said that had he had a similar rule to this present proposal he would have been able to do so much. I should like to ask the government what they would do with this power. Efforts to curtail parliamentary power have been characteristic over the years. History proves that autocracy and dictatorships are shadows that forever stand in the wings of parliament.

I should like some minister to tell us what the government are going to do when they get this power. Where are these strong men that form the government? Where is the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp)? Where is the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), that wizard on financial matters? What action are these people taking today? With this rule would they have taken any action to forestall the increase to its highest point of the cost of living in this country? Would they have taken action to ensure that the western farmer would not be in the position he now is, with the economy going down and down and retail sales disappearing on every hand? I think sales have slumped 13 per cent during the last six months.

What does the one per cent to which reference has been made mean? Nobody knows. Ministers do not speak, they sit—if they are here. One would expect ministers to rise in their place to defend this proposal. But no; except for one or two speeches there has been silence. I should like to hear from the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the right hon. gentleman as his time has expired.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) not here? The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) is a congenial fellow with a knowledge of this parliament that few have. I knew his distinguished father and his distinguished grandfather, and the hon. member is always in the house. I feel more at home seeing him here, and I know he would not say anything to which the government would not want to listen.

So I conclude by asking whether the government intend to bring about the abolition of our parliamentary system. Is the Secretary of State now to be given the opportunity to push through in four days a measure dealing with the abolition of the monarchy? Is this what the government has in mind? There is no question the government could do this under this proposed rule. They have a favourable Senate. In recent years that institution has not shown that independence of which so much is often spoken.

No longer have we a constitution. It can now be amended by a simple vote of the House of Commons and Senate. Would the house leader tell us what he has in mind by his reference to one per cent? This is about the ratio that the legislation introduced bears to the total amount of legislation that should have been introduced by this government. What does the government want to destroy? What is the plan?

Last September the Prime Minister stated that the government would have to find out whether other institutions must take the place of parliament. These days this parliament has an appointment with its own destiny. The question facing it will not be answered by an opposition that grovels and goes on bended knee. Although we are all desirous of taking a vacation let me tell the government they are not going to push this proposal through. What the government has done to this country during the last year has resulted in the greatest fall in support in political history.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Hon. members used to quote Gallup polls when they told a story in their favour. But look what happened in Manitoba. Down went the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Liberals in Manitoba could not stomach this government here and voted N.D.P. That is why we have a change of government in Manitoba today. If Liberal members have been in their constituencies I would have liked to have been present to listen to what their constituents said to them, because the language would not have been parliamentary. I presume that is the reason those members will not place it before the House of Commons.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): It is a great honour to follow the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). I feel somewhat like a conductor of a high school orchestra being asked to perform following the New York Philharmonic. I am delighted to congratulate the right hon. member for a very excellent speech in spite of the fact that he said many of the things I wanted to say. I would like to thank him also for all his kind words about the N.D.P.

This is a speech I hoped I would never be required to make. Before I am through a number of hon. members will probably feel the same way. It should have been unnecessary to make this kind of speech, but the stubborn cabinet seem to delight in this kind of cliff-hanger. We had their Christmas present in terms of rule 16A and now we face the dubious prospect of sitting around here throughout the stifling Ottawa summer.

Mr. Crouse: Incidentally, where is the cabinet?

Mr. Rose: An hon. member is asking, where is the cabinet? I imagine the cabinet is reviewing some legislation because that is what it has been doing all year.

Mr. Crouse: They are not in the house.

Mr. Rose: I wish to tell hon. members that I for one resent being kept here to prove some point or to save the face of the government house leader. I will stay here night and day—

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like the Chair to notice that there is not one member of Her Majesty's Privy Council in the chamber at this time.

Mr. Perrault: That's no point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: I would not like the member for Burnaby-Seymour, no matter how wise he may be—

Mr. Perrault: It is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member should be allowed to state his point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: I want to draw to the attention of the Chair that there is not one member of Her Majesty's Privy Council in the chamber. To my knowledge I believe this is a tradition that has been so long in observance it has almost become a rule of this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I fail to see the point of order.

Mr. Rose: As I was saying before the point of order was raised, I am prepared to sit here all summer to debate this amendment, although I would much rather stay here to debate something useful. I suggest the government should introduce some legislation to lower the interest rates. They should make some proposals to deal with the cost of living. We would then gladly stay here to support the government. But they are playing around here with a gag rule, a kind of subliminal closure which is not needed. For all their talk about parliamentary reform what I believe they are trying to do is cow the opposition with a lot of bull.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rose: I think most Canadians welcome parliamentary reform. I know our party does. We agree to time limits as long as they are reached in consultation and by agreement, and to such rules as 75A and 75B. By the way, for the most part proposed rules 75A and 75B were articulated by my house leader, the phantom of parliament, that muscular member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

We agree there should be a reform in parliament. I do not think there will be any argument in this house that reform is not necessary, but I wish to remind the house that reform in parliament is not everything. What is really needed here is reform in government. When parliament is reformed, it does not automatically follow that government will be reformed and made more responsive to the aspirations and needs of people. We need the kind of government which is much more forthright and open and not the kind which we have now which is furtive and secretive.

How can parliamentary reform guarantee that the government is going to desist from its preoccupation with various "style" issues

such as bilingualism and biculturalism, the constitution, and instead, involve itself with the needs and issues that really concern people? Inadequate housing and employment and galloping inflation are the matters that are currently making a mockery of our egalitarian ideal. It is time we spent our summer debating issues such as these rather than a gag rule such as 75c.

It is obvious to everyone the government will not bring forward legislation to deal with unemployment and inflation, and I do not believe it wants to. In spite of the lesson in Manitoba the government continues to be contemptuous of what the Canadian people are trying to tell it. I wish to quote from an article by Peter Regenstreif which appeared in the June 23 issue of the Toronto *Daily Star*:

> Bilingualism or "the constitution" are irrelevant to the great majority of Canadians. Ask a national sample of voters: "What do you feel are the most important problems government should do something about?" and the answers come back—high taxes, the high cost of living, housing, unemployment. Pose the same question to top officials in government, industry, communications, and to the better educated—in other words to the elites—and the most frequently mentioned reply has something to do with relations between French and English or government.
>
> It is easy to claim that such differences in orientation are to be expected because they spring from the different backgrounds and needs of the various groups involved. Unfortunately, many often go on from this to claim that politics is not simply the business of counting noses but requires what they like to call "leadership." That is, the leaders of a society know best what's good for it and so while the working-class whites in the United States and the mass public in Canada may want something, they shouldn't be allowed to get it unless it squares with what the elite feels it should have.
>
> This argument tends to be heard more often in Canada than in the United States but it hardly matters, it seems to me, what should or should not be the case. If the leadership of a society ever really holds this view for very long, it will find itself without a society to lead.

I did not come to Ottawa to indulge in silly little games like this, Mr. Speaker, but if this is the way the game is played, I guess we will have to play it out to the bitter end. The people of Canada regard parliament and parliamentarians with contempt. When Canadian citizens are on the way to their summer cottages, vacations and camping trips, they read about parliament sitting in the oppressive atmosphere of the Ottawa summer squabbling endlessly, not about important legislation but about some obscure, barely understandable rule, some brainchild of the government, designed to limit discussion on something or other sometime in the future. Here we are frittering our time away on a debate which is virtually meaningless to many Canadians. We are using what little brains God gave most of us figuring out picayune devices like quorum calls and other phoney stunts designed to embarrass the government in order for it to come to its senses and depart from the stupid position it has taken.

• (4:40 p.m.)

An hon. Member: We have no choice.

Mr. Rose: All right. Here we are engaged in a debate in which perhaps everything of real importance has been said in the first four speeches. The value of the contribution by the extra speakers might be judged not in relation to what they say but how long they take in saying it. Any speech shorter than 39 minutes is considered in this debate to be a very poor speech. When the debate on the amendment is concluded we will all be making 39 minute speeches on the main motion just to prolong this war of attrition until something gives and sanity once more is allowed to prevail.

Here we are in the opposition forced into the role of defiant schoolboys, who have been kept in after school in the detention room by an overbearing school principal in the person of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his petulant sabre-rattling hatchet man, the house leader, Mac the Knife, who now has himself manoeuvred into a corner where he can only back down with a tremendous loss of face, accompanied naturally by the justified scorn of the combined opposition, an opposition whose mood of operation I am afraid is now at an end and that now is determined to see this through to the bitter finale whatever and whenever that may be.

It has been said before, but I believe it bears repeating, that this government has had the full co-operation of the opposition all session. Not that we have dealt with anything very radical or new this year. Most of the time admittedly has been devoted to a clean-up of the old Pearson legislation. The major bills such as the drug bill, the Criminal Code amendments and the language bill were in virtually their final form last year when the government was defeated and later dissolved graciously by the new leader. Certainly these pieces can be regarded as important, but what else is new; what else has the government proposed this year that would justify the faith Canadians placed in it last June? What has been accomplished this session to

demonstrate the new politics, a new direction, or even to show a glimpse of progress toward a solution of the many problems facing many Canadians today?

Oh, sure, interest rates have been upped through three farm bills, a couple of fisheries bills, and on student loans. In the classic manner of fighting inflation by allowing higher interest rates for the lenders and higher taxes for the borrowers, the government has freed mortgage housing rates to find their own level somewhere in the stratosphere. Concurrently the 3 per cent income tax surcharge has been maintained. Additionally, the magnificent gesture of the added 2 per cent social development tax levied upon wage earners was sanctioned in the name of protecting them from themselves.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must direct his attention to the fact that we are debating a question of procedure and I would invite him to return to the subject matter which really is before the house.

Mr. Rose: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was attempting to show an example of how we might be using our time here debating something of greater relevance at the moment than 75c. You have said I have strayed too far afield, and I will be guided by your wisdom. I shall try to get back on the track and proceed.

I would suggest that the debate in which we are currently involved has a number of ramifications which have to do with the future of Canada and it has been used as a substitute for the real issues that face the Canadian people. What we are engaged in here is not debate which most people understand but rather a debate in which all the relevant things which concern the people of Canada are deliberately avoided. We are engaged in what to most people is an almost incomprehensible struggle, long after we have completed all the regular government legislation, all the legislation with which we have been asked to deal.

Here we are burning the midsummer oil, so to speak, when most members would prefer to be in their constituencies doing the other kind of work a member of parliament is required to do. While we are here in the house discussing 75c we of course cannot be in our constituencies dealing with the kind of problems which crop up from time to time and which need our attention.

As I say we are burning the midsummer oil because this whole thing has been motivated by a stubborn cabinet determined to save the face of the house leader in respect of what I believe to be a rather dumb move and a heavy-handed attempt to stifle debate on some future legislation of which we know nothing at this time. I am certain many members on the other side of the house share the desire many of us have to adjourn and return to our constituencies. But here we are locked in combat. We will remain here until sanity returns or weariness erodes our will to prolong the battle.

I am sure Canadians would have full confidence in what we are doing here and would grant full support to it if we could demonstrate that this struggle is in the interest of progress, but it is not. We are staying here not to solve the desperate income gap between the rich and the poor in Canada. We are here not to bring in legislation to assist the veterans and the pensioners with a solution to their problems. We are here not to quieten the turbulence of and provide social justice to the native people. We are here not to enact legislation to brighten the employment picture for university students and those just graduating from high school. We are here not to protect our industry and financial institutions from foreign takeovers. Finally we are here not to enact laws to preserve our environment from industrial pollution. In fact we are probably contributing to the air pollution in this chamber at this very moment.

On the contrary we are adding greatly to the costs borne by the long suffering Canadian public because of a naked, unsophisticated power grab by an overwhelming government majority in an arrogant attempt to achieve unilateral control which the government does not need. What is embarrassing for the government is that they have no real issue here. Their problem, even in disciplining their own silent and long suffering backbenchers, is that they cannot point to one example this session in which the people's business has been frustrated by an intractable, irresponsible opposition.

What frightens me, Mr. Speaker, is the reason they want this power. Why do they need it? As the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) said, why do they need the legislative over-kill? What really disturbs me, as it must disturb members on both sides of the house, is that the gag rule will have just as much effect on, and will muzzle members on the other side of the house when they next journey to sit on this side of the house. I know that like Hitler's

Reich many Liberals believe they are destined to rule for 1,000 years, but I also know that like Hitler they won't.

• (4:50 p.m.)

When they come over here to sit I wonder how many of them will then be enthusiastic about little old rule 75c. What kind of legislation is the government preparing that they need 75c? Will there be a radical shake-up, a blatant move to the left, to the right, sideways, or up and down, or will this revolutionize the way of Canadian life? I doubt it very much. I do not think this is going to happen. Nothing in the personnel of the government benches or their record thus far would give us any cause to be alarmed on that score.

I think it is more likely that 75c arises from the dissatisfaction of articulate and capable backbenchers on the government side who are frustrated by the fact that there is little for them to say. They sit over there twiddling their hearing aids because the government—and any government would feel this way—is always in some haste to have its legislation passed. Contributions from government backbenchers only prolong the agony.

In emulation of their leader the backbenchers arrived in Ottawa last fall full of "kiss and vinegar" and found to their disappointment and dismay that they were not expected to do very much at all. The front benchers were supposed to do all the talking. The first and most obvious thing to do was get everyone busy on committees. It did not really matter whether the government was guided in any way by committee reports. On the contrary, sometimes the government was not even courteous or political enough to wait for a committee to report before it made decisions in respect of things which were currently under study by the committee. All of us who were members of the transport committee know what I have in mind.

Once committee work became a little dull here in Ottawa the next obvious move was to send 20 or 30 members junketing around the country at great expense, hearing briefs and representations. This had many advantages. It kept at least 11 government members occupied and out of the house, and an almost equal number of opposition members. After all, if there was no obligation to adopt committee reports, to see them translated into legislation, what was better than to entertain government backbenchers at public expense by extended trips around the country? This was at least an appearance of action.

[Mr. Rose.]

However, there seems to be a growing disenchantment with and cynicism about the committee system. Even government members regard some committees as a sham and a waste of time. This is demonstrated by the difficulty some committees have in finding a quorum in order to conduct their meetings. Everyone knows this is not because the opposition members always fail to show up. This is frequently because government members themselves, even though they are members of a committee, do not regard their presence as vital or essential. As a result the committees often cannot meet because they lack a quorum. This could be deliberate although I would not like to suggest that. However, it is a distinct possibility.

What are we going to do now? That is a problem facing the government. What are we going to do with all these talented backbenchers—probably enough to form three cabinets? They are sitting there languishing in gloom. What are we going to do with them? These backbenchers want to speak. They want to get some things they have to say on behalf of their constituents into *Hansard*. They want to send copies of *Hansard* back to the folks at home. In short, they are jealous of the opposition exposure, or the opportunity of the opposition to be exposed to the press and broadcasters during the debates in the house.

These members voice their frustrations in caucus. They want to know what is going to be done. The result is rule 75c. What does this accomplish for government backbenchers? The answer is abundantly obvious. It establishes time limits, and when you have time limits you, Mr. Speaker, are required to recognize hon. members in proportion to the strengths of their parties in the house.

So if a four hour time limit is imposed by the fiat of 75c, the preponderance of speakers will come from the government side. Well over half, or over two of the four hours, will be taken up by spokesmen from that side. This will give government backbenchers more opportunity to take part in the debate. Every time we have time limits, speakers favorable to the government point of view will crowd the debate. This is what 75c is all about. I have not seen many backbenchers from the government side on their feet during this debate. Speakers have come mainly from the opposition. Rule 75c will give the government backbenchers more time and will alleviate their frustration as a result of their being silent minions of the government.

What will be left to the opposition of this four hours if the government takes up more

than two hours? It will leave just about time for the leaders of the various opposition parties to make a short statement, and that is all. What opportunity will a new member on the opposition side have, who, like some of the government members, is in the backbenches? What opportunity will he have to make the views of his constituents known? I feel it is my right to speak here on behalf of my constituents. I believe my right to speak here will be severely limited by contemplated rule 75c.

In rising today to speak in this debate I am acutely conscious of what a tremendous impact the proposed changes will have on parliamentary democracy in Canada. As a relatively new member of parliament may I say I was attracted to the party to which I belong because I felt it stood for change, innovation and progress. Since coming to Ottawa I have not been disappointed. The New Democratic Party caucus both now and in the past has shown a marked acceptance of change. Certainly in view of the increasing role of government in our modern society some compromise must be reached. The government is taking over an extended role in the society in which we live and some compromise is inevitable. A compromise must be reached between one or two basically opposing forces.

The first of these forces is the need to bring a heavier legislative program before the house each year. Of course the second is the contradictory force of competition in view of the limited time available and the need to examine more thoroughly legislation and the estimates that come before the house. Everybody understands the problem. I think everyone who is sent here has thought about how to get more done in less time while continuing to ensure the right of hon. members to bring to this house their views and the views of their constituents. I do not think anybody argues about that.

Reasonable men are sympathetic about this problem and are searching for an equitable way to solve it. We know this and we know of the efforts made by the special committee on procedures of this house. This committee provides an example of intelligent discussion by men who sought to bring a century old practice up to date, to meet the needs of modern society. Except for the gag rule in 16A and 75c, which is the bastard child of 16A, and possibly with some reservations about the committee system approach to supply, the procedure committee work deserves commendation from all corners of the house.

All change is not necessarily progress. Our country today is beset with an increasing cynicism about parliament, government and politicians generally. Many people feel that government is too big, that it is too remote, and too much beyond their control. Now do you get closer to the people if you do not let their elected members speak? During the recent election campaign I encountered a large number of people who said they were not going to vote. When I inquired why, their replies added up to a shrug and the expression that it would make little difference. I was often asked what difference would it make who got their votes, and what chance would they have with just one vote to influence government direction.

Alienation of this kind is all too common. I believe it is on the increase. What we need to combat this kind of electoral drop-out-ism is not the imposition of 75c but a greater opportunity for members of parliament to participate, to suggest, and to speak in this house. We do not need the imposition of rules that prevent them from doing just that.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Much of the debate on the committee report, whether or not it has been stated in so many words, has been concerned with the individual member's concept of what parliament is really meant to be. I believe everybody would agree that the root of the word "parliament" means a place where people speak. This is how it was conceived. I remind the government that the people of Fraser Valley West sent me here to speak for them on issues of concern. Further, I was elected in precisely the same manner as any other member of the house, whether he be an opposition backbencher, member of the government party, or cabinet member. We were all elected by popular vote. Therefore, I believe I have precisely the same right to speak as anyone in the house, unless I give it up to accept a suggestion on time limit put forward by my house leader.

I will fight any attempt to take away that right. I am not very pleased when anyone attempts to gag or muzzle me, and proposed Standing Order 75c would do just that. The imposition of rules which are unacceptable to parliament concerns me greatly. We should be very careful to see this does not happen, because alienation will grow, not diminish, if situations such as this are allowed to prevail.

It is all very well to say that we do not move quickly enough in dealing with business

in the house. I believe we have moved very rapidly this session in respect of legislation brought before us. I said earlier that 75c is clearly a naked power-grab. I am fearful that the government majority next session may be planning to ram down the throats of the opposition legislation that may be complex and far-reaching in its implications, and that will demand a great deal of sober debate and reflection.

It has been asserted more than once to me by Liberal members that they were elected to govern and, by God, that is exactly what they intend to do. No one quarrels with that statement, provided it is not presented with unmitigated arrogance. What makes the government believe they can proceed with papal infallibility? Does all intelligence reside on the other side of the chamber?

Mr. Benjamin: They do not say anything, so you cannot tell.

Mr. Rose: I ask hon. members to consider for a moment what might happen if the normal checks and balances were one by one removed from our democracy. We would be confronted with the situation whereby an all-powerful government, headed by an all-powerful prime minister, would face a completely de-fanged paper tiger of an opposition. What chance would there be of sober examination of legislation the government wished to rush through the house? How would people then be able to protect themselves and protest the passage of hasty, ill-conceived legislation, or that prompted by the lobby of a special interest group which happened to have the ear of the government?

In his book "The Reform of Parliament" Mr. Bernard Crick wrote a great deal about parliamentary matters. In this excellent book he had this to say about the topic I have been discussing:

> The only meanings of parliamentary control worth considering, and worth the house spending much of its time on, are those which do not threaten the parliamentary defeat of a government, but which help to keep it responsive to the underlying currents and the more important drifts of public opinion. All others are purely antiquarian shufflings. It is wholly legitimate for any modern government to do what it needs to guard against parliamentary defeat; but it is not legitimate for it to hinder parliament, particularly the opposition, from reaching the public ears as effectively as it can. Governments must govern in the expectation that they can serve out their statutory period of office, that they can plan—if they choose—at least that far ahead, but that everything they do may be exposed to the light of day and that everything they say may be challenged in circumstances designed to make criticism as authoritative, informed and as public as possible.
>
> Thus the phrase "parliamentary control", and talk about the "decline of parliamentary control", should not mislead anyone into asking for a situation in which governments can have their legislation changed or defeated, or their life terminated . . . Control means influence, not direct power; advice, not command; criticism, not obstruction; scrutiny, not initiation; and publicity, not secrecy. Here is a very realistic sense of parliamentary control which does affect any government. The government will make decisions, whether by existing powers or by bringing in new legislation, in the knowledge that these decisions, sooner or later, will find their way to debate on the floor of one of the houses of parliament. The type of scrutiny they will get will obviously affect, in purely political terms, the type of actions undertaken. And the civil service will administer with the knowledge that it too may be called upon to justify perhaps even the most minute actions.

[Mr. Rose.]

I plead with the government: Don't do it, fellows. Don't try and push this thing through. If you want closure, say so. You have a rule for closure. Use it. At least people will respect you for having the courage to use the rule that is in the book. If there is a real issue and you want to close off debate, use the closure rule. But don't try and sneak in closure by peddling 75c as something you may not use. You know that when the chips are down you will use it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the government to reconsider this matter; and I wish them a happy vacation!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like to advise hon. members of the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Vancouver—Closing of French radio station; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Water Resources—Hamilton, Ontario—Pollution by Steel Company of Canada, Limited; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Senior Officials—Department of Finance.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p.10963).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, if I rise now, it is with the purpose of supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) which is aimed at sending the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization back to committe with instructions to amend it by striking out rule 75c.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, not only did I follow closely this debate, I also read most of the speeches made in this house in the past ten days. I have been impressed by the statements made on both sides of the house, but especially by the opposition members, who want to protect this institution.

I have also been impressed by the statement of a few government members who, with great obedience, have accepted the idea of their leader of establishing a dictatorship in this parliamentary institution.

As lately as yesterday, a government member, namely the member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) said that on June 25, 1968 the Canadian people had decided to give the Liberal party and its leader the necessary power to rule and govern this country.

One could discuss this statement at length, Mr. Speaker, but surely the Canadian people did not give their support to the Liberal party in order to establish a dictatorship in Canada.

This statement made by the hon. member for Bruce is completely illogical even though, as pointed out by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the reins of government have been given to three socialists I very much doubt that the Canadians were really aware of it.

If as a result of the last election, the government has full authority to enforce a dictatorship, it must be kept in mind that the electoral campaign was conducted with much publicity.

A political party with plenty of electoral funds can easily hire the best publicity experts and that is exactly what the Liberal party did.

Thanks to a well conducted publicity, campaign, one can make the people accept almost anything, with only a few exceptions.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if the majority of Canadian voters supported the Liberal party, the fact remains that many others gave their support to the Conservative party, the N.D.P. or the Ralliement Créditiste.

Under the circumstances, the supporters of the opposition parties asked their members to co-operate in the drawing up of legislation designed to develop this country and to protect the Canadian people adequately against detrimental measures and, as far as we are concerned, we intend to discharge that responsibility.

Opposition parties have their part to play and they have played it since the beginning of confederation. Now, the procedure which it is intended to apply at this time is precisely aimed at abolishing the role of the opposition.

Last December, on the eve of the adjournment for the Christmas holiday, the government brought in, after consideration in committee, rule 16A which is quite similar to the one we are being asked to pass today.

I should like to congratulate the committee which did a very fine job of considering the standing orders and the procedure of the house. I had the opportunity to attend two or three of its meetings and I found out by myself that the proposals made by any committee member were considered with great impartiality and willingness.

However, at the very end, a few members of that committee brought in that famous rule 16A which had the effect of taking the other members by surprise and the committee introduced it as such.

Because of the determination of the opposition against that rule 16A, the government retreated thinking at first that the members opposite would be anxious to leave for the Christmas holidays. The government thought that it could have that amendment passed quickly. However, it was mistaken and had to retreat.

The same thing occurred in June. After having re-established that committee and reconsidered the new standing orders and procedure of the house, at the very last moment, the government through members of the government moved concurrence in rule

75c and being aware of the objections of the other members, put the question against the wishes of the opposition. Since the Liberal members were in a majority on the committee, it is obvious that this majority won, but against the will of the three opposition parties.

Once again, believing the members were anxious to leave for their holidays, this report was introduced—we know how the government managed it—so that the members would lose interest in the proposal and give up.

Mr. Speaker, as far as we, members of the Ralliement Créditiste are concerned, for anybody, we do not intend to give up, because if the rule were passed, there would really be no more opposition. In fact, not only would the opposition disappear, but even government back-benchers would no longer be useful.

And I would even go as far as to say that the Speaker would no longer be useful since only the government would have its say. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would not need 28 ministers because five or six would be enough to rule or administer the country according to the wishes of a dictatorial prime minister.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we are justified in opposing such a proposal and we have the support of the Canadian people.

Lately, in my riding, I met a number of my constituents and I was asked the following question: Why is the house sitting at this time? Then, following my explanation, they said: Do not give up; carry on. You cannot give up, protect your rights.

Mr. Speaker, we are sitting at a time when hon. members, to whatever party they belong, should be with their constituents in order to consult them, to hear about their wishes and to report on their mandate, asking the people if they are satisfied with the legislation which has been passed since the beginning of the session.

It seems that only the Prime Minister can manage to feel the pulse of the people, and according to reports we have heard, there is every reason to believe that he is not getting such a warm welcome. I hope that when he returns, he will have realized that the Canadian voters, especially in the west, are not satisfied with his administration.

Mr. Speaker, at this time we are discussing a matter which has no interest for the Canadian taxpayers while we should be

[Mr. Laprise.]

studying legislation likely to improve the lot of the unemployed. There are too many unemployed in Canada even during the most active period of the year. There are still people looking for work and who cannot find any.

Furthermore, thousands of young students would like to earn a few dollars during their summer holidays so as to pay part of their tuition fees, but they cannot do it.

Many things could be discussed. For example, the producers of industrial milk, especially those in eastern Canada, are faced with serious problems. People are waiting.

The western farmers are also faced with serious problems and the government does not offer any solution. It is studying, it will see, it will inquire. It does not suggest anything to improve this situation.

What could be done to improve the lot of the Canadian workers? Many bills could be introduced in order to improve the situation of our wood workers, miners, construction workers, industrial workers in shipbuilding, transportation and so on. We could do much better than discuss procedure and organization. However, we are forced to hang around here. We are forced to wait and to discuss a subject about which the government knows beforehand it will have to give in.

Mr. Speaker, how can this debate stop the increase in the cost of living? Yet, all the Canadian consumers are asking that this steady increase in the cost of living be curbed because it annoys everybody.

How can this debate solve the housing problem? We constantly get representations from our constituents asking that the government attend to this problem. However, the government does not propose anything. We are forced to hang about and to discuss subjects that are entirely different from those in which our constituents are interested.

Mr. Speaker, on December 10 last, when a similar debate was held on Standing Order 16A, my colleague the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) said, and I quote from page 3779 of *Hansard*:

> However, one must not think that parliamentary reform will solve at once the economic problem of Canadians. A better parliamentary procedure does not necessarily mean a better government, because a government is not judged merely by the value of the measures it adopts. We can have a better procedure and pass legislation more rapidly but, if the opposition is governed by a mediocre procedure, it can hardly do much better. This means that the government must introduce legislation that will meet the needs of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we need now. Regardless of what Standing Orders the house has, regardless of how we improve them, if the government does not introduce better legislation, that which the Canadian public asks for and needs, all this will be of little use.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the determination of the government and of the submission of the government members in accepting the proposed Standing Order, we have the right to ask ourselves some questions.

One of the questions we ask ourselves—and I repeat that many of my colleagues of the opposition have already done so, as I have too—is this: what is the government hiding to be so bent on having the right to decide, on its own, in such a short time, what legislation it should have enacted?

Since the Prime Minister is trying so hard to prevent the opposition from commenting on the legislation he introduces, we are entitled to believe, that these laws are very unpopular indeed.

In fact, the hon. member for Medicine Hat, the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), said recently that were there to be now an election, it would be awkward for him to seek re-election because the government has brought forth unpopular legislation. The government is trying, by way of a provision in the rules of the house, to prevent the opposition from giving its opinion on the bills the government wants to introduce because this legislation is unpopular and detrimental to the welfare of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, it is for those reasons that we are firmly opposed to that procedure and to concurrence in that report, which I call a minority report since only one party agreed with the content of rule 75c. If we are so firmly opposed to it, it is because we are afraid of what this government is planning for the future. And, knowing the background of the Prime Minister and of his nearest colleagues, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our fears as to Canada's future, the Canadian people's future, are justified.

In today's edition of *Le Devoir,* Mr. Claude Ryan deals with this debate in an editorial which he entitles: "A deplorable blunder on the part of the Trudeau government".

In that editorial, Mr. Claude Ryan reflects almost exactly the present state of mind of the Canadian people. He concludes his article with the following words:

> As in December last, the opposition parties can rely, in their fight against rule 75c, on the support of public opinion. The government has erred in putting forward this rule. It has only half-corrected its mistake by trying, last Friday, to divide the opposition through an insidious sub-amendment. Now that this last piece of strategy, just as the equally deplorable one that was the Macdonald motion, has failed, there is only one course open to the government and that is to beat an honorable retreat. Otherwise the opposition will be compelled to carry the fight to its bitter end.

Mr. Speaker, may the government know once and for all that we, the members of the Ralliement créditiste, have no objection whatsoever to spending the summer here if need be, but we would prefer to spend it in dealing with legislative proposals to improve conditions obtaining in Canada instead of a government motion curtailing the freedom of expression of the opposition members.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River. I do not intend at this stage to deal any further with the report of the committee on procedure and organization, but I may take the opportunity of coming back to it when the report is more closely studied.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to strongly object to the proposed rule 75c. I can do no better in opening my remarks than to quote an editorial from the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of July 14:

> How Not to Make Friends
>
> The Liberal government is stomping through a political minefield in attempting to impose parliamentary rule changes that smack of closure.
>
> Because the business of national government is increasing day by day, and decisions on laws require faster action than has been the practice, some method must be found to speed up procedure and schedule the legislative agenda in more orderly fashion.
>
> But the Liberal approach, and it should be pointed out that a substantial number of Liberal MP back benchers are against it, of trying to push through a time limit on debate, and clumsily making it appear that opposition parties are being gagged in the process, is not the way to achieve agreement on rules changes.
>
> Liberal strategists responsible for the current situation ought to be instructed to read two texts: the Commons *Hansard* for 1956, and "How to Win Friends and Influence People."
>
> The former would certainly remind them it was careless handling of a similar rule of closure on debate that hammered the first nail into the coffin of another Liberal government, branded it (at the time of the pipeline debate) arrogant and dictatorial, and helped banish it from office within months of that episode.

The latter would provide useful hints on the unwisdom of being crudely provocative with people whose co-operation may be useful or even necessary at a later juncture.

That editorial in the Halifax *Herald* of July 14 will be available in my office as recommended reading for any Liberal member. I will go further and have copies made for distribution among them.

This proposed rule, Mr. Speaker, is an actual desertion from what the government has called participatory democracy. It removes the opportunity for all members of parliament to fully discuss legislation which may come before this house. What is happening to the just society? Who are we participating with and on what? Does the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) measure up to his promise when he comes into the house for the question period and then runs to his shelter? Are we participating with him? Are we participating with the cabinet when they are under orders to follow a roster system which keeps them out of the house, despite the fact they are elected members and first and foremost are responsible for representing their constituencies? It was evident, during recent months, that one cabinet minister who wished to come into the house to reply to a question was denied that opportunity because the roster which the Prime Minister established did not permit him to be present on that particular day. This is a shameful approach by a government which says, all will participate in this democracy.

This debate is another demonstration of the incompetence and stupidity of the government. First of all the government dictator proposed that 75c be put into the committee report. The Prime Minister dictated to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). The President of the Privy Council dictated to the Liberal majority on the committee. When the report was placed before the house, it was clear the government had painted itself into a corner. Proposed rule 75B was ambiguous. Rule 75B could deliver the government into the hands of a united opposition and this, of course, could not be tolerated by this arrogant government. Even when the President of the Privy Council was in a position to dictate the report, he was too stupid to dictate it correctly.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: I hear interjections and objections from the other side, Mr. Speaker. I remind these hon. members that the adjective

I used was the one introduced into this house by the Prime Minister, and there should be nothing wrong with quoting this Prime Minister. Any hon. member of the government can say I am wrong. If they do, I am perfectly willing to sit down to hear their objections to a word which their leader, the Prime Minister, introduced into this parliament.

When they realized their mistake, the government brought in their own motion to rectify it. In doing so, the President of the Privy Council made a government tool of the committee chairman, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). There was going to be a motion of censure of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton moved from this side. I can assure you the motion would have been debated for some time. If the hon. member had the intestinal fortitude, he would resign as committee chairman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis: The hon. member is probably following the same line as that taken by the other great parliamentarian, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) who, as the chairman of the defence committee, brought into this house a falsified report of what took place in the committee. What he said in committee is recorded, as well as his absolute departure from the truth when he reported to the house. If anyone cares to object to that statement regarding the lies he brought back from committee, they can find the basis for my statement in *Hansard*.

The President of the Privy Council allowed his motion to stand, and we are now back to the committee report. On Friday the President of the Privy Council tried to patch up his original mistake. He had the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra move a subamendment. I think this was another mistake on his part. This subamendment was ruled out of order. The President of the Privy Council is so stupid that he cannot even draft an amendment which is in order. Out of all the huge staff hired to build the Prime Minister's empire in the East Block, they cannot find a man who can draft an amendment that will be acceptable to the Chair. Talk about stupidity! The President of the Privy Council can now be called, "The minister of stupidity". He was even too stupid to keep a quorum in the house.

If this government is interested in saving time, it would be well advised to drop some of the stupid approaches it has taken under

the Prime Minister. The government would be well advised to answer the questions which are asked in all sincerity. Questions are asked, an answer is promised, then after a lapse of three months when the same questions are again put to ministers they sit glued to their seat, just as the Prime Minister has this past week.

When government supporters speak of having ample time under rule 75c to examine legislation, they are making a ridiculous statement. It would take this government a day to answer the questions I have put to them, and which they have failed to answer in any way, shape or form. To study legislation is not enough. Members should be informed so that they are aware of the results of the legislation once enacted. I could refer to Bill C-135 but I am sure the majority of members on the other side do not even know what Bill C-135 is. For their benefit I inform them that it is the bill that set up the Devco Crown Corporation to look into the affairs of the ailing Cape Breton coal industry.

Very little of that legislation could be changed. For the most part, it is very good legislation. However, how many members are aware of what has resulted from it? Members on all sides of the house cannot be faulted because this legislation has brought about discrimination among those it was intended to help. On recent visits to my home I have taken advantage of the occasion to explain that all Liberal members of the House of Commons cannot be faulted for the discrimination practised under the early retirement plan of the Devco Crown Corporation.

• (5:40 p.m.)

It is no fault of members of this house that a piece of government legislation has been used to bring about this discrimination. There is no question or doubt because the minister responsible in this house admitted there are cases of isolated discrimination. Now, I fail to understand how the minister can say in one breath there is no discrimination under the early retirement leave plan of the Devco Corporation and then, the next moment, in answer to a supplementary question say there are isolated cases. I ask hon. members, does it matter whether there are isolated cases? There still are cases. One would imagine that in a just society such discrimination would not be condoned. The passage of legislation under normal circumstances could have prevented such an unfair departure. What will be the result if members are denied the right to study legislation in order to prevent such a situation from occuring again? Members may say it is unfortunate but it does not concern them. Today it is my turn, but it may be theirs tomorrow.

Bill C-135 seemed to be the answer to many of the problems. I would be very interested in finding out why the retired chairman of the board acted as he did because I have expressed the opinion all along that the legislation provides the answers for which we are looking. However, the implementation of the legislation has been carried out in a way which is entirely unsuitable to the problems in Cape Breton. This becomes particularly evident when one considers that people 59 years of age are arbitrarily dismissed. This practice is supported by a government which is supposedly leading us into a just society. It is unfortunate that this government is acting as it is. It is in the hands of a troika. The Three Wise Men have taken over and are trying to put into practice what a former Liberal cabinet minister felt could be done as far back as 1951. He felt that he, along with the prime minister and the minister of trade and commerce, were the government. Imagine that! This is the attitude adopted today by these Liberals. They feel three men are the government.

Do not let anyone on that side of the house kid himself that this government is not run by three men only. Step out of line and watch out! Soon you will get your lumps. I should like to quote what this former Liberal cabinet minister had to say. He said:

> As long as the three of us remain where we are, I think it will be fairly generally agreed across the country that we have an exceedingly good government.

The three wise men must be looking back at this statement and saying to themselves, if a Liberal cabinet minister in 1951 felt that three men made up the government there is no reason they cannot take over in 1969. But they should look at what happened to this former cabinet minister, the minister of trade and commerce and the prime minister. They all went down the drain, if you will excuse the expression. They exhibited the kind of arrogance that we saw here last week and the kind of arrogance that is evident every day in this house.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) can sit there and smirk. He is all ready with the answers to questions before they are asked. He was so pleased to back up his Prime Minister today that he did not even find it necessary to hear the questions. Every

day in this house the members of the government have to watch each other in case the troica lowers the boom. The minister will recall that only this afternoon he had to be sharpened up by his house leader.

Mr. Sharp: This is an entertaining speech.

Mr. MacInnis: In reply to the remark of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, may I say that I assume this is the only reason he is sitting in the house this afternoon. He is not sitting here because his conscience tells him to do a good job for the Canadian people. If he feels I am entertaining him here this afternoon I wish he would send over the price of admission. At least he should pay for what he is getting because he is giving nothing in return to the Canadian people in line with the duties connected with his portfolio. He only got that because of the flip he made last spring in favour of the present Prime Minister. I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in sending over a messenger, will not prove himself to be as cheap as I think he is.

This would seem to be the unfortunate attitude of this government. It is headed up by three men. It is unfortunate that the house leader is placed in a position where he cannot think for himself, but is blindly following orders which compel him to allow an unacceptable amendment to be introduced. This supports my earlier remark about a stupid government. Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not wearing out that adjective. The Prime Minister introduced it in the house the other day. If I am not allowed to do so, I will get around to a few others which he used in respect of the Liberals in the not too distant past.

Government supporters would have you believe this proposed rule would streamline parliament and allow for a more efficient parliament. On this, no one is fooled. Backbenchers in the government are not participating now. I repeat that for the benefit of those within hearing. Backbenchers in the government are not participating now, and the more efficient we become the less they will have to do. Members opposite probably do not wish to accept this fact. Perhaps I should support my argument by quotating from the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). I shall quote from page 11174 of *Hansard*:

> However, there are many new members in our party who do not like sitting around doing what they consider to be nothing.

Well, if we have backbenchers on the government side who are complaining now about the fact they are sitting around doing what they consider to be nothing, if parliament is programmed and streamlined to the extent intended, then I do not see how they will be employed usefully in any sense of the word. Of course we can go back to the Prime Minister and quote his reference to the Liberal party as "The spineless herd". Probably another delegation of Liberal wives is necessary to see the little man since the Prime Minister has such an appeal, or is it the office that appeals? After all, take away the office and what is left? Just a 50 year old bachelor or, would you believe 51—a bag of bones and a hank of hair.

Now that the Message has been delivered, I see that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is just as cheap as I assumed he was. It is most unfortunate that Liberals of today cannot follow the dictates of their late spiritual leader, Prime Minister Mackenzie King who said—

An hon. Member: He was speaking here last night.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis: I am glad to note there are a few believers. In any event, he said:

> The government must be by parliament and through parliament. It must not be carried on by cabinet ministers in their secret chambers.

That is from your spiritual leader. I hope he talks to you again tonight. Let me quote further from the late Prime Minister who said:

> The air of Liberalism is to seek a wider freedom for the masses in social, political, religious and industrial life, to restore the control of the people over parliament and to restore the control of parliament over the executive.

Never was this objective more necessary than it is today. The withdrawal of rule 75c might assure the late Right Hon. Mackenzie King that Liberalism is still what he thought it was, then there would be no need for him to turn over in his grave. Surely, the Liberals cannot ignore words of wisdom that come from this source. If they continue to do so I suppose one will have to call upon the words of another Liberal cabinet minister who said, speaking about a Liberal government:

> We are fighting for liberty, we are fighting for democracy and parliamentary institutions. Yet most of our activities are in the hands of little potentates, men of no experience, dictators in the field that has been given to them for administration.

Unless the government sees fit to amend its stupid ways, this indictment by a former

Liberal cabinet member of another Liberal government will certainly apply to this government.

Let me refer to the statement of another former Liberal cabinet minister, and this also applies:

> If this is to be the funeral of Liberalism I do not wish to be even an honorary pall bearer at the funeral.

Members of this government, in spite of the fact they are dominated by the troika, should consider this move which will destroy this parliament and this country. It is not too late to change for the better, and in this regard Liberals should take a second look at what they are trying to impose upon all members of this parliament, including their own backbenchers. They should change this course of action before it is too late. It is of the utmost importance to each and every member of this house that the proposed rule 75c be withdrawn. What may not appear to be important today could very well adversely affect every individual member of this house tomorrow.

Again I could refer to Bill C-135 and its detrimental effects. Some of these effects were acknowledged by the minister in charge of this Crown corporation. He has placed on record the fact that discrimination has been practised. I say to you, in spite of the fact that this has been acknowledged by the responsible minister, that it is not the fault of any member of this house. I ask the Liberal members to take a good close look at Bill C-135 and the results that have come from the passage of this legislation, which I maintain is good except for a few minor parts.

One result of this legislation has been a report that members of parliament have not had the opportunity to see. Because members have not had a chance to see it, discrimination has been practised in this country. Every member of this house is at fault for not correcting this situation. Certainly, it is within the authority of the government to do so.

In speaking of Bill C-135 I am reminded of the fact that the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was the minister of justice at the time this legislation was introduced. I could point to some things in it to indicate that there have been some very obvious mistakes made. These could also be corrected, as it is within the authority of the government to do so. At the time this legislation was drafted no one disputed this particular point. I have in mind the authority given to the Crown corporation. Let me repeat, it was the present Prime Minister who was then minister of justice.

This Crown corporation was given the authority to purchase the lands beneath the sea off the Island of Cape Breton. Bill C-135 dealt with the coal industry. This authority was included in the legislation introduced in this house by the then minister of justice. What did this government and the Prime Minister do a few short months later? He made the arbitrary decision that offshore mineral rights belong to the federal government. He has since worked out a formula, but whether it will be accepted by the provinces is another question. The fact remains that this piece of legislation went through this house and was examined without the use of a rule such as 75c. This legislation authorized the Crown corporation to purchase land beneath the sea.

I cannot understand the sudden reversal in approach, but this reversal was made. It is for this reason I object to rule 75c which will, if accepted, prevent the members of this house from thoroughly examining legislation of the type included in Bill C-135. This right will be completely ignored. This will prevent any proper examination of a legislative measure, and therefore errors such as the kind to which I have referred will not be corrected. There have been stupid, undemocratic and even dictatorial actions taken by former Liberal governments. Perhaps hon. members could learn something from their own history if they study some of the worst possible examples available to them of this type of action.

Let me refer hon. members to the defence debate, and the fact that the chairman of that committee came into this house with a pack of lies in respect of what took place in that committee. He told this house lies in respect of the committee's hearings and then had his own Minister of National Defence stand and use those lies in this house for his own purpose. I refer to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). Of course, he came into national prominence when he went to the press and leaked decisions in relation to the flag debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

Procedure and Organization

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was referring to the Liberal government as stupid, undemocratic and dictatorial. I said they were looking back to former Liberal governments and following the worst possible examples. I was about to refer to the legislation brought before the house with respect to our defences and the unification of the armed forces. I do not wish to be critical of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), who until very recently seemed to be filling that position with dignity and honour. However, he seems to have backed away from the proposition he enunciated earlier.

With regard to the unification of the armed forces and what the legislation was supposed to do, I would point out that not long after the government took office the direction was suddenly switched and we found the Department of National Defence trying to set up a segregated force for this country. The department was trying to establish segregated crews for some of the ships in our navy, and most recently it tried to set up separate squadrons within our air division. This raises a very interesting question and one which the minister will perhaps answer in the very near future, that is, have there been resignations by French speaking Canadians who do not agree with the principle of segregating the French speaking members of the armed forces?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is now in the house and I think it would be in order to congratulate him on his effort to hold down inflation. This is further proof that—

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I submit that what the hon. member is now saying has nothing whatsoever to do with the rules. He should resume his seat, because he is not dealing with the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) is aware that we are dealing with an amendment to a committee report in respect of procedure. I invite him to restrict his remarks to that subject, as I invite all hon. members to confine their remarks to the matter before the house.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the hon. member was hit with enough bricks this afternoon. When dealing with the rules, it is absolutely necessary that we refer to the people who have tried to impose the rules on the house; therefore, we must deal with the government, which is responsible for the rules. I was dealing with the government, and see no reason why the hon. member should take exception to my singling out the generous Secretary of State for External Affairs, despite the fact that the Prime Minister has referred to him as the minister of foreign affairs, as has the minister himself. I was in the process of congratulating the minister for his effort to hold down inflation. I remind him that he has drawn to my attention how easy it is to entertain idiots.

All hon. members should ask themselves this question in respect of proposed rule 75c: Since the Prime Minister is the author of programming and so-called efficiency, why does he not participate in the debate? What has happened to the principle that Canadians should participate in every way, shape and form in the business of government? The Prime Minister has allowed the house leader to take the brunt of the blame in this regard. He is responsible for the attitude of Liberal members toward their house leader, who is no longer looked to for leadership but is pitied for his stupidity. To realize this we have only to recall a remark made by a member of the house leader's party, who today stated that if he were house leader for ten minutes he could clear up this matter.

This is the type of conversation that we hear in the cafeteria, the hallways and elevators. The house leader is bearing the brunt in this respect because of the stupidity of a Prime Minister who said we would have participatory democracy and then ran off to the west. The Prime Minister said his trip to the west was more important than listening to a stupid filibuster. He did not follow up his good intentions in this regard, because last evening in an interview on national television, when asked what he hoped to accomplish in the west he said, "Nothing". It is obvious that the western farmer will gain nothing from the Prime Minister's trip. This is also evident from the arrogant attitude of the house leader, who this afternoon was the only person that refused unanimous consent to debate the crisis facing western Canada. I repeat that he was the only member in the house who objected to discussing the plight of the western farmer.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

Mr. MacInnis: Of course, the Prime Minister's trip out west may accomplish something. It may make amends for his derogatory remarks about the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) who accompanied him west. When I refer to them as derogatory remarks, there is no question that they were because the Prime Minister belittled the minister. If the Minister of Supply and Services had the intestinal fortitude to which I referred earlier this evening he would not follow the Prime Minister. The derogatory remarks to which I refer may be found in the *Globe and Mail* of last December. As reported in that newspaper, the Prime Minister said:

> Sure I believe that you should have somebody better, but you didn't elect him.

The Prime Minister was referring to the Minister of Supply and Services. He appointed this man to his cabinet, and having done so had the audacity, carelessness and disregard for the minister to refer to him as the Minister without Portfolio, despite the fact he had given him a portfolio several weeks earlier. This demonstrates the careless attitude of the Prime Minister toward his ministers and parliament generally.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In the Prime Minister's absence a subamendment, which was ruled out of order, was brought before the house. It was clear, if one read that subamendment, that the government was prepared to make concessions. Perhaps it is a good thing the Prime Minister is absent. Perhaps goodwill will once again prevail in his absence. Perhaps when he returns he can be prevailed upon to abandon the roster system and to allow cabinet ministers to attend during the question period. Often fewer than half our cabinet ministers are present for the question period. The Prime Minister's presence does not make up for their absence, nor is it a case as in 1951 that a certain cabinet minister, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) together constitute the government. They may think so but we do not. I also hope that the government will consider seriously rectifying the serious wrongs Cape Breton miners have suffered as a result of legislation passed by this house. The government itself must rectify these wrongs. It is no use looking to the Minister for Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) in the hope that he will correct what is wrong. If one pays attention to rumours flying about one may hear that he is not nearly so interested in his portfolio as in the idea that he may succeed Jean Lesage as Liberal leader in Quebec. Some say the minister wants to become premier of Quebec.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I wish to remind him that we are dealing with the report of the standing committee.

Mr. Gibson: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The rules of relevancy demand that so far as possible, hon. members restrict their remarks to the subject being considered. I invite the hon. member to do so.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be responsible for having the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) break his hands in pounding the desk. He ought to keep quiet. After all he is deviating from his orders to keep quiet. The Liberal backbenchers have been marvellously silent recently, presumably because the government has told them to keep quiet.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: It is not their fault their Prime Minister called them bums and idiots. Yes, Mr. Speaker; the Prime Minister called them that. And who are they to take exception to what the Prime Minister said about them. It is he who said they are bums and idiots, not we.

Proposed rule 75c should not be included in our rules because it will apply to government backbenchers as well as to members of the opposition. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I have defended Liberals, but I did so on one occasion when I said that, surely to goodness no one in his right mind would countenance what has been done to the Cape Breton miners. I was defending Liberals then. I say to hon. members opposite that it is about time they kicked over the traces in caucus and stood up like independent men. I shall be listening to their whispers in elevators and coffee shops and I shall be waiting to hear them say, "we said to our house leader in caucus that we are going to stand up and be independent; we are going to rectify what is wrong here." We need hon. members to be independent. Hon. members opposite ought to tell the government house leader that they are not prepared to do the damage to parliament that has been attempted in these last two weeks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement for that?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Bell: Closure.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) upon his approach to this entire problem and for the way he chastised this government.

An hon. Member: Don't be sarcastic.

Mr. Alexander: He criticized the government's attitude vigorously. Yet, even in his bitterness, he had mercy on those who sit on the back benches. He felt for them. He tried to reach out to them and all they did was laugh.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Alexander: And then my hon. friend for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) pounded the desk. Clearly he is one of the trained seals. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I had the nerve of the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond and was capable of saying that the government and its supporter are brainless. I wish I had the nerve to say that government supporters are stupid; I wish I had the intestinal fortitude to say they are bums; and, how I wish I had the courage to call them idiots. But, Mr. Speaker, I am a charitable man. I could never stand here and make those remarks. But I can always think them. I can always think they are idiots.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: I will not take much time. I believe that in its debates this house must reach responsible conclusions. I wish to register my protest to the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) statement in this house that this debate is stupid. I do not think this debate is stupid; after all, we on this side are fighting for our very lives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: We are fighting for our very existence. I was therefore shocked to hear the Prime Minister say that we on this side are hypocrites. I take issue with him most strongly on that.

I am not an expert on the rules, Mr. Speaker, but then, neither are most hon. members opposite. As a matter of fact, there are probably only ten men in this house who know just what the rules say and who can stand up with a certain amount of integrity and tell the government that these proposed changes are wrong. Although I am not an expert on the rules, unlike others who have said they do not intend to participate in this debate, I have felt it my duty to participate because I am concerned, Mr. Speaker.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I want to speak on behalf of the 80,000 to 90,000 people who sent me here, though the government does not want me to do so. I want to speak on behalf of the trained seals at the rear who have so absorbed the philosophy of "keep your mouth shut, or else" that they cannot stand up like men and be counted. So, with their permission I speak on behalf of several of them, because I know several of them think the way we think.

There is no question that we on this side have been in favour of parliamentary reform. We showed our good intentions in December 1968. As a matter of fact, it was the members of this party who gave leadership in showing which rules should be reformed, why they should be reformed, and what would happen as a result of their reformation. I believe we must have parliamentary reform because the mounting problems that are facing this country daily become more complex and demand immediate action. I also believe we must have parliamentary rules reform because parliament, and its standing committees, must be efficient. They must be able to deal with the many bills that come before them quickly and with a certain responsibility so these measures may come back to the house, pass third reading, and eventually become the law of the land.

These are days of social unrest, when people become extremely impatient with government whether at the federal level, the provincial level or the municipal level. Therefore, parliament must think and act in contemporary terms. In other words, it must become streamlined. I should like the members of the government to know that we have shown our good faith in the area of parliamentary reform, and this good faith was expressed last December by accepting the rules changes holus-bolus. Many of these we had determined. Notwithstanding that, at no time did we say that reform included government without

opposition, or that reform meant that parliament should be a rubber stamp to be used at the whim of the government. At no time did we give any indication to the government that this was what we had in mind when we talked of reform. Quite the contrary.

We have also shown our good faith in that, as I understand it, we have accepted proposed Standing Orders 75A and 75B in principle. I do not think that is questioned. Rule 75A provides for a time allocation when there is all party agreement; 75B provides for time allocation when the majority of the four parties agree. However, what we do not accept and will never accept is rule 75C, which gives the government power to limit debate without the agreement of any other party. That is the provision to which we take exception, and it is what this debate is all about.

This is why we on this side are standing and will continue to stand and fight for our very lives. Having first been presented with rule 16A, the iniquitous rule 75C is further proof of the arrogant attitude taken by this government in its attempt to downgrade parliament and the role of its members. What is ironic about the government's attempt to downgrade the effectiveness of parliament and the worth of its members is that not only are the member for Hamilton West and the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) affected, but all members are affected, including the government backbenchers.

Our parliamentary institution is one of the great bastions of our democratic way of life. History has shown this to be a fact, and it will continue to show it to be a fact if only we can bring this government to life. Our parliamentary system should not be tampered with lightly under the guise of improving efficiency; this is a great institution and we cannot treat it lightly.

It seems to me that a very frightening pattern has been established since I have been a member of this parliament. Although I am a baby at the game, I am certainly learning fast. One need be here no longer than eight months to know what it is all about, where it's at and all the rest of it.

An hon. Member: What about your partners?

Mr. Alexander: My partners are ready to shaft you any time you want to stand up. I do not expect too much interruption from the other side, Mr. Speaker, because I am talking responsibly. I am concerned at the frightening pattern that is being developed by this government. And I am not the only one who is frightened. Members of the government—those who cannot speak—people on the street, those who sent us here to protect our rights, are becoming concerned at the deliberate trend that appears, to me at any rate, to be leading us ultimately into the realm of dictatorship.

We use this institution to question cabinet ministers on matters of urgent and national scope. But the Prime Minister has said that no matters are national or urgent any longer, and accordingly we have the cabinet roster. Today, there were present six ministers. I should like to know where the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) was because I had a question for him. He was supposed to be here today. I also had a question for the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). Where was he today? It was not an earth shaking question, but it was one that I thought would be of interest to the house and the nation.

Mr. MacInnis: Certainly not hypocritical!

Mr. Alexander: No, not hyprocritical. Another worsening attitude, one I find disgusting, is the flippant manner of ministers during the question period. After all, they are ordinary members of parliament just like the hon. member for Hamilton West. I demand respect from them as I, in turn, give them respect. I am not here to play games. Perhaps they are and that is why they are not here for such long periods. I suppose they might as well get their licks in while they have the opportunity.

Then, there is the rudeness of the Prime Minister. I wish I had the nerve to stand up in my place and tell him a few things. I wish I were the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond. When the Prime Minister uses a word like "hypocrisy" in talking about a responsible and loyal opposition, then it goes down very hard, if it goes down at all. He says that this debate is a filibuster, but I do not think he knows what a filibuster is.

Mr. Crouse: A "stupid" filibuster.

Mr. Alexander: Yes, I did not mention the adjective. This is the place for debate. There will always be debate as long as there is an opposition and, believe me, we are going to continue to have an opposition. That is part of the pattern. What about the unwarranted rudeness of the Prime Minister? What about standing committees, Mr. Speaker? This was

part of the just society, and participatory democracy.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Have you ever seen such a shambles as the presentation of the Transport Committee report? The most important part was omitted, the part that had to do with the "Newfie Bullet". Where did that recommendation go? I do not want to say anyone was playing hanky-panky in the standing committee. Heavens no! That is a fault we on this side recognize.

Then we come to rule 16A. I will not go over that. Notice the pattern, Mr. Speaker. What about the general disrespect of the opposition? It is becoming increasingly worse. Why? That is what I want to know. Here is an opportunity for some intelligent Liberal backbencher to stand up and tell me why.

What about instructions to government members on standing committees? Legislation is supposed to go to a committee, be discussed and come back in the same state. Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker. Those are the words of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). The great Canadian phrase, untouched by human hands, is applicable. I believe him because I do not think that hon. member would be quoted in the newspapers of this country and face possibility of being checked by his government for telling lies. I believe him.

Mr. Bell: He is very honourable, for a Liberal!

Mr. Alexander: What about the pattern? A report that was presented by the chairman of the rules committee was abrogated by that brilliant pussy-footer, the government house leader. He attempted with all sincerity and viciousness, to abrogate that report.

An hon. Member: Vicious sincerity?

Mr. Alexander: I am not really so worried about the chairman as about what he did. He uttered disrespect for a standing committee that was formed by parliament. He said parliament does not count, it is nonsense. This attitude was discussed here to such an extent that the government house leader said, I am sorry; I was wrong. It is a terrible day when he has to say he is wrong, and it is a rare day.

To continue with the pattern, Mr. Speaker, we now have rule 75c, the ultimate in demagoguery! It appears that the philosophy of this government is power for power's sake at any cost, even if they have to cut the throat of the opposition. Apparently that is allowed in the new politics on the other side of the house. We cannot and will not accept that philosophy. We are prepared to fight this week, next week, the following week—

An hon. Member: Merry Christmas!

Mr. Alexander: As the hon. member to my left has said, Merry Christmas to you and a Happy New Year!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: Yes indeed, order your Christmas turkey now and get your Christmas shopping done because I tell you we are here to stay!

I must give this great city of Ottawa a plug. I usually talk about Hamilton, but something tells me that September in Ottawa can be very exciting. There is the green belt, the Arts Centre and all the urban renewal that is going on here. I am sorry I cannot get to Hamilton. However, I am still optimistic.

As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) stated, we have no intention of caving in; we can go on indefinitely. The Leader of the Opposition is a very responsible person. He does not make the statements I do. Do not think that we on this side are playing games or hanky-panky. Our leader has said we can go on indefinitely.

Speaking on behalf of many opposition members, if not all, we welcome such involvement, Mr. Speaker. We have to fight. We have to fight to hang on. We have to fight to protect our role as parliamentarians and, in particular, as opposition members. For a while I was a little concerned about whether this message that we were attempting to project was being received across the country, and whether those who sent us here would understand what we have been trying to do. I was very happy the other day. I received a letter—

An hon. Member: One letter!

Mr. Alexander: Don't worry! You just sit there and wait. God, that's an ignorant group over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: At one time, I called many of them my friends—that is outside of the house. When we get in the chamber there are no holds barred. If members on the government side keep on messing around, I am liable to get like the hon. member for Cape

Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis)! I can be just as vicious. Let me read my letter because this is very encouraging to government members also. The letter is dated July 2, 1969.

An hon. Member: Pretty good postal service!

Mr. Alexander: That is what I call stupidity! The member does not know when the letter was sent or when I received it, and yet he is saying, pretty good postal service. That is the attitude of a member of the government. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I shall now be like the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond and say they are stupid. I will now read the letter which I received from Mr. Donald J. Allan. It is dated July 2, 1969:

Dear Mr. Alexander:

I am writing you on a matter of grave concern to all Canadians. The governments bill to set the time limit of debate at all stages through parliament. The government is already equipped with the rule of closure should it want to limit debate, and this is enough power in the hands of any body of legislators. Should the government be given more powers, the day may come when an inept or corrupt government could rule the country in any way they desired.

This is the most important part of this letter. When he refers to me, he is also talking to the leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party and the leader of the Créditiste party:

Mr. Alexander, I beg of you, continue opposition to this bill. Fight it with every means at your disposal before the very means themselves are legislated out of existence.

I do not know this person who wrote this letter. Hon. members know I am a man of integrity. They can accept my word for this. I do not know who wrote it, but there are countless other letters like that. We must be concerned now. There is a principle involved. The principle involved is the accepted role of the opposition. Is such a principle valid in a democratic system? Is the accepted role of the opposition valid? The answer unqualifiedly is, yes. The word "democracy" supports the role of the opposition and precludes any other conclusion. Oh, but we have the draftsmen of the just society. I remember that in my maiden speech I said that was a slogan without definition. Yet the draftsmen of the just society and the draftsmen of the other slogan, participatory democracy, would disagree with what I just said. Because of the alleged mandate handed to them last June 25 they have interpreted the new politics of the Prime Minister as meaning there is no role at all for the opposition or, at the most, an insignificant role, whether it be the loyal opposition, the N.D.P. or the Créditistes.

• (8:40 p.m.)

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think many people across this nation, and all of us on this side, have come to the conclusion that this government is drunk with power and is hung up on this mandate about which they continually talk. I never heard so much talk, until I came here, about the great mandate they received. It is as if this were the end of everything. Do you know what the mandate means to them? To hon. members on the other side, with a few exceptions,—I must be fair in that regard—mandate means the granting of an unrestricted licence to do anything to anybody, regardless of the consequences, solely for the ultimate purpose and benefit of the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: I am becoming sick and tired of hearing hon. members throw across the chamber in a taunting way the reminder that they have a mandate. They are just like a bunch of babies. They seem to suggest they are the masters of the house.

Let me tell you this, Mr. Speaker. We are not frustrated because of their mandate. We do not cringe in fear because of their mandate. We are not weak because of their mandate. We shall not be bullied because of their mandate and we shall not be harrassed because of it. We shall not accept rule 75c because of their mandate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: Why do I say this? There is a relatively simple approach to this matter. We on this side of the house also received a mandate. We, too, in the loyal opposition received a mandate. Do you know what our mandate was? It was a mandate to criticize constructively; it was a mandate to probe government action; it was a mandate to be responsible.

Mr. Stanfield: A mandate to keep them honest.

Mr. Alexander: It was a mandate to be the defender of the rights of people. It was a mandate which implied a future role as the government of this great country, and do not sell that last one short.

This government, as well as any government in the future, must be aware of the fact that the opposition does in fact legally exist. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to read another quotation. I do not like reading quotations. I must say I am not the most brilliant orator nor am I the most brilliant speechmaker, but when I see something good I like to pass it on. I was going to say "pass it on to my stupid friends", but that would not be parliamentary. I should like to refer to Sir Kenneth Wheare's book entitled "Legislatures". I cannot give the citation, but it is really up to date. It was published by the Oxford University Press, New York and Toronto, in 1968. I wish to quote from page 77. The title of this particular chapter is, "Making the Government Behave".

Mr. Stanfield: Oh! How do you do that?

Mr. Alexander: With the general agreement of the house, perhaps I should read the whole book.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: I wish to refer to just a few paragraphs. The first appears at page 77:

> A famous American, Lawrence Lowell, professor of government at Harvard, and later president of the university, wrote in his *Government of England*: 'His Majesty's Opposition embodies the greatest contribution of the nineteenth century to the art of government.'

Did hon. members in the government know that?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Alexander: The quotation continues:

> We need not settle an order of merit in these matters; we can easily concede that the invention was important. Indeed, it is not too much to say that in the British constitution today the office of Leader of the Opposition is regarded as of no less importance—though it may be less desired—than that of Prime Minister.

Is that not significant to hon. gentlemen? This institution of ours comes from the Mother of Parliaments, and that is what is said by a great historian. Let me carry on a little further. Do hon. members realise that by the Ministers of the Crown Act of 1937 a salary was provided for the Leader of the Opposition? In that same act, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition were recognized as being of fundamental importance to the system of government. What is important is that Canada probably was the first country in the world, as far back as 1905, which decided to pay a salary to the Leader of the Opposition. A great figure at that particular time, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then prime minister, said:

> The Leader of the Opposition under our present system is just as much a part of the constitutional system of government as the Prime Minister himself.

Where is Mr. Trudeau today? I hope he reads my speech. I am not the best speaker, but I hope he pays me the courtesy of saying, "I wonder what that hon. member said about me". Let me continue with the quotation from this book. I find this very important, particularly when we know this government is attempting to emasculate the opposition. Do the members of the government really know what the opposition is all about? I should like to read from page 79:

> —in so far as one of the functions of a legislature is to make the government behave, the chief part in performing that function falls to the opposition and its leader. It is important to stress that they are not expected to undertake the whole of this task. The government's supporters are not supposed to be mere yes-men; influence can be exerted from outside the legislature, as we explained in Chapter 3, by individuals or by organized interests, which help to keep the government up to the mark. But in the legislature itself, though government supporters may grumble behind the scenes and occasionally in public—

Isn't that so true?

> —it is the members of the Opposition who are charged with the duty of examining and criticizing what the government has done and proposes to do.

• (8:50 p.m.)

> Through questions to ministers in the house, through motions of censure and no confidence, through the debates that accompany the passing of financial legislation and so on, the opposition in the British and other Commonwealth legislatures carries on its task. And the leading idea upon which it is organized is that it offers itself before the country as an alternative government. It criticizes upon the understanding that, given the opportunity, it could do better itself. In this way, so runs the theory at least, it is possible to have not only responsible government but responsible opposition also.

I could say much about the latter, but about the former I am devoid of words. The introduction of 75c gives a minister the power to arbitrarily propose the setting of a time limit on debate. This proposal ridicules the writer, Sir Kenneth Wheare. It ridicules his conclusion and makes a mockery of parliamentary rights.

I must stand up and be counted as voicing my objection to a rule which appears to me to be a deliberate attempt to emasculate the role of the opposition. Rule 75c can only be interpreted as a calculated, selfish, partisan

theory for relegating the opposition to a state of impotence. It is a deliberate attempt to abrogate the right to criticize. It is a deliberate attempt to abrogate the right to debate. It is a deliberate attempt to abrogate the right to dissent. All of these are unquestionably time honoured rights of the opposition, through which the opposition is able to make the government behave. The right to criticize, debate and dissent, Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen, are fundamental to the opposition's effectiveness. If this is so, and I really believe it is so, how could this government be so naive as to believe that we in the opposition would relinquish these rights without a murmur? Their memory is not very long. They seem to have forgotten December of 1968.

Rule 75c is only a modified version of 16A and it is totally unacceptable. In 1968, after much debate, 16A was withdrawn by the government. Public opinion indicated last December that 16A was not acceptable. Why should a modernized version, equally as vicious and equally as unacceptable, be acceptable now? Why should the government insist on 75c anyway? That is what I want to know. I have listened to some brilliant speeches from both sides of the house but nobody seems to be able to tell me why this is necessary. Have we on this side of the house been irresponsible? Have we not been co-operative? Have we not been reasonable? What is the necessity for 75c?

As a matter of fact, all the legislation the government desired to deal with has been dealt with and there is nothing on the Order Paper except this rules package. What is the necessity for 75c? It has been said that 75c is required in order to get on with legislation. What legislation are we talking about? Is the government talking about assistance to old age pensioners who are being strangled by the high cost of living? Is the government going to bring in legislation to cope with that problem? Is the government talking about the superannuates who are also being strangled by the high cost of living and inflation? Is this what the government is talking about? Is it talking about relief for the farmers in respect of the wheat problem? Is this the type of legislation it is talking about? Is the government talking about the plight of its first citizens? Is that the type of legislation about which this government is talking? Perhaps the government is going to bring in legislation which will determine a great oil policy for this continent. Perhaps, and this is my pet peeve, the government is going to create a ministry of housing and urban development. What a great innovation that would be. Is that what the government is talking about when it talks about legislation?

Is the government talking about housing or is it talking about inflation and high costs? If these are the things about which the government is concerned, it does not need 75c because we will co-operate with regard to them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Alexander: The government does not need that rule. I have outlined enough work to keep the government busy for two and a half years. It does not need 75c, and I would say that this government has proved miserably—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) for an outstanding contribution to this debate. In a very eloquent fashion, the hon. member tried to persuade some members opposite to change their ways, to change their minds and to repent before it is too late. It seems to me that throughout the address of the hon. member for Hamilton West there was the implication of that saying; hope springs eternal. It seems to me that if hon. members opposite show no sign of response to the very eloquent appeal just delivered by the hon. member, and if the only thing they are capable of is the type of interjection we heard during his speech, then really I am afraid both his and my faith in human nature may drop just a little bit.

This debate is an amazing spectacle. I entered this house in 1968 and I have been a member for a little over a year. It is some 10 months since this present session was convened. We are already witnessing a second major debate on the rules of this house. I noted with interest that the rules changes introduced before Christmas, which included rule 16A as well as quite a large number of other changes, were generally accepted throughout the house. That debate lasted nine

days. We have already spent six days on this debate. By the end of this week we will have reached nine days of debate as well. Some 18 days of the time of this house will have been spent debating the rules, all because of the persistence of this government in respect of this one particular matter.

It seems to me, after listening to the speeches by government members and the arguments presented by the government, that much of the motivation is based on occurrences in the last parliament. They are not up to date, and they are not dealing with the situation before parliament now. It seems to me this government is attempting to give the impression that it is moving forward into the future with its eyes firmly fixed on the past.

There are all sorts of images and comparisons which come to one's mind in trying to figure out what this government is trying to do. One image that comes to my mind is that this government somehow gives the impression of a new car hurtling down the road in which there is a beautiful blond sitting alongside the driver who has neither of his hands on the steering wheel. Some of the members might suggest that in this modern technological and technocratic age that car was being operated by remote control. It seems to me there might be some validity in that impression on the basis of the attendance both of cabinet ministers and government members in this house during the question period and during other debates in this house.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Long before I became a member of parliament I was convinced that the rules of parliament needed a thorough overhaul and an updating. In my opinion, parliament needs a safeguard to protect freedom of debate and to recognize the proper, useful and essential role of debate, while at the same time recognizing the needs of the nation and the rule and work to be performed by parliament. Some hon. members will know that prior to my election last year I was an unsuccessful candidate in several federal elections. My first run as a candidate was in the general election of 1957. I have to confess that on several occasions during the 11 years between 1957 and 1968 I was secretly relieved that I had not been elected. There were occasions when members of the house were called upon to work intolerable, inhuman hours for more than a year at a stretch. There were situations devoid of commonsense and reason. I should not need to recall to members of the house that on several occasions in recent years there was a general feeling in Canada that parliament was no longer relevant and no longer capable of coping with the needs of Canadian people. There was a feeling that parliament was slowly strangling itself, as well as the nation, as a result of its failure to restructure its operations.

My feelings on this subject were reinforced by one small incident last September. On that occasion, shortly after my arrival in Ottawa, my four year old son commented, on seeing the parliament buildings for the first time, "It's a castle". This made me think: Surely this is the way many young people must feel about parliament. One of the things I looked forward to at the commencement of the session was the prospect that the rules of parliament would be revised to enable the house to cope with an ever-expanding workload occasioned by the increasing scope and scale of public activity and concern. I was mindful of the fact that members of my own party, in particular the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), had long pressed for an adequate revision of the rules. Their concern was based on a recognition of both the desirability and the inevitability of expansion in the scope of governmental activity and concern.

When the session commenced last September I thought there was real reason for hope. Members and spokesmen for the government had indicated that they wanted to improve the rules. There seemed to be a disposition on all sides of the house to update the rules and make them more meaningful and relevant to today's needs. I thought there was real hope that progress would be made, while at the same time safeguarding the basic rights of parliament.

I should have known better than to think you could trust Liberals to have a controlling voice in making such changes. One reason I should have known better was that my father once sat as a member of this house, as well as a member of the Saskatchewan legislature, and had plenty of experience with Liberals. He learned through experience, sometimes bitter experience, to never trust a Liberal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Wise old Joe.

Mr. Burton: I am well aware of the background and experience that gave rise to this conclusion and thoroughly justified him in that belief. If any hon. members would like to hear some stories in this regard, I would be glad to tell them either now or on another

occasion. I thought times had changed somewhat. I thought: Surely, some Liberals have learned some things over the years; surely some of the Liberals are a new breed of cat who have a more up to date outlook.

An hon. Member: They have the same meow.

Mr. Burton: I was rather hopeful about the situation. But these thoughts turned out to be illusions. The Liberal approach to the rules has turned out to be a case of typical Liberal arrogance, autocracy and dictatorial conduct.

An hon. Member: What about your attitude?

Mr. Burton: We are talking about the rules of the house which you are attempting to foist upon parliament and the entire country. Rule 16A before Christmas, and 75c, are being imposed from the top without regard to the fact that the effect will be of crushing any opposition in the path of the Liberal cabinet juggernaut. Hon. members will note that I said "Liberal cabinet juggernaut", because hon. members across the way know, as well as anybody else, that this is the area from which the real pressure is coming. These two rules, 16A and 75c, imposed upon the committee by the heavy hand of the government, have placed many of the government's own supporters in a very difficult position. When I expressed my feeling last fall that there was hope for good rule changes, it was based in part on the knowledge that on the government back benches there are many capable men who are intelligent, well educated and well motivated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Burton: All hon. members with those characteristics are now being put to a cruel test and a cruel choice. Either they stand up for their convictions and principles by opposing 75c, or they give in to the heavy hand that is bringing pressure to bear upon them and which they know will eventually bring their government to defeat. I look across the way and see many hon. members with the characteristics I have mentioned; the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen), the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand), the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Borrie) and others. I know these are sincere, hardworking members. But I suggest that each of them, and in fact all members of the House of Commons, reach a point when they have to make a decision whether they are going to fight for some of the principles basic to the good operation of democratic institutions, or whether they are going to give in to the heavy hand that is pressing on them at the present time.

I suggest that if they are content to become puppets in the hands of their leaders, and remain as such, they must make that choice now. This is the turning point for many hon. members opposite. They will have to make a very difficult and important choice. There are other sincere, hardworking members on the other side of the chamber. There is the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), who introduced the motion now under debate. He is certainly a sincere, hardworking member. I am sure he is trying to do a good job, but he is operating under a very special difficulty.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I recall when the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton attended the same university as I did a number of years ago. At that time a bright future was already being forecast for the hon. member, that some day he might be a federal cabinet member of the prime minister of the country. One gains the impression that in fact he really would not mind too much if he were brought into the cabinet of the present government. I do not criticize the hon. member for this ambition, but I suggest that he, too, is now in a position where he has to make a very difficult choice. He must decide whether he will bow to the pressures brought to bear upon him by those in inner government circles, or whether he will stand up for his convictions. The hon. member looked very uncomfortable on several occasions when this debate commenced and we were discussing the various points of procedure and order that were raised. I suggest that if any hon. member has in fact such ambitions, in the long run he will be much better off to stand up for his principles and convictions at the present time. History can and does repeat itself. Former Liberal governments have grown arrogant and autocratic with age. This government has developed such characteristics more quickly than Liberal governments in the past. Such attitudes can lead to the downfall of a government, regardless of its political stripe. Some hon. members, particularly on the government side, are prone to think that the public does not care much about such things as rules and rule changes. But, Mr. Speaker, history has shown the public to be far more sensitive to

things affecting fundamental rights than politicians are often prone to think. On occasion public response might be slow or tardy; but it is there and any politician ignores it at his peril. Thus government backbenchers are faced with an important and difficult choice. Do they stand up to the autocratic decrees delivered to them by those in control of their party or do they allow their party to slide down the long, slippery slope which eventually leads to political oblivion.

At the beginning of this session, Mr. Speaker, a special committee was established to examine the rules of the house. The report of that committee was submitted to the house before the Christmas recess, and it was debated at that time. Some changes proposed were acceptable on this side of the house. Those included substantial changes in the structure of operations in parliament. The benefits of those changes are now evident in terms of dispatch of business this session. While problems remain, such as the manner and effectiveness of the operations of committees, there can be no question that business has been expedited. There are other questions, as well, that remain to be considered, among them being the whole question of communication between parliament as an institution, individual members in this house and the public at large.

Similarly, the question of whether legislation is adequate in the view of an individual member has nothing to do with the assessment of the effectiveness of these rule changes. Rule changes, just by themselves, do not produce a better parliament, do not produce better legislation or better government programs. These depend on the programs that in fact are introduced by the government, and the effectiveness of those programs. However, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of these very acceptable rule changes which were introduced before Christmas, rule 16A stuck out like a sore thumb, or like one rotten apple in a barrel, to use another type of expression. It was bad in itself and in time would spoil everything around it. As justification for the proposal to give the government arbitrary and sole power to limit debate, government members pointed to the small amount of business disposed of up to that time. In that debate I dealt with this point as will be seen by reference to pages 3896 and 3897 of *Hansard* for December 12 and pages 3914 and 3915 of *Hansard* for December 13. I will not go into detail with respect to points I made at that time, but I commend those pages to all members in order that they may gain, by reading them, a better picture of the business that had been transacted and dealt with by this house even prior to the rule changes adopted before the Christmas recess.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that from September 12 until the commencement of the rules debate, there were 60 sitting days. Some 36½ of these days were consumed with the opening day, the throne speech debate, the first budget and budget debates, supply and interim supply debates the length of which was based on agreement reached between the leaders of the various parties, and one day on which we did not sit. On that day no business was transacted because the house adjourned out of respect for the late premier Johnson of Quebec who had just passed away. Also there were debates involved in establishing the committees on procedure and statutory instruments. Although the Prime Minister stated at that time that only nine measures or bills prior to the Christmas recess had passed through parliament, the actual number of bills was eleven, and consideration had commenced on five other measures.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), and others on the government benches, complained about a number of measures which had not received consideration in the house during the present session. However, the President of the Privy Council fails to recognize that the house spent nine days debating rule 16A prior to Christmas; those nine days could have been used to consider other items of business.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that some time would have been required for us to consider other arguments stemming from the committee report—indeed, some aspects required further consideration—but there can be no question that the government's attempt to bulldoze rule 16A through the house consumed valuable time. In my view, they cannot have it both ways. If they insist on foisting measures such as rule 16A and rule 75C on the house, they are going to have to accept the consequences.

Hon. members know that the subject of time allocation was referred to a special committee in the new year as a result of the agreement that was reached just prior to the Christmas recess. This occurred after it became clear even to the government that they could not ram rule 16A down the throats of the house or country. Surely, it would have been reasonable to have expected the government to be sensitive to its experience with

rule 16A. But, Mr. Speaker, rule 75c demonstrates that such was not the case. Rule 75c introduced following the demise of rule 16A, demonstrates that this government is determined one way or the other to acquire a degree of raw, naked power that goes far beyond what the people of this country conceive as properly belonging to the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Burton: This question must be asked: why do they want this power? What do they intend to bring before parliament in the coming months? Is there legislation coming which will be unacceptable to the house and country, and which the government is going to ram down the country's throat? Can they only do this if they have rule 75c at their disposal?

The manner in which operations of the house are carried on, and the way we can expect the government to use this rule, was illustrated today when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), my colleague, suggested seriously to the government as a result of questions asked both yesterday and today that one of the allotted days the opposition had foregone prior to the end of the session should be used to discuss the serious wheat situation and the consequent farm income situation in western Canada.

This one day, could have been granted without any problem. The wheat question is very important, as is obvious, and as is recognized on all sides of the house. The debate would have lasted one day, and that would have been the end of it. But again we saw how unresponsive the President of the Privy Council is to positive and constructive proposals coming from this side of the house. If this is the type of response we are to continue to get from the government benches, and from the President of the Privy Council, then we have to view with suspicion some of the powers the government is attempting to acquire unto itself. My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and other members have already demonstrated that there has been a reasonable dispatch of business during the present session. In fact, had some of the legislation that was presented been more adequate, there would have been less debate, not more. Debate is often occasioned by the inadequacy of the legislation and measures that are placed before the house.

• (9:20 p.m.)

It should also be pointed out that in another session there will presumably be need for only one budget rather than the two we had this session. Some of the other rules changes, such as the changed approach to supply bills, will have effect for a full session and will result in further time for the conduct of other items of public business. Hopefully, unless the government persists in the type of approach it is adopting at the present time, we might even have less time spent on the discussion of rules changes, presuming that somehow or other we will be able to get through to the government and persuade them that they are not going to ram this sort of proposal down the throats of members of parliament.

Why does the government need these powers for which it is asking? It has been demonstrated during this session that the opposition members have been reasonable. Among other things, the opposition has relinguished two days of the throne speech debate. It allowed the time for consideration of the 1968-69 business of supply to be cut from 35 days to 17½ days. I note as well that following Christmas, the 1969-70 estimates were dealt with in committees. Two days of the second budget debate were surrendered by the opposition, and there were two opposition allotted days which were postponed at the end of June and not taken up by the opposition.

Is this what the government calls obstruction? Is the opposition being difficult? Anybody who suggests that the opposition has been obstructive in this session lusts for powers that all members should be wary of granting. Members of the government and supporters of the government should take heed of the old proverb: "They who live by the sword shall perish by the sword". This proverb has application in two ways. First, it could lead to the demise of this government. Secondly, I suggest members on the government benches should consider carefully just what their situation is going to be when once again they are sitting on this side of the house—at least, those with some chance of political survival.

I have made a number of references to the rules debate that took place prior to Christmas. It seems to me that some of the principles that were enunciated on several occasions should have been kept in mind by the government and those who support the proposal

now being debated in the house. On December 12 I commenced my speech with these words, as reported at page 3894 of *Hansard:*

> The debate on the rules now before us is of the utmost importance to Canada, it involves critical and essential components of the functioning of a democracy. Consideration of the matters under discussion should not be viewed from the standpoint of the mechanics of the matter, but rather from the standpoint of the principle involved and the consequences of our considerations on our democratic institutions. The mechanics are important in their place, but that place is still secondary to the principles involved.

The very manner in which rule 75c was pushed through the committee, having been introduced at the last moment and voted upon almost immediately, is an example of how the government has not heeded the advice given to it from all quarters of the house during the last rules debate before Christmas. It seems to me we must keep in mind some of the considerations raised at that time.

When the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) moved an amendment to the motion adopting the new rules prior to Christmas, his amendment in fact accepted the principle of time allocation in debates. This principle as such was recognized and accepted, I think, by all sides of the house.

As members will be aware, the key question is: How will this principle be applied? The application of the principle is the important thing. At that time the members of all opposition parties made their stand clear. They made it clear that they were not prepared to accept rule 16A or anything like rule 16A. It now seems that somehow or other their message failed to get through to the government.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Burton: Certainly.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Trudeau's hatchet man.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to object to the shouting; I think it is quite unbecoming. An hon. member does not have to accept a question, but if he does the hon. member who wants to ask the question should be allowed to do so without being subjected to this kind of conduct.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member, and all hon. members opposite, accepted last December 20 the fact that the committee should look into the British procedure in relation to allocating time for debates. Would not the hon. member agree that the British procedure is more strict on the opposition than the proposal here?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But we do not have to accept it.

Mr. Burton: I agree that this was one of the proposals that the committee was to look into, following its terms of reference agreed to on December 20. The hearings of the committee were held in camera, but I trust that the committee gave full consideration to the British procedures. It seems to me that the terms of reference in no way imposed an obligation or duty on the committee to accept those particular procedures. Although they were valid points for study, anyone who listened to the debate at that time would realize that rule 75c would not have been acceptable to the opposition parties had it been proposed prior to Christmas.

In December, the principle of time allocation was accepted, and this principle was embodied in the wording of the amendment, as I pointed out in the debate at that time. It seems to me we have to be very careful in considering the British procedure and the British parliamentary practice. While we can certainly learn useful lessons from British parliamentary practice, and as all members know the pattern of our parliament is based in large part upon British parliamentary tradition, the fact is that there are important differences between the British parliamentary system and the Canadian House of Commons, our own practices and needs.

We live in a different type of country from Britain, which for the most part is a homogeneous nation where matters can be debated in more capsulized form. Britain does not have our geographical dimension with its many regional interests and concerns. It is at a more advanced stage of economic, political and social development.

Mr. Fairweather: The committee chairmen there are also neutral.

Mr. Burton: As pointed out by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) the committee chairmen there are neutral. In addition, it should also be noted that the British House of Commons has some 625 members, whereas the Canadian House of Commons has 264. This simple arithmetical fact means, it seems to me, that members must

accept a different method of operation in order to carry on their business.

I came to Ottawa on the basis that I had been elected to a democratic institution. I was elected a member of the House of Commons in order to participate in debate on public issues and to make decisions thereon. I was not elected as the member for Regina East to accept a muzzle and I do not intend to accept a muzzle under any circumstances. I intend to fight proposals such as rule 75c in every way possible. When the government and its supporters come to their senses, we can resume reasonable discussions about the rules and urgent items of public business. We can deal with some of the items referred to in the question period today at any time the government may wish.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The government knows that rules 75A and 75B are reasonable and that they have been accepted in principle by the opposition. They provide for time allocation when there is full agreement among the house leaders of the various parties. They provide for determination of time allocation when all parties but one agree on the allocation. Why not accept rules 75A and 75B, find out how they work, and if they do not meet the need then let the matter be discussed further.

The government should know by now the position of the opposition. As I mentioned previously, rule 16A was voted to a standstill. Rule 75c will also be voted to a standstill. As soon as members opposite understand this we can begin to make some progress. Why not do it now? Why not adopt the slogan of one of the government's own agencies, "Do it now"? Why does the government not use intelligence and avoid this senseless confrontation? It is only rule 75c that stands in the way. Rules 75A and 75B represent a reasonable solution.

We are reasonable men and women. I suppose I should say woman, because regretfully, Mr. Speaker, there is only one woman in the house. I can assure all members that the hon. lady is a reasonable woman. If we are reasonable then we will reach agreement by adopting rules 75A and 75B. Let's get on with the job.

As a result of listening to some hon. members across the way, both in debate and private conversation, I gained the impression that part of their motivation for presenting this particular rule change which we find so objectionable is based on fear. It is based on the fear of veto, that somehow the opposition will be successful in vetoing and hold up government business. Several hon. members have already pointed out the example of the Criminal Code debate and the extensive amendments proposed by members of the Creditiste Party. This situation could have been dealt with under proposed rule 75B. I have no argument with the proposition that some of the debate on the amendment to the abortion section of the Criminal Code was unreasonable. I say that as one who in fact had some sympathy for some of the amendments in respect of abortion. As has been pointed out, this situation could have been dealt with under proposed rule 75B. I am sure a reasonable agreement could have been reached.

If the members of the government do, in fact, hold such fears about what the opposition is going to do, I suggest members opposite should consider that members on this side of the house have just as much right to be fearful of what the government is going to do, what its intentions are and what actions and decisions it will take in the future. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the government has forced debate on this particular proposal at the present time, knowing there was going to be strong opposition to rule 75c, is one example that cannot help but increase fears that the government is going to use this rule 75c in an unacceptable way.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if we are to have a parliament that is going to practice the principles of participatory democracy, about which we heard a good deal over the past year and a half, we are going to have to reject firmly the type of proposal contained in rule 75c. As I stated, we certainly agree with proposed rules 75A and 75B.

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member since his time has expired. The hon. member cannot continue unless he has unanimous consent of the house.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, when the measure now before us was introduced, I was far from thinking of speaking to it, first, because I do not consider myself an expert on the rules of the house and secondly, because I believe that the objections raised, both in the house and outside, would make the government understand that rule 75c should be withdrawn in the general interest.

I must admit today that I was entirely wrong as each and everyone of the government members are still possessed with the arrogance that was always shown by this government. And it is because of the consequences that would result from the concurrence in the proposed rules, that I decided to make some demands which are also, I believe, those of the people I have the honour to represent in this house.

Does the hon. member for Papineau wish to say something?

Mr. George C. Lachance (Lafontaine): For Lafontaine.

Mr. Ricard: The hon. member for Lafontaine could surely abide by the rules and stop interrupting me unnecessarily, besides, no one can understand what he says.

Mr. Lachance: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Lambert: You will make your speech later.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can make his speech in due time.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe.

Mr. Ricard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened, without interrupting them, to the members opposite, and I would like the French Canadians, those from the province of Quebec at least, to show me the same courtesy I have shown to all previous speakers, whether on this side or on the other side of the house.

I was sent here by the people of Saint-Hyacinthe to speak on their behalf, and I am sure that as well as the rest of the people in Quebec, they do not approve of the members being gagged. In general, the population does not approve of such methods to silence the members of the house. Our constituents have entrusted us with a specific mandate: to protect their interests and to express their views in the house of commons.

My fellow citizens want their rights to be respected by the government in power, whether it be Conservative, Liberal or other, and they will not tolerate that I be silenced by the will of only one man. They think that if I want to speak, I must have the right to do it as often as I see fit, especially when their interests are at stake, while I respect the rules of the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents think that only the Speaker has the power to call me to order and to ask that I sit down if I do not follow the rules.

In its simplest expession, rule 75c means that even before a legislative proposal is known to the house, closure will be forced upon us and after four days of debate, no member will be able to rise in order to enforce the rights and privileges of his constituents.

It goes without saying that I object and that I will object with all my strength to this measure because I think it is a dictatorial one. In addition, I am sure that the people in general are opposed to it, not only because I want to have the right to express in the house the ideas that are dictated to me by my constituents, but also because I want to be sure that those who will come after me will also be able to enforce the interests of the constituents of the St. Hyacinthe areas as often as they see fit.

My constituents believe strongly that the rights which are guaranteed to us by our democracy do not allow the government to resort to dictatorial measures in order to silence their representative.

There is another reason which leads me to oppose the adoption of the measure now under study.

• (9:40 p.m.)

In fact, we know that in 1964, if my memory serves me right, a debate which is now history, took place with regard to the adoption of a distinctive national flag. At that time, closure was imposed upon us and in a circular which I sent out to my constituents, I explained the reasons for the stand which I had taken with regard to the adoption of a distinctive national flag. I stated then that I would object with all my might to the imposition of closure, and I quote:

> Closure is an undemocratic measure. I voted against its application because I believe it is unfair to prevent a member from making his views known in the house as often as he deems necessary to do so. Even if such a measure were presented by my party, I would still vote against it.

I cannot miss this opportunity to say that I am against adopting a closure rule. With my colleagues of the Conservative party and the other parties of the opposition I shall do my outmost to try to bring the government to its senses.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the submissiveness of my friends across the way. I

fail to understand how they could, deliberately, from sheer wantonness, adopt a measure that will prevent them from speaking on behalf of their electors. If they vote in favour of Standing Order 75c, they will repudiate their commitments towards those who have sent them here. It is unbelievable that party discipline should have them submit so blindly to the will of their boss.

Everyone agrees, Mr. Speaker, that parliamentary procedure must be improved. Still, it must be recognized that we have, in the last few years, made much progress in that direction. During the present session, the opposition has proved repeatedly its goodwill, its eagerness to co-operate with the government to speed up the business of the house. Others, before me, gave several examples of this.

Allow me to recall one again that we gave up days allotted to the opposition, that we also agreed to shorten our speeches that a greater number of members might be heard.

All this, Mr. Speaker, was achieved by mutual agreement between the members of the opposition and those of the Liberal party. I am firmly convinced that more work can be done, that there can be none agreement if we proceed as we have done until now, that is by mutual agreement.

Statistics reveal, Mr. Speaker, that at the time of the debates on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, on the budget and other important topics, the government members used their right to speak according to their numbers.

But it is rather surprising to see that today those same members in some particular cases, ask that their rights be recognized when they, in the same breath, would like to prevent the opposition members from enjoying the rights given them under the rules.

A few years back, Mr. Speaker, I sat on the committee set up to review parliamentary procedure. This committee included members such as Messrs G. W. Pickersgill, Lionel Chevrier and, if my memory serves me right, Paul Martin also. I can assure you, that none of these gentlemen would ever have accepted a bill such as the one now under consideration. In fact, when proposals were brought forward to improve parliamentary procedure, which would have prevented somewhat the opposition members from speaking as long as they wished, they cried out loud about dictatorship, if not worse. Their contribution on the committee on parliamentary procedure was strictly limited to the benefits it could bring to their party.

Perhaps is it also relevant to recall some of my first memories from the time when I first came here.

I was elected on June 10, 1957. As you know, we came in after a government known for its arrogance throughout the country if not the world over. The government we replaced had refused for many hours and even for many days to provide the opposition which information it was entitled to. And finally, to prevent the public from knowing some very unflattering things about several friends of the Liberal party, the government we replaced finally resorted to the gag. As a result of that attitude taken by the Saint-Laurent administration in 1956, that government was defeated during the elections held on June 10, 1957. The people took advantage of that opportunity to show in a concrete and tangible way its disapproval as well as its indignation. It refused to trust that government again with the result that the Conservative government, then headed by the right hon. John Diefenbaker, came into power.

I attended in this house the proceedings which begun after parliament met in October 1957—if I am not mistaken—and I can say that the humiliation of defeat has failed to convince the people opposite to put an end to their arrogance. From the way they acted, you could see that they intended to keep on claiming that power was theirs forever by right and to consider the administration of public affairs as their own province.

You should have seen the Chevrier, Martin, Pickersgill and even the right hon. Pearson systematically and continuously challenging the authority of the Speaker, rising on points of orders that actually were not founded, resorting to any means to embarrass the ministers and the government. All they wanted was to filibuster and they made no bones about it.

If the young members opposite really want to learn about the behaviour of those who came before them in this house, they have but to read the official report of the House of Commons from 1957 to 1963. They will realize that the authority of the house was never so much abused as when the Liberal party was in the opposition. It would have been very interesting to see their reactions at that time if the government had tried then to introduce a legislation such as rule 75c, which they are trying to impose upon us now. They would have shouted "tyranny", "dictatorship", if not deplored the death of freedom in this country.

Today, Mr. Speaker, they want us to swallow this same pill which has been sugar-coated, without a word of protest.

In presenting rule 75c, the president of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said that he wanted to ensure a more rational, more logical use of the house's time. This reason is far from being very convincing since it has not won the approval of all opposition parties. The solid bloc which the opposition represents, Mr. Speaker, is proof that it is not in the best interest of Canadians to adopt this measure.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

• (9:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It being ten o'clock, a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been made and seconded at this time.

[*Translation*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under standing order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—VANCOUVER—CLOSING OF FRENCH STATION

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, on June 4 last, I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) if it was true that the French radio station in Vancouver was on the point of being closed?

Before making any comments on the changes that have taken place since I asked my question, let me state the facts, because in Canada, history has taught those who have studied it that in olden days, there was the dispersion of Acadians and the 12 French-speaking employees of the C.B.C. in Vancouver had the impression of going through the same experience.

As a matter of fact, a formal complaint had been lodged with the management of the Crown corporation, to draw their attention to what was happening. For those employees, it seemed like the beginning of the end of the French-language station, CBUF-FM.

At any rate, movers had come to the first floor of the Vancouver Hotel where the French network employees had their offices to move the furniture elsewhere and thus scatter

the team among the large group of English-speaking personnel.

The English network now has 450 employees in British Columbia. For administrative purposes, French-speaking employees come under the British Columbia region. But, according to the policy announced some time ago by the management of the Crown Corporation there are two networks and, in that case, those employees should come under the French network.

The policy which the Director of the English network in that region is trying to apply in Vancouver is therefore contrary to the policy of the Corporation, as stated by the employees who made this information known by telephone.

According to a report, the management felt that a faction was in action. Now, the 14 employees have already signed a first petition in which they object to the break-up. A second petition bearing the signatures of nine of them followed; three people had not signed because one was back in Montreal and a secretary and a technician were on holidays.

The 12 employees put up 20 hours of local production per week, six of which are transmitted over the national network. One of them said, and I quote:

> It is important that we work together, to maintain efficiency and also to protect our language. However, we are determined not to let our office furniture be carried away.

Moreover, the employees concerned stated that all those who thought that they would give up their rights can on the contrary be sure that they intend to defend them. As far as I am concerned, I wish also to be on the side of those defenders of the truth, in order that justice be granted to all our people. Otherwise, Canada will no longer exist.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, here is how the incident ended. The employees of the C.B.C.'s French-language station eventually won their battle to stay together and maintain their cultural identity. There was talk of moving members of the CBUF-FM station in an administrative wing with the English-speaking officials, but the announcer André Vigeant said:

> We have no intention of moving, except as a group.

A compromise was finally arrived at and the station is to keep on operating. However, we must keep our eyes open and be on the look-out.

I have in hand a statement to put on the order paper. I shall read it to you word for

word. It follows the government's decision to grant an educational television station to western Canada. Here it is:

The hon. Gérard Pelletier, Secretary of State, has announced that an agreement has just been signed under the aegis of the Department of the Secretary of State between the C.B.C. and the Department of Education of Alberta. Under that agreement, the C.B.C. will ask the Canadian Radio-Television Commission the authorization to establish a French TV station in the Edmonton area which will also be used to broadcast educational programs provided by the Metropolitan Edmonton Educational Television (MEETA).

The Secretary of State has pointed out that he has recently received a petition with 28,000 signatures asking the establishment of a French TV station in the Edmonton area.

On October 24, 1968, realizing the urgency of the situation, the Secretary of State announced the creation of a task force on educational broadcasting which, among other things, would look for interim measures to be taken before the adoption of the bill.

The agreement which has just been signed, must be considered as a happy one, provided that in reply to the proposal accepted by the government, we do not hear too many statements such as the one I read today in a newspaper article entitled: The Voice of Western Canadians Does Not Want French Radio or Television in Edmonton.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker—and unfortunately, I will not have enough time for all I would like to say—such statements should not be made or published in neespapers.

I shall quote a few sentences therefrom, because I do not want anyone to think that I made those statements. However, I wish the whole of Canada to know that, if there are separatists in Quebec, you can also find people who do not accept French Canadians as they should do. I shall therefore quote the opening of the statement:

—A group called "The Voice of Western Canadians" sent a letter to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission stating that the establishment of a French TV station in Edmonton was neither justified nor desired.

Last month, the C.B.C. filed with the C.R.T.C. a petition for a French TV station in the Albertan capital. No decision has yet been announced by the C.R.T.S.

In April, 28,000 Albertans forwarded a petition to the Secretary of State . . . asking him to support the establishment of that station. It is following that petition that the C.B.C. presented its request.

As for the *Association canadienne-française d'Alberta*, it rates at 40,000 the number of French-speaking Canadians in the Edmonton area alone—

"The Voice of Western Canadians", on behalf of its 400 members, protests against the establishment of that station, and as the watch-dog of the rights of Canadians, I wanted to ask this question. Whenever our people will be discriminated against—with the hope that the injustice will be quickly corrected—I will always be among the defenders who wish Canada to remain the Canada we know today.

[*English*]

Hon. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the Ralliement Creditiste has said that many in western Canada have their heritage rooted in Quebec. Not only do they wish to be involved in the affairs of western Canada but they also wish to retain their relations with other French speaking people in this country. He talked about the establishment of a French language television station in the capital of Alberta, Edmonton, and suggested this is of paramount importance for French speaking people living in that part of Canada. With that I agree. In my own part of Canada, the Northwest Territories, the missions which have ministered to many of our people have come from French Canada and other French speaking parts of the world. The people of western Canada, and particularly of northern Alberta, know how to get along with each other. Thousands of our Ukrainians, Eskimos and Indians have learned how to get along with each other, and that is demonstrated in communities like Lac-La-Biche and St. Paul, where the basic language is French. The French speaking people of these communities know how to get along with their neighbours.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt but the parliamentary secretary's time has expired.

WATER RESOURCES—HAMILTON, ONTARIO—POLLUTION BY STEEL COMPANY THROUGH DUMPING OF ACID

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I directed a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and asked whether his department had investigaged a report to the effect that in February the Steel Company of Canada dumped 150,000 gallons of hydrochloric acid into Hamilton Bay. I asked, if that were so, had a report been made and would it be tabled. I repeat that question this evening.

Other members of this house have talked about the severe pollution problem which presently exists in Hamilton Bay. That area apparently is one of the worst polluted areas

of Canada today, and I am pleased to see members of all parties are taking a keen interest in this problem. I am fully aware of newspaper stories of this incident, and of the investigation carried out by the Ontario Water Resources Commission. However, the federal government also has a responsibility in this particular area of Lake Ontario, and this matter certainly comes within the orbit of several federal departments.

If an investigation has been carried out by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources or any other federal department, we should certainly be entitled to see the report. If the investigation was carried out in co-operation with other authorities, the report should still be available. If there was no federal participation, then we have every right to ask the minister to tell us why there has not been compliance with the pollution regulations laid down by government. I understand that the Great Lakes system, and its pollution problems, come under federal jurisdiction.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) indicated on May 29 that the government was concerned with the general pollution problem in Hamilton Bay. He stated also that there are certain federal legislative powers in existence which can be used in certain instances. For example, there are powers under the Fisheries Act, under the Shipping Act and under the health act. His own department also exercises certain powers, and there are powers under the International Joint Commission. In my opinion, these powers could have been used to investigate the incident to which I have referred.

If none of the above agencies was used to investigate the acid spill, I ask why this was so. It is the dismal lack of enforcement, even by our present inadequate pollution standards, which is partly responsible for the dangerous pollution hazards that exist everywhere. Why are regulations written by certain departments and then ignored? The acid spill in Hamilton Bay clearly falls within federal jurisdiction and we are awaiting the minister's report. If a jurisdictional problem is involved, I ask the minister to outline it and to tell us what is being done to solve the problem.

Let me just refer to a few of these regulations. Hamilton Bay falls within the jurisdiction of the National Harbours Board. Among the regulations pursuant to that legislation is the following:

Nothing shall be thrown, drained or discharged into the water, allowed to come in contact with the water, or deposited anywhere within the limits of the harbour, which may in any manner—

(b) cause any nuisance or endanger life or health;—

This regulation clearly includes the pollution that occurred in this case. There are also regulations pursuant to the Fisheries Act, one of which provides that:

No one shall throw overboard ballast, coal ashes, stones, or other prejudicial or deleterious substances in any river, harbour or roadstead, or in any water where fishing is carried on—

It goes on to provide:

Every person who violates this section is guilty of an offence and liable for the first conviction to a fine of not less than $100 and not more than $1,000, or to imprisonment for one to six months, or to both.

For the second and any subsequent conviction, he is liable to a fine of $300 to $2,000 or to imprisonment of two to twelve months, or to both.

In addition, the Governor General in Council may make regulations respecting the obstruction and pollution of any waters frequented by fish.

I should like also to put on record part of a letter written by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on June 14, 1969:

The federal government has full and comprehensive jurisdiction over Canada's fisheries. Under the British North America Act this covers "sea coast and inland fisheries". From 1868 onwards the federal Fisheries Act has contained clauses dealing with the quality of water and measures designed to protect fish and other forms of marine life.

While some sections of the present Fisheries Act need to be updated, I feel that this particular piece of legislation provides an excellent vehicle for federal participation in the war against pollution, not only on our sea coasts but also in our inland waters as well.

I ask the minister concerned why some of the federal powers in this field have not been exercised. In my opinion, there is no doubt that the spill in Hamilton Bay falls under the jurisdiction of several federal government departments and they cannot escape their responsibility. We need immediate action on pollution problems, not only in Hamilton Bay but everywhere. The federal government cannot escape its responsibility in this field. I urge the minister and the house to make this question one of the top priorities in the years to come. Man and his very existence on earth depends upon the solution of this pollution problem.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) is a member of the Energy, Mines and Resources Committee. I hope he speaks for his party when he says that the federal jurisdiction in relation to water management and water pollution must become the concern of Canadians. I hope when the legislation dealing with the Canada water act is introduced into the House of Commons that, apart from the details of the act, we will be able to rely on hon. members across the way for their full and complete support in the event that there are jurisdictional problems.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Bring it in tomorrow.

Mr. Orange: We could bring it in tomorrow, but we would like your support in a way that is meaningful for Canada.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Why not do something with the legislation you now have? Why are you sitting around?

Mr. Orange: I think the hon. member is aware of the jurisdictional problem. He was once the premier of a province. He recognizes the problems connected with introducing legislation. He should recognize also the problems of jurisdiction between the province and the municipalities. What we are faced with here, at the moment, is the important provincial problem.

We have a report that 150,000 gallons of acid were dumped into Hamilton Bay by the Steel Company of Canada. This has never been confirmed by the Ontario Water Resources Commission or any other source. This happened a month ago. With the greatest of respect to the hon. member, he really has not brought this before the house since that time. However, that is not the point.

The point is that we, as federal legislators, should recognize that water pollution and water management are major problems in this country. Please recognize that it takes a little bit of time to get organized. We recognize that there are jurisdictional problems.

Mr. Harding: Did you investigate it?

Mr. Orange: We investigated this.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What did you find?

Mr. Orange: Never mind. We have jurisdictional problems. I look to opposition members for support, particularly those who feel so hearty these days because they have some representation in the province of Manitoba. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for recognizing the Manitoba centennial today. We need this support for which I am asking in order to convince the people of Canada that water management and pollution affect the quality of life of all people in Canada. As the result of the major policy statement tonight by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), I assume we have that support.

SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS—DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, on June 11 I asked the following question as recorded at page 9997 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Does the minister intend to expose senior civil servants in his department to the difficulties and frustrations of the marketplace, as suggested by the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer)?

My question arose from a speech the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) made, I believe, in Toronto on June 11 to some cost accountants. Because of the hon. member's recent association with the ministry, I thought it might be relevant to ask that question of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). At that time Mr. Speaker said:

> Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is rather mysterious, as far as the chair is concerned. Perhaps it might be considered in the hour of mystery some time after ten o'clock.

Since we have had some mysterious answers here this evening, I suggest I am not out of place in bringing this question before this huge assembly at this time. One aspect of the suggestion made by the former minister of transport was that senior civil servants should perhaps have a different type of training before assuming their positions. From time to time we hear rumbles that the top level of the public service should rise and fall with the fortunes of government, similar to what happens in the United States where all the top people are replaced when a new president assumes office.

• (10:20 p.m.)

While I have raised only one question of mystery, upon which I hope the Parliamentary Secretary will throw some light, concerning whether the member for Trinity

was flying a real balloon, a lead balloon or his own balloon, perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary would also deal with this other question about which there is a rumour around Ottawa. We will be interested in what he has to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance): I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether my remarks will lift or add to the veil of mystery to which Mr. Speaker referred when he shunted the hon. member's question into this late show period. I think it is important to note that the government and its officials do in fact make an effort to be aware of the views not only from the world of business but also from the worlds of labour, the professions and the universities. I think the government has been working to expand the range of these contacts. In my opinion a very important role in this regard can be and is being played by members of parliament like ourselves. We are in a particularly good position to bring the views of groups and individuals to the attention of the government. I think I must conclude by saying if there are to be changes in existing government policies with regard to the role of the civil service, then I am sure the hon. member knows such changes will be announced in due course and in the usual way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What about their pensions?

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.24 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 16, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL CAPITAL

TABLING OF SIXTY-NINTH REPORT OF COMMISSION

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in French and English two copies of the 69th report of the National Capital Commission. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not having tabled that report yesterday, which was the deadline, but one of the essential signatures was missing, due to the summer holidays. I hope that the house will excuse me for this slight irregularity.

[*English*]

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH CHAIRMAN RESPECTING RESIGNATION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, further to an undertaking given earlier by the Prime Minister I should like to table copies of correspondence between the Prime Minister and Mr. Fullerton, the chairman of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, in respect of the latter's resignation.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MESSAGE FROM CANADIAN HIGH COMMISSION IN LAGOS RESPECTING ALLEGED STATEMENT BY BRIGADIER HAMILTON

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a copy of a message from the Canadian High Commission in Lagos, dated July 14, 1969, on the subject of the report in the *Globe and Mail* of July 12 relating to a statement alleged to have been made by Brigadier Hamilton.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INFORMATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Qusetion No. 2,217—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Justice provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided, to whom are they distributed, and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1, 2 and 3. The Department of Justice does not provide an information service. However, I am informed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who, before being transferred to the Department of the Solicitor General on October 1, 1966, as follows: 1. Yes. 1960, $18,320; 1961, $22,800; 1962, $37,765; 1963, $39,269; 1964, $42,449; 1965, $46,704.

2 and 3.

Year	Cost	Publications	Distribution	Public Releases
1960/61	—	Not available	—	Not available
1961/62	—	Not available	—	28
1962/63	$ 347.04	"Serve Canada With RCMP"	11,568	22
	$ 1,273.63	"Career in Scarlet"	2,549	—
	*$ 2,932.00	"Crime in Your Community"	54,700	—
1963/64	$ 435.48	"Serve Canada With RCMP"	14,516	32
	$ 1,117.84	"Career in Scarlet"	2,178	—

Questions

Year	Cost	Publications	Distribution	Public Releases
1964/65	$ 280.00	"RCMP Service Dogs"	1,000	19
	$ 447.15	"Historical Outline"	4,065	—
	$ 99.00	"RCMP Band Posters"	550	—
	$ 909.00	"RCMP Blue Book"	5,050	—
	$ 423.00	"Serve Canada With RCMP"	13,200	—
	$ 1,853.70	"Career in Scarlet"	6,179	—
1965/66	$ 846.30	"Historical Outline"	10,270	37
	$ 2,912.56	"RCMP Blue Book"	21,464	—
	$ 583.50	"RCMP Musical Ride"	8,066	—
	$ 818.00	"Serve Canada With RCMP"	35,500	—
	$ 3,420.58	"Career in Scarlet"	10,815	—
	*$ 2,431.10	"Crime in Your Community"	34,730	—

*Reimbursed 50 per cent by Bank of Canada.

POLYMER CORPORATION—LANGUAGE SPOKEN BY EMPLOYEES—CAPITAL EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Question No. 2,248—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. How many persons on the Executive of Polymer Corporation speak, as their mother tongue (a) French (b) English (c) other, and how many are bilingual?

2. How many persons on the Board of Directors of Polymer Corporation speak, as their mother tongue (a) French (b) English (c) other, and how many are bilingual?

3. What is the amount of capital expenditures by Polymer Corporation (a) in Ontario (b) in Quebec?

4. Is Polymer Corporation planning to establish a production branch or a subsidiary in the Province of Quebec and, if not, for what reason?

5. How many employees does Polymer Corporation have (a) in Quebec (b) in Ontario?

6. What was the return on invested capital for the last three years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Polymer Corporation Limited is concerned: 1. (a) One; (b) Eight; (c) None. One member of the Executive is bilingual.

2. (a) One; (b) Eight; (c) None. Two Board members are bilingual.

3. The capital expenditures in Ontario as represented by fixed assets, amounted to $163,593,000 as of December 31, 1968. The Company does not have any fixed assets in Quebec and does not have a record of the value of the capital assets it has purchased in Quebec.

4. No. The capacity of the Company's existing Canadian operations is sufficient for its current needs and the Company, therefore, does not have any current plans to establish a subsidiary or branch elsewhere in Canada.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

However, it is continually seeking attractive opportunities for further expansion and growth.

5. Polymer does not have any employees located in Quebec and had 2,649 employees in Ontario as of May 31, 1969.

6. The return on invested capital for the last three years was as follows: 1966, 11.2%; 1967, 5.6%; 1968, 6.7%.

[*English*]

INFORMATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Question No. 2,317—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes.

	Costs of Information Services
1960	Not available
1961	" "
1962	$259,986
1963	268,336
1964	331,800
1965	391,879
1966	442,402
1967	508,560
1968	479,207

2.

	Publications	Periodicals	Posters	Press Releases
1960	26	8	1	127
1961	37	8	1	135
1962	480	8	137	104
1963	522	8	144	90
1964	474	8	106	70
1965	893	8	134	98
1966	1178	8	254	86
1967	668	8	168	99
1968	750	8	127	143

All publications are the responsibility of each separate division of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and their cost varies according to the requirements of the division. Thus, costs involved are difficult to obtain as new publications, reprints and revisions are done through a number of different channels. To assess costs of each publication would involve an excessive amount of staff research and would be most difficult under the present resource limitations.

3. See answer in 2. Distribution is effected as follows: (a) health publications through the Provincial Departments of Health; (b) welfare publications through Canada Pension Plan, Old Age Assistance and Family Allowance Headquarters and Regional Offices.

CROWN ASSETS DISPOSAL CORPORATION—SALES PROCEDURE

Question No. 2,354—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. What criteria does the government use in the choice of its tenderers in relation to the disposition by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation of trucks, jeeps, etc.?

2. How many of these tenderers were from the Province of Quebec?

3. How much has the government realized each year from the sale of goods by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for the period 1960 to 1968 inclusive?

4. On what basis does the government compare the original costs of such goods?

[*Translation*]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: 1. The Corporation maintains lists of all companies, establishments and individuals who have in some manner recorded with the Corporation their interest in the sale of trucks, jeeps, etc.

2. There are 632 companies and individuals located in the Province of Quebec listed on the solicitation lists to receive tenders.

3. 1959-1960, $6,671,475; 1960-1961, $7,201,-810; 1961-1962, $7,166,131; 1962-1963, $6,708,-661; 1963-1964, $6,430,775; 1964-1965, $11,-019,634; 1965-1966, $10,932,480; 1966-1967, $14,741,192; 1967-1968, $9,820,259; 1968-1969, $8,586,045; Total, $89,278,462.

4. Most of the materials and surpluses sold by the Corporation consist of military equipment having little commercial application.

The bulk of the surpluses is sold on the basis of recovery of the value of the basic material content, as salvage and prices realized in most cases do not bear any meaningful relationship to the original cost of such goods.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS—RENEWAL OF BUSINESS LICENCES

Question No. 2,432—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. How many applications by an existing business for a renewal of its licence to function in a National Park have been refused since 1957?

2. What is the name of each person, firm or corporation to whom or to which a renewed business licence has been refused since 1957?

3. Prior to the refusal to grant such renewed licence, did the Crown in any case make an offer to the lessee of the property from which the applicant for such licence carried on business, for the purchase of the leasehold interest, which offer was refused?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. There are many business licences issued in National Parks each year and it would be necessary to examine each licence for each year since 1957 to yield this type of information. Records are not kept in such a way as to find this information without considerable cost financially and in man years. Business licences for established businesses are rarely refused renewal and when they are, if the operator agrees to meeting the minimum standards, the licence is issued or reinstated as the case may be.

2. As indicated in the answer to part 1, the costs financially and in man years to the taxpayer to search for the information would be exorbitant.

3. If the long-range plans of the Department involve a change in land use where substandard facilities exist, the Department may offer to purchase the unexpired leasehold interest, if sufficient funds are available and if the acquisition has sufficient priority.

PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,436—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Defence Production have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. The former Department of Defence Production is now part of the Department of Supply and Services. The Department of Supply and Services has no public relations staff as such. Relations with the public media are part of the regular duties performed by the Information Division of the Department.

2. Not applicable.

AIRPORTS—LAND OWNED BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 2,512—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. What amount of land (in acreage) is owned by the Government of Canada for the purpose of airports?

2. At what location and what amount?

3. What is the market value of such lands?

4. Is all land employed for use by the government or for the specific use of air transportation?

5. How much land at each location is used for other purposes?

6. What are the contractual arrangements for such use?

7. What is the government's remuneration as consideration for the use of those lands?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):

1. Province	Area in Acreas
Alberta	16,828
British Columbia	41,313
Manitoba	12,228
New Brunswick	4,722
Newfoundland	90,963
Nova Scotia	4,981
Ontario	33,220
Prince Edward Island	470
Quebec	111,951
Saskatchewan	6,325
Yukon Territory	9,559
Northwest Territories	57,382
Total	389,942

2, 3, 5 and 6. The information requested is very extensive and it will be time consuming to prepare. If the questions were related to specific airports it could be made available quite readily.

4. When land is acquired for airport purposes it is sometimes necessary to purchase whole units of land for example, a whole farm where only a portion of the farm is required for airport purposes. This severance land is therefore surplus to airport requirements but is used for revenue purposes mainly through agricultural leases.

7. The total revenue earned from land rentals for the fiscal year 1967/68 was $822,-369. The land rental rate policy for land for commercial or industrial use at airports, with some exceptions, is calculated to earn interest on the market value of the land plus recovery of development costs plus an airport maintenance charge; and land for agricultural purposes is put out to tender periodically. At some airports land for commercial or industrial use is leased at standard rental rates established in accordance with a former land rental policy, but as leases come up for renewal their rental rates are brought in line with the existing policy.

TSAWWASSEN INDIAN BAND—ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BY NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

Question No. 2,517—**Mr. Rose:**

1. What was the reason for the acquisition by the National Harbours Board from the Tsawwassen Indian Band of British Columbia of its property and/or rights?

2. Was there any consultation with the Tsawwassen Indian Band regarding this acquisition?

3. If so, what was the response of the Tsawwassen Indian Band?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Acquisition of thirteen acres from Indian Band was necessary for relocation of B.C. Hydro D.C. cable installation between lower mainland and Vancouver Island. B.C. Hydro had planned their installation of a highly specialized cable previous to the decision to develop Roberts Bank. The development of Roberts Bank necessitated that B.C. Hydro's plan be changed and the only practical alternative was through the Reserve.

2. There was very close and lengthy consultation with the Band respecting this acquisition both through their solicitor and by direct contact with Band officials.

3. Indian Band has accepted an arrangement arrived at through the negotiations mentioned above.

WAR SURPLUS GAS MASKS—BAN ON SALE

Question No. 2,527—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Is the Department of National Health and Welfare considering placing a ban on the sale of war surplus gas masks?

2. Has the Department received any representations from the Ontario Government regarding this matter?

3. If so, what was the Department's reply?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare is consulting with other federal agencies with respect to the most appropriate means of controlling the sale of war surplus gas masks.

2. Yes.

3. The Department indicated that it was consulting with other federal agencies with respect to this problem.

SALE OF PICTON, ONT. AIR STATION

Question No. 2,533—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What was the government's selling price of the air station at Picton, Ontario to Piasecki Aircraft of Canada Limited?

2. Who are the chief executive officers of this company?

3. Was there a competitive tender for the purchase of this airport?

4. If so, who were the other bidders and what were their respective bids?

5. If not, what were the reasons for not requesting competitive tenders for the sale of this Airport?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: 1. A portion of the Canadian Forces Base at Picton, Ontario was sold to Piasecki Aircraft of Canada Limited for the sum of $260,000.

2. Directors: Frank M. Piasecki, H. George S. Bain, Arthur J. Kania, H. J. Bird. Officers: Frank M. Piasecki, President; Arthur J. Kania, Secretary-Treasurer; Donald M. Myers, Vice-President; Ernest Summers, Vice-President; James W. Clopp, Vice-President.

3. No.

4. N/A.

5. About two years ago, Piasecki Aircraft Corporation of Philadelphia decided on the establishment of a Canadian based operation to develop a compound helicopter utilizing Canadian Pratt & Whitney engines and has since been looking for adequate existing facility for such a program. A Canadian subsidiary, Piasecki Aircraft of Canada Limited, was incorporated in March 1968. Upon representation that Picton Base appeared to meet the company's requirements in most respects, particularly timing, the Government, anxious to take advantage of the opportunity to introduce in Canada a major helicopter industrial plant with export potential and considering the adverse effect on the regional economy caused by the closing of the Picton Base, authorized CADC to enter into immediate negotiations with Piasecki Aircraft of Canada Limited on the basis of the appraised value.

DARTMOUTH, N.S., PUBLIC WHARF—DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Question No. 2,535—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What specific steps are now being taken by the government to formulate a development policy as referred to in the reply to Question No. 2,086, for the Dartmouth side of Halifax Harbour?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: Specific steps to formulate a development policy for the Dartmouth side of Halifax Harbour will depend on the outcome of consultations with local interests.

CROWN ASSETS DISPOSAL CORPORATION SALES

Question No. 2,541—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What was the total revenue received from sales of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation in each of the years 1945 to 1968 inclusive?

2. What was the book value of the assets at the time of disposition to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

3. What percentage of the items were classified (a) obsolete (b) obsolescent?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: 1. The total revenue received from the gross sales of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation in each of the years 1948 to 1968 inclusive is as follows: 1944-1945, $9,116,131.55; 1945-1946, $124,878,368.66; 1946-1947, $219,205,531.91; 1947-1948, $74,046,218.69; 1948-1949, $30,495,-341.87; 1949-1950, $11,650,550.30; 1950-1951, $20,770,555.12; 1951-1952, $3,864,777.40; 1952-1953, $4,311,238.51; 1953-1954, $4,330,310.47; 1954-1955, $5,578,069.36; 1955-1956, $6,727,-490.13; 1956-1957, $8,524,750.05; 1957-1958, $7,841,996.51; 1958-1959, $9,910,619.78; 1959-1960, $8,638,052.91; 1960-1961, $9,577,566.79; 1961-1962, $13,229,716.82; 1962-1963, $8,881,-212.97; 1963-1964, $11,239,647.39; 1964-1965, $17,267,031.33; 1965-1966, $16,368,882.28; 1966-1967, $25,861,947.15; 1967-1968, $14,790,114.43; 1968-1969, $15,239,067.54.

Questions

2. The book value of the assets declared surplus to the Corporation was never provided to the Corporation by the declaring departments. However, from the years 1965/66 on, in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee recorded in *Votes and Proceedings* No. 205 of December 7, 1964, departments and agencies report the cost, as recorded in their perpetual inventory accounting system, of (1) obsolete but serviceable and (2) surplus but serviceable material declared surplus. The latter information appears in the annual issue of the Public Accounts of Canada.

3. The Corporation does not maintain its records in such a manner as to provide this information.

CARIBOU, N.S.-WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I. FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Question No. 2,552—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Is the government giving consideration to providing additional necessary facilities at the Ferry Terminals at Caribou, N.S. and Wood Island, P.E.I. for the Nova Scotia-P.E.I. Ferry Service?

2. If so, when is it expected that a decision will be reached?

3. Is consideration being given to the provision of a third ferry for the service?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. Additional terminal facilities are being provided at Wood Island, P.E.I. to be completed about mid-July. Provision of additional facilities at Caribou, N.S., await conclusion of forthcoming discussions with the Province.

2. See 1.

3. Yes.

KAISER JEEP CANADA LIMITED—POSITION UNDER AUTOMOTIVE PACT

Question No. 2,587—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Was Kaiser Jeep Canada Limited defined as a 'manufacturer' under the terms of the Canada-U.S. Automotive Pact?

2. For each year since 1960, what have been Kaiser Jeep Canada Limited's exports and imports of automotive products?

3. Since the Automotive Pact was signed in 1964, what has been the estimated loss in Canadian duties accorded to Kaiser Jeep Canada Limited?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes.

2. Detailed information on the internal affairs of each company participating in the automotive program is given to the Government on a regular basis. This information is confidential. Its public disclosure could be detrimental to the company concerned and adversely affect the flow of confidential information to the Government from other participants in the program.

3. There is every indication that Kaiser Jeep has fully complied with the terms of the automotive program allowing duty free flow of its Canadian made products into the U.S. and vice versa. There is, therefore, no estimated loss in Canadian duties accorded to this company.

KAMOURASKA, QUE.—C.M.H.C. LOANS, HOMES FOR AGED

Question No. 2,592—**Mr. Dionne:**

What was the total amount of loans granted by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the construction of homes for the aged in the federal constituency of Kamouraska in 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): The number and amount of loans approved by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to Non-Profit Corporations under Section 16A of the National Housing Act to house elderly persons in the Kamouraska area for the period 1965 to 1968 is as follows.

Net NHA Loans Approved to Non-Profit Corporations Under Section 16A of the National Housing Act in the Kamouraska Area 1965–1968*

Period	New Housing				Existing Projects				Total			
	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000
1965.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1966.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1967.....	2	8	100	720	—	—	—	—	2	8	100	720
1968.....	1	5	38	313	—	—	—	—	1	5	38	313

*All activity to house elderly persons under the National Housing Act in Kamouraska area during the period 1965 to 1968 occurred under Section 16A. C.M.H.C. statistical data are not recorded on a constituency basis. The data contained in the above table approximate the activity in the constituency.

[Mr. Richardson.]

FEASIBILITY STUDY, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN FRANCE BY CANADIAN METHODS

Question No. 2,623—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Was there a competitive tender by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding the feasibility study on introducing Canadian timber-frame construction methods in France?

2. If so, what were the names of the bidders for this study?

3. If not, why was Campeau Corporation of Ottawa chosen for this study?

4. What financial amount was given to the Campeau Corporation for this feasibility study?

5. What were the results of this feasibility study?

6. What financial and other arrangements have been made with the Campeau Corporation as a result of this study?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. No. This is a private enterprise project with Government assistance directed at increasing the export of Canadian building materials.

2. Not applicable.

3. The Canadian Home Manufacturers Association, whose members comprise prefabricated housing producers from across Canada, was asked to suggest representation on the Special Housing Study Mission to France, March 30 to April 6, 1968. Their selection included Campeau Corporation Limited of Ottawa. As a result of the Mission, Campeau Corporation Ltd. concluded that a project of this nature would be of interest to them if assistance from the Canadian Government could be obtained. In considering their request for assistance, the Department noted that Campeau Corporation Ltd. had the necessary expertise in major single family housing project developments and factory assembly of components, as well as a French-speaking capability for supervisory and labour training purposes. In these respects, they met the essential criteria suggested by the special mission.

4. The agreement with Campeau Corporation Ltd. covering the feasibility and information study provides for the payment of the costs of the study in an amount not to exceed $97,000.

5. The study, the results of which will be made available to Canadian home builders, is not yet complete. Findings to date support proceeding with five prototype houses to confirm these findings.

6. The Department is negotiating with Campeau Corporation Ltd. with respect to assistance to be provided for the construction of the five prototype houses for demonstration purposes, the amount of such assistance not to exceed $140,500.

WEATHER FORECASTING, SOUTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 2,627—**Mr. Southam:**

1. Has the government studied the problem of weather forecasting in Southern Saskatchewan particularly with respect to the forecast for the higher altitudes and, if so, what are the results of such studies?

2. If such facilities are not available to assist farmers in accurately planning their day-to-day operations, on what date is it expected that such facilities will be available?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. In addition to facilities already in being, improvements planned for the area over the next two fiscal years include the installation of two new weather reporting stations and the expansion of the weather reporting program at Kindersley.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

GRAIN—AMOUNT SOLD AND PAYMENTS POSITIONS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,196—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. What amount of wheat, oats and barley was harvested in Canada during the years 1966, 1967 and 1968?

2. How much of this grain was sold to mills in Canada during the same years and for what prices?

3. How much of this grain was sold to foreign countries during the same years and for what prices?

4. What was the amount paid by each of the purchasing countries during the same years?

5. Which of the countries purchasing wheat or other grain have not paid for their purchases to date, and what is the amount owed by each?

Return tabled.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION—COST OF INFORMATION SERVICE AND NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 2,462—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Defence Production provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

Increase in Bank of Canada Interest Rate

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

FINANCE

INCREASE IN BANK OF CANADA INTEREST RATE

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the rise in the bank rate to 8 per cent announced yesterday by the Bank of Canada, which will have the effect of raising the interest rate and the cost of living to an unprecedented level and increasing the hardships to all those on fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has given the Chair the notice required under the provisions of Standing Order 26. The problem raised by the hon. member for Waterloo is obviously an important one; it refers to a situation which is undoubtedly urgent. At the same time, I am sure it is a matter which is of continuing interest to all hon. members of the house.

As everyone knows, there has been a pattern of changing interest rates in recent months and from time to time announcements have been made by the Bank of Canada of alterations in the bank rate. The inevitable conclusion is that the problem is of continuing concern. As evidence of this the Chair need only refer to the fact that on June 25 the very matter referred to in the hon. member's motion was referred by the house to one of its standing committees for consideration. The order of the house reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs be empowered to consider the present level of interest rates in Canada and their relation both to rates in other countries and to economic conditions in Canada and elsewhere.

In this sense the matter is before a committee of the house. As I have said, the fact that the house has already been dealing with the situation for some time is an indication that we have here a problem which is of a continuing nature. In this sense I doubt very much that it falls within the purview of Standing Order 26. For these reasons I regret very much that it will not be possible at this time to put to the house the motion proposed by the hon. member for Waterloo.

[Mr. Robinson.]

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 256 is acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

MANPOWER TREND STUDIES

Motion No. 256—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the recent studies on manpower trends in Canada undertaken in the Department of Manpower and Immigration referred to by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his speech at Wolfville, Nova Scotia, on June 26, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 140, 206, 214, 255 and 257?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

GUIDELINES ISSUED TO IMMIGRATION OFFICERS

Motion No. 140—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all telegrams, correspondence and other documents received by the Prime Minister, Minister of Manpower and Immigration or the Secretary of State for External Affairs, with respect to the admissibility by the Government of Canada of deserters, draft dodgers or military personnel from any other country seeking immigration to this country and a copy of all instructions, regulations, guidelines or memoranda circulated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to departmental officials at Immigration centres respecting immigration to this country issued since January 1, 1967.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has no objection in principle to gathering together all the correspondence called for in the first part of this motion. However, the papers requested in the second part are directives circulated within the department from headquarters to field staff. It has not been the practice to make public such papers because of their confidential character. In view of this, perhaps the hon. gentleman would agree to withdraw his motion, because we accept the first part.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, since another motion of mine applies to the second part and it was put over for debate, I agree to the request of the parliamentary secretary.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

SALES TAX ON DRUGS

Motion No. 206—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of any reports, reviews or studies of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding the removal of the federal sales tax on pharmaceuticals and drugs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the reports, reviews or studies referred to by the hon. member consist of working sheets and memoranda composed for internal use in the department and passing between officials and the minister. As such they are privileged documents, the production of which is contrary to public policy. In view of this, I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the taxpayers of Canada made these concessions, I think these documents should be made public. Therefore I ask that the motion be transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the motion shall be transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

NATIONAL POSTAL ZONING CODE

Motion No. 214—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interim study undertaken by one of the task forces in the Department of Communications regarding a national postal zoning code as referred to by the Minister of Communications in *Hansard* of June 9, page 9870.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Communications has asked me to refuse this motion on the grounds that the final report of the study to which reference has been made of a national postal code has not yet been received and that it is therefore not possible to determine at this time whether the publication of this report in whole or in part would be in the public interest. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I accept the government's explanation and I withdraw the motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM PRIME MINISTER TO GENERAL GOWON

Motion No. 255—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the message sent by the Prime Minister to General Gowan as mentioned on July 2, 1969, as reported in *Hansard* on page 10751.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, communications between heads of government are normally confidential and their contents not made public. In any case such action cannot be taken unilaterally. In the circumstances I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Because of the importance of the matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to transfer the motion for debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate and placed on the order paper under the heading Notices of Motions (Papers), pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 48(1).

[*English*]

PRELIMINARY STUDY, CONFLICT OF INTEREST LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Motion No. 257—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the preliminary study of existing legislation on conflict of interest provisions for Members of Parliament, the Senate and other public officials as referred to by the President of the Privy Council in a recent statement to the press.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the documents in response to this motion are made up of internal studies prepared by members of my own staff, in addition to a study prepared by the research branch of the library. I would, of course, claim privilege in respect of my own internal documents, but if the hon. member is agreeable I would be prepared to table the study just mentioned in response to the motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will accept what is

offered and then decide where to go from there.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the minister, is it agreed that notice of motion No. 257 shall be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Before calling oral questions, I would like to suggest to the house that we be allowed to return to motions. The hon. member for Lotbinière indicated by letter that he proposes to make a motion. Unfortunately we are moving with such speed and expeditiousness today—

[*Translation*]

—we have forgotten or lost the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) en route. Therefore, we revert to motions to allow him to propose his motion.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

AGRICULTURE

MILK—REQUEST TO PRESENT MOTION THAT AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE STUDY HARMFUL EFFECTS OF CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION POLICY

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, I am asking the unanimous consent of the house to move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), the following motion:

That the standing committee on agriculture be immediately requested to inquire into the extremely harmful effects suffered by the milk producers of the Province of Quebec, in respect of deliveries above their quota set by the Canadian Dairy Commission, on which the witholding rate of 52 cents per cwt. of milk constitutes an unbearable penalty.

Mr. Speaker, without taking needlessly the time of the house and delaying its business, even if very often Créditistes are ahead, I should like to ask for the consent of my hon. colleagues in order to bring this question before the house, so that the hon. members from the province of Quebec will have the opportunity to bring forth the problems facing their constituents at the present time and the government to make known its policy with regard to the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious problem. Dairy producers are penalized; they are taxed

52 cents per cwt. for milk for which they are not paid. Such a tax drives most of those producers to bankruptcy, as can be seen in the *Canada Gazette*.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I conclude my comments on this matter by expressing the hope that my colleagues from the province of Quebec, realizing the importance of the situation, will co-operate and try to bring their colleagues to give their unanimous consent so that the dairy producers of Quebec may be protected.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has moved a motion under Standing Order 43 for which unanimous consent is required.

[*English*]

I therefore ask the house whether there is unanimous agreement to consider the problem referred to by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I regret to advise the hon. member that among the comments which have just been made, I have heard some negative ones and, under the circumstances, it will be impossible to proceed under Standing Order 43.

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

AGRICULTURE

REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE RESPECTING ASSISTANCE TO WESTERN FARMERS—REQUEST FOR DEBATE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, in view of the urgency of the telegram sent to the minister and four of his colleagues today by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, which referred to the disastrous income losses being suffered by western farmers and called for immediate and substantial action to be taken by the federal government by way of providing cash assistance, whether he would tell the house what reply is being given to the urgent representations made to the government in this telegram?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, apparently the Leader of the

Opposition received the telegram before I did; I have not seen it yet.

An hon. Member: Go to your office.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the minister does not know what is going on. May I redirect the question to the Acting Prime Minister; at least he must be aware of what is going on.

In light of the allegation by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that the government has made no response to the proposals submitted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture on May 28, almost two months ago, will the minister say what decision is being made in regard to their proposals of May 28 which are referred to in the telegram to which I have just alluded? Are the proposals still under consideration and, if so, when may we expect a statement?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is quite correct. The proposals that were put forward by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture are still under consideration.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, in view of this situation may I direct a question to the genial President of the Privy Council. In light of the situation disclosed a few days ago by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and referred to in the telegram from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and in view of the emergency situation on the prairies, will the President of the Privy Council now agree to consult with the opposition parties in order that arrangements can be made to provide during the next few days one of the opposition allotted days so that special consideration can be given to the emergency at a time when the appropriate minister is in the house?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, I would be glad to arrange for a discussion of this kind as soon as the rules debate is disposed of. If the hon. gentleman has any influence with his colleagues, perhaps he might persuade them to bring that matter to a head.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I think it is preposterous that we cannot have a debate on this important subject.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: With your co-operation, Mr. Speaker, I will meet the minister here tomorrow night at ten o'clock.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. Since apparently no plans have been made to comply with requests of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, is the Prime Minister in the course of his western tour prepared to meet representatives of that organization?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Prime Minister will meet a number of companies and others who are members of the Federation of Agriculture. But his chief purpose in going out west is to meet the people of western Canada and not organized groups.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is staying away from the people.

Mr. Gleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government aware that in western Canada there are two substantial farm organizations, namely, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the National Farmers Union?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that supplementary is in order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since members of the cabinet seem to take the attitude that the present situation in western Canada is one they may treat with jocularity and contempt—

Mr. McIlraith: Withdraw, withdraw!

Mr. Diefenbaker: You know better than that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McIlraith: Withdraw!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps, with those introductory remarks, the right hon. gentleman might ask his question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now that it has been established that the cabinet does not hold that view I am hopeful of obtaining a favourable answer from the adamantine President of the Privy Council. Will he adjourn the debate on the rules so that something may be done to meet the serious situation on the prairies which has been cavalierly brushed aside by the government?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. member is seriously interested in the matter he will let the debate come to a vote. After that we could get on with the matter he raised.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: So the farmers are not to be helped.

Mr. Bell: Merry Christmas! That's how long we will stay here.

FINANCE

INCREASE IN BANK OF CANADA INTEREST RATE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Did the governor of the Bank of Canada consult him on the matter of raising the Bank of Canada's interest rate to 8 per cent? Has this step the government's approval and concurrence?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, of course the matter of the interest rate is a decision for the governor of the Bank of Canada, but I ought to indicate that I was consulted.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the chartered banks have often raised their commercial interest rates after the Bank of Canada has increased its rate, has the minister taken any steps to persuade the chartered banks not to raise their commercial interest rates inasmuch as there is no law requiring that there be a spread of one percentage point between the commercial and Bank of Canada rates?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, as the governor of the bank explained in his statement, the bank rate was raised primarily for external purposes. Interest rates prevailing in other parts of the world are so attractive that Canadian funds have been moving out to be invested in other parts of the world through swap deposits. This flow increased by some $180 million last week. To rectify the situation the governor of the Bank of Canada first of all requested that the banks maintain swap deposits only at their present level and, second, he increased the Bank of Canada rate to 8 per cent. I sincerely hope this does not mean that there will be an increase in the commercial prime rate which is now at 8½ per cent.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): While all hon. members share the pious hope of the Minister of Finance, what I am asking is whether he has had or intends to have any meetings with the representatives of the chartered banks in order to persuade them, by whatever means at his disposal, not to raise the commercial rate and not to use the increased rate of the Bank of Canada as an excuse for doing so as has been the case so often in the past?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I do not direct the banks in respect of what rates they may charge and neither does the governor of the Bank of Canada, as he indicated in his testimony before a committee of this house. I do not see any occasion for an increase in the prime rate in these particular circumstances.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as I understood the minister, I believe he said the Bank of Canada rate was being raised because funds owned by Canadians were flowing out of the country. How does he think this step will be effective in retaining funds in Canada unless it is reflected in higher interest rates in Canada?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, swapped deposits, as my hon. friend will understand from the statement of the governor of the Bank of Canada, are carried out through the banks. The increase in the bank rate means it will cost the banks more to get money if they should turn to the Bank of Canada. The governor has also placed a ceiling on swapped deposits. The request of the governor of the Bank of Canada should discourage this outflow because interest rates are higher in other countries than in Canada.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance indicate what effect the higher interest rates have had on the holdings of Canada Savings Bonds?

Mr. Benson: To date there have been no undue redemptions of Canada Savings Bonds. They are moving along relatively at the same rate as in the past.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Could the minister tell us whether the Canadian constitution has been amended, and when, to give the governor of the Bank of Canada such powers to increase interest rates?

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance along the line of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. In view of the fact that the minister in his reply indicated that unless the commercial bank rate is raised the effect on the outflow of funds is likely to be fairly small and, indeed, negligible, is it not more appropriate for the government and the governor of the Bank of Canada to take other steps to stop the outflow of funds by means of limited, discretionary foreign exchange controls rather than by starting the interest rates going up all over again?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me the question is argumentative. It gives that appearance, but in view of its importance perhaps the minister might be allowed to reply.

Mr. Benson: We are not contemplating foreign exchange controls at the present time. I should say that our reserves are not being seriously depleted but a continuation of what was going on, as indicated in the swap deposits figures published by the Bank of Canada last week, would indicate that there is a problem which should be faced, and we have faced it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister what value there is to the people of Canada in starting a further upward hump in the interest rate if the effect on the outflow is likely to be negligible?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this supplementary is argumentative.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the governor of the Bank of Canada has decided to raise the discount rate and also that according to his statement the minister was not consulted in that regard, is the latter ready to tell us if he is willing to urge the Canadian chartered banks not to raise their interest rates?

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, first of all I said I was consulted, not that I was not consulted, by the governor of the Bank of Canada. I previously indicated I would hope the chartered banks would not increase their prime rates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

I realize that the minister perhaps has not grasped my question. I was asking whether he intends to enter into discussions with the chartered banks to regulate the interest rates and prevent an increase.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that the hon. member repeats a question that was asked a few moments ago.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to ask a supplementary question.

Would the Minister of Finance tell the house whether foreign countries or this government should make decisions concerning the interest rate?

[*English*]

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance arising from this morning's report that bank loans are up by $221 million despite pressures from Ottawa. In light of the effect of the pressures from Ottawa, is the minister considering any additional steps to curtail the issuing of credit in Canada and to bring interest rates down?

Mr. Benson: I think the effect of the pressure from Ottawa is being and will be felt by the banks. The figures to which my hon. friend is referring are applicable, I believe, to a week or ten days ago, and this situation changes weekly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo on a final supplementary.

Mr. Saltsman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house that he is preparing emergency measures to make sure that the interest rate does settle down if the spiral continues?

Mr. Speaker: I think I would have to rule that the question is hypothetical.

OLD AGE SECURITY

POSITION OF SEPARATED MARRIED COUPLES

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It has to do with the plight of thousands of married couples qualifying for the old age pension who have been separated for years

but not legally. Because of their married status they do not qualify for full social benefits.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member might agree with me that this is a question of a very general scope and the type of question which normally would call for a statement on motions. I wonder whether the hon. member might like to qualify his question in this way.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, may I ask the minister whether he will make a statement on motions in respect of this problem?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question or statement made by the hon. member I do not believe a statement is required. This matter is under consideration for review and revision of the act.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RESERVE FORCES—FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WITH CONFERENCE OF DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence whether he can assure the house that there will be further discussions, either by himself or by representatives of the department, with the Conference of Defence Associations before a final decision is taken with regard to the continuing strength of the reserve forces, especially the militia?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I indicated yesterday that we already had consulted with the Defence Associations. There is to be a further meeting or meetings some time in early August I believe. Discussions and negotiations will be continued with the Conference of Defence Associations.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAINLAND CHINA—PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has he anything to pass on to the house regarding the progress being made in the conversations which have been going on in Stockholm for some time now regarding recognition of Communist China by this country?

[Mr. Rynard.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, toward the end of last week there were further discussions on the outstanding issues. I cannot really say anything more about them except that the negotiations are tough and may continue for some time.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise the house what advantages the government believes will accrue to Canada, if we are permitted to recognize Communist China, that will make up for the humiliation this country has succumbed to for the past eight months?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will recognize that if the minister is to reply it should be on motions and not by way of a reply to a question.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, probably the minister would be able to clarify the situation in connection with the negotiations going on with Mao's representatives. Has there been any indication given, as rumour has it, that the Communist government of Red China is prepared to accept recognition provided Taiwan is sacrificed, and will in compensation purchase additional wheat rather than purchasing wheat from Australia which does not recognize it?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the question of wheat has never entered into the negotiations on recognition.

DRUGS

TETRACYCLINE—ALLEGED FRAUD BY U.S. COMPANIES IN OBTAINING PATENT

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs of which I have given him notice. In light of the fact that the United States government has filed a $25 million damage suit against American Cyanamid and Chas. Pfizer and Co. for fraudulently obtaining a patent for the antibiotic drug tetracycline, can the minister indicate whether his department is investigating if similar fraudulence has occurred in Canada in respect of the same companies?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, following receipt of information about this officials will be getting in contact with United States

officials to obtain more information than is available in the press reports. We will be following the course of the United States inquiries or investigations to determine whether there is any basis upon which to believe an investigation should be carried out in Canada. We need more information because of the fact there are a number of tetracycline patents in Canada and we do not know from United States reports which are involved.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

WAGE INCREASE OBTAINED BY CARPENTERS AND JOINERS

Mr. Keith Hymmen (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he is aware of a wage settlement announced in Toronto involving one segment of the building trades, namely, carpenters and joiners, providing for a 43 per cent wage increase over a period of less than two years? Is the Prices and Incomes Commission studying this settlement and will it investigate the inflationary aspect of this and other wage settlements?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there has been a substantial wage settlement although I am not certain of the precise percentage. I am also aware that there have been other very substantial wage and cost increases in respect of construction, which in turn are reflected in increased construction costs. I am sure this is a matter of concern to us all. The Prices and Incomes Commission which is independent will, I have no doubt, regard the construction industry as one of the key sectors of the economy. I am sure this is one of the areas in which it will have an interest.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Acting Prime Minister. Is he prepared to tell us whether that question is one of the hypocritical ones?

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SAC BOMBER SITES—POSSIBLE LOCATION IN CANADA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence because it is suggested that he cannot tell the difference between a bomber and a fuel carrier. I do not believe this. I am wondering whether he will tell the house that the United States defence authorities have in fact made two distinct and separate requests in respect of dispersal of SAC sites and the renewal of the old agreement, or was there some misunderstanding involved in the answer the minister made yesterday?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think the misunderstanding originates from the fact that the question was posed in this way:

> I wish to ask ... whether there has been any request or approach on the part of United States officials with regard to the possibility of dispersing SAC bomber sites and locating some of them in Canada?

My answer, of course, was a bit confused following that question. I said yes, because I could not say no, the SAC system comprising both bombers and tankers. The request we received was for a refuelling system for tankers in Canada.

An hon. Member: Mr. Speaker, I should like to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubts whether this question ought not to have originally been placed on the order paper. Perhaps the whole question might be "sacked". In view of the fact the Leader of the Opposition has been allowed a supplementary question, perhaps the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands ought to be allowed to pursue the matter.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Pentagon has asked for refuelling bases in Canada, according to the minister's statement, I should like to ask what reason the Pentagon gave for reactivating an agreement which was rescinded in 1963?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I am qualified to go into the reasons. This is part of an over-all dispersal plan because conditions have changed. The request made to the Canadian government is for the renewal of the agreement which existed then, with some difference to the extent that no aircraft will be permanently stationed on these bases, that the bases will be used only in case of an international crisis, and that the aircraft will fly from Canadian bases to carry out their assigned missions and return to their home bases on termination of the crisis. Peacetime operations would be held to test the operation. What is basically requested actually are landing strips, some facilities for the refuelling of aircraft, and parking areas. That is all that is requested.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Does the request by the United States government involve the stationing of U.S. military personnel on Canadian soil, and will the program include not only a military alert but also tactical or strategic exercises?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, whether exercises in a time of crisis would be called strategic exercises is not for me to determine. The request is that these bases would be used in time of international crises.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that my questions of yesterday and today are of urgent public importance. Therefore I should like to ask the minister when the request was made by the United States and what answer the government of Canada proposes to make?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have an indication that discussions took place through the permanent joint board and at different levels to reinstate the former agreement. They began about May, 1967. They have been going on ever since. I cannot indicate what the decision of the government will be because it has not been taken.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the agreement, as I recall it, was made during the period of my administration, is it a fact that what is being sought by the United States now merely involves changes and new conditions referred to by the minister? Is there any reason in the interests of Canada and the protection of this country for not acceding to the request so long as our sovereignty is maintained?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): If I were permitted to express a personal opinion I would agree with the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has a supplementary question, following which I will recognize the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister answered only the latter part of my question. I also asked him whether or not the request of the Pentagon involved the stationing of United States military personnel on Canadian soil?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What would be wrong with that?

[Mr. Cadieux (Labelle).]

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the provisions, if I remember correctly, involves United States personnel for training, if some arrangement has been made with the Canadian authorities. My understanding is that these personnel would be flown in with the operation itself in the event of an international crisis.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in light of Canada's difficulty in obtaining tanker refuelling planes for our CF-5's, would one of the considerations be having available on Canadian soil K-135 tankers with the refuelling capacity necessary for our aircraft in order to make them operationally possible?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): The tanker to which my hon. friend has referred is actually one that we are considering.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

EXEMPTION OF OLD ORDER MENNONITES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

An hon. Member: He has been out looking for a cigarette.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Saltsman: It is in connection with a reply he gave me during the adjournment debate regarding the exemption of Mennonites from the Canada Pension Plan. At that time the minister indicated he would discuss this matter with the cabinet. Has he discussed it with them and, if so, what conclusions have been reached?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this matter is under consideration by the government at the present time. No decision has yet been reached.

Mr. Stanfield: Like everything else.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give us some indication when a decision will be reached? Will it be before parliament adjourns?

Mr. Munro: Possibly some time in the next few weeks, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PRESENCE OF SOVIET VESSEL OFF QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the previous line of questioning directed to the Minister of National Defence with regard to the subject of foreign personnel on or near Canadian territory. Has the minister had any reports of a Soviet vessel, allegedly on an oceanographic survey, which has been anchored off the Queen Charlotte Islands for some days during the past week, and have units of the Canadian defence forces been maintaining surveillance of this vessel?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Secretary of State for External Affairs probably has more information on this matter than I have. All I know is that the Canadian forces are maintaining surveillance of the ship. This is just a normal operation for the forces. We understand that the ship is outside our limits on the west coast, and therefore it does not present any security problem.

AIR CANADA

EFFECT OF WORK TO RULE ANNOUNCEMENT BY CANADIAN AIRLINE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the congenial Minister of Transport. Has the minister any statement to make on the effect the Canadian Airline Employees Association announcement of working to rule as of 6 a.m. today will have on Canada's major air line at the height of our tourist season?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no definitive statement on that matter at the moment. We do not really know what the ramifications will be or just how effective the working to rule will be. We are looking into the question in order to ascertain what we can do to alleviate the difficulty which may be experienced by the travelling public, but I do not have anything specific to say at this time.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. Now that Premier Smallwood has decided to remain as Liberal leader in Newfoundland, will the minister now be able to devote full time to his duties?

TRANSPORT

RAILWAYS—MAINTENANCE OF PASSENGER SERVICE STANDARD

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is related to one already asked and has to do with tourists during the peak of the summer season. Is the minister now in a position to reply to the question directed to him earlier regarding the lack of service on Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that there are two periods each summer, early July and early September, when there is an extremely heavy load on and demand for the transcontinental trains. To cope with that additional load and at the same time provide for the normal over the year traffic would require a great deal of extra, new equipment. The alternative is to put back into service old equipment. This generally results in complaints by the travelling public. The peak seems to be over for the start of this summer but the problem will arise later in the year. I believe the railways would be prepared to put on some of the older equipment if the public understands that the service will not be up to the normal level.

Mr. Alexander: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house that he will take back to the railway officials the suggestion that notwithstanding the fact there may be some objection to old rolling stock being used this can be done to alleviate the situation, and would he have the railways advertise this fact to the travelling public?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the nature of the representation I propose to make to the railways.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—REPLY TO CANADIAN OFFER TO PROVIDE NEUTRAL RELIEF FLIGHT OBSERVERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister today tabled a communication from the High Commissioner in Lagos, presumably referring to a Canadian offer to provide inspectors for mercy flights. Will he tell the house whether the High Commissioner's communication indicates that the Nigerian federal government is willing to accept the Canadian proposal without crippling conditions?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to correct the first part of the statement made by the hon. member. What I tabled today was in response to a question from the hon. member for York South. He asked me to table a report we had received about the statement alleged to have been made by Brigadier Hamilton, which has nothing to do with this question.

In answer to the hon. member's question, we have had no direct response. We do understand, however, that the conversations now going on between the International Red Cross and the government in Lagos are proceeding on a somewhat better basis. Conditions have improved to some extent, and we are still hoping for the best.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

CLAIMS OF DOMINION COAL COMPANY SHAREHOLDERS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I have given him notice of it. It is prompted by a statement by a Mr. Charles MacCulloch with reference to the takeover by the government, through the Cape Breton Development Corporation, of Dominion Coal Company. Mr. MacCulloch is quoted as saying:

> We feel the government has been dragging its feet on the matter, and quite deliberately, so we're prepared to take it to court.

I ask the minister whether this assertion is correct. I ask, in addition, whether this corporation has in the past ever dragged its feet or evaded its responsibilities?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Department of Justice that they are still assessing the properties of Dominion Coal Company and there have been no undue delays. Of course, the government is not ready to accept all the claims made by the shareholders. If they want to take this matter to court, it is up to them, but we will not accept any threat from Dominion Coal.

COMMUNICATIONS

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING DELAYS IN TRANSMISSION OF TELEGRAMS AND CABLES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. It is prompted by widespread complaints, especially from the Toronto area, concerning excessive delays in the transmission of telegrams and cables by the C.N.-C.P. group. Will the minister, through the C.N. or otherwise, undertake to have this obviously serious matter investigated?

[Mr. Brewin.]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

WESTERN RESERVES—INQUIRY AS TO VISIT BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister did not include in his formal western itinerary a visit to even a single Indian reservation, would the Acting Prime Minister inform the house whether the itinerary has been adjusted to include such a visit in order that the Indian people may meet with the Prime Minister and, if not, why not?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my recollection from what I have seen of the Prime Minister's itinerary is that he is getting the views of the Indian people directly from the Indians.

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED FLIGHT SAFETY COMMITTEE—AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Is he in a position to answer my questions taken as notice yesterday? To be precise, can the minister say what reply has been made to the Canadian Airline Pilots Association brief, which suggested that a national flight safety committee should be established? Can the minister also say whether the Department of Transport has any plans to form a flight safety committee, either internally or at the external, national level?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with the pilots association within a short time. With regard to the question of a flight safety committee, if it turns out to be the most appropriate forum with which to achieve the results the pilots are advocating, we will be quite prepared to consider it. I hope we can resolve this matter satisfactorily in a short time. Incidentally, the hon. member did not reiterate the question asked yesterday

with regard to whether there are financial considerations. There are none.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to remind hon. members that we have only two or three minutes before the end of the question period. Therefore I ask the co-operation of hon. members in asking short questions and making short replies.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NEWSPRINT—INVESTIGATION INTO PRICING POLICIES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he had been informed that an investigation had been made by the United States Department of Justice into the paper industry. The minister replied that he had heard of a grand jury hearing in New York. I now ask the minister whether he has a report to make in this respect.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have made further inquiries, as I told the hon. member privately, and have every reason to believe that the answer I gave on Thursday last was correct. I am informed that a subpoena was issued by the United States Department of Justice against Domtar Incorporated, which is a United States company, and that no subpoena was issued against the Canadian company.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROCLAMATION OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. I have given him notice of it. Can the minister advise when he proposes to have the omnibus Criminal Code amendments proclaimed, and will they all be proclaimed at once or at different times?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. Section 11 of the amendments to the Criminal Code relating to race tracks under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture was proclaimed by Order in Council June 27, taking effect on July 1. Aside from that, we hope to proclaim the major part of the Criminal Code amendments some time in August. We have had discussions with the Attorneys General of all provinces relating to certain aspects of the amendments which will involve the administrative responsibilities of the provinces. I refer particularly to the drinking and driving aspects of the amendments, the licensing of firearms, licensing of lotteries and some other matters. When the Order in Council is passed I will ensure that the Canadian people and the law enforcement officers across the country receive ample notice of the proclamation of this bill.

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON CRISIS IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister has given a much higher priority to western Canada than to the rules debate, will the government and the Acting Prime Minister support the Prime Minister by allowing an emergency debate on the crisis in western Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): If the hon. gentleman agreed with my colleague the government house leader, he would bring the rules debate to a vote and we could then go on with other urgent business.

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Acting Prime Minister not recognize the fact I am agreeing with the Prime Minister and am asking for support for him?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, July 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, for the next few minutes, I would like to call the attention of the house to the fact that the proposal of the President

of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) concerning rule 75c meets neither the views of the hon. members of the opposition nor those of the people. Indeed public opinion is beginning to realize that hon. members of the opposition are absolutely right.

We are receiving from all over messages encouraging us to continue the fight, and to attempt to make the government understand the soundness of our claims which are, for all practical purposes, those of the Canadian people.

Several dailies have even published articles dealing with the proposal of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). I have here an article written by Claude Ryan, in yesterday's *Le Devoir*, dealing with the proposed rule 75c. It is interesting to note that Mr. Claude Ryan is in complete agreement with the opposition in regard to the proposal of the President of the Privy Council, and in my view he is even encouraging the opposition to keep on fighting.

Here is what Mr. Claude Ryan said in his editorial of July 15, and I quote:

Further to his strong statement made on this subject in the House of Commons last Thursday, Mr. Robert Stanfield reiterated yesterday his firm determination to fight to the finish against the proposed changes to the Standing Orders, which appear on this page.

The debate on that matter has taken up a good part of the time of the house for some fifteen days. Now, it is obvious that the new proposal (especially rule 75c) is only a finer redrafting of another proposal—rule 16A—which incurred last December the proper censure of parliament and public opinion. Consequently, it deserves exactly the same fate as its unfortunate predecessor.

Mr. Claude Ryan is unequivocally blaming the new attempt of the President of the Privy Council who would like to reinstate standing order 16A repudiated last December.

Further, in his editorial, Mr. Claude Ryan stated, and I quote:

—Let us note by the way that standing order 75B rests on the principle of agreements reached "by a majority of the representatives of the several parties" and does not provide any special status for the government party. Was it done on purpose or was it an oversight on the part of the government? Anyway, the leader of the government in the house, Mr. Donald Macdonald, has made in this connection an intolerable misuse of authority by trying, through a government motion, to alter the text of the rule in obvious contempt of the will of one of the house committees. Last Tuesday, Mr. Macdonald was forced to yield on that point and he had to give priority to the committee report. But his attitude showed in an alarming way how he considers relations between the government and the house.

[Mr. Ricard.]

Mr. Speaker, opposition members are not the only ones to criticize the approach of the President of the Privy Council, and to think that he is being arrogant; newspapermen are also beginning to believe that we are right and they support us in our present campaign. I continue the quotation:

Notwithstanding their objective value, proposed Standing Orders 75A and 75B unfortunately lose all their meaning when flanked by rule 75c which derives from a very different inspiration.

The first two rules are based on the principle of the fundamental equality of the parties concerned and of their ability to agree freely on procedural matters.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Rule 75c, on the contrary, proceeds from the philosophy of arbitration by an authority, which, in that case, is nothing else than the majority party. That looks like, as stated in the house by Mr. Knowles, a negotiation in which one of the parties, while recognizing itself equal to the others, would secure the right of being able to impose on them compulsory arbitration.

This is what Mr. Claude Ryan, an editorialist whose competence is acknowledged throughout the country, thinks of the proposal of the President of the Privy Council.

In his article, Mr. Ryan writes also the following:

Beyond the stands that are opposed, a further matter is of interest. Why did the government choose to revive at this time a proposal which was clearly defeated in December last and which since that time has made no progress in the public opinion?

One argument could have justified the government's attitude, the one he would have had if these last months the opposition parties had indulged in sterile filibustering. But according to numerous observers, it is the opposite which took place. Thanks to the reasonable co-operation of the various parties, the Commons have been operating at a much improved speed for the last few months. In many case, there was agreement to limit considerably the duration of certain debates.

Not only are we the only ones, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that we reached agreement, but many newspapers recognize that fact. In general, they admit that under our leader (Mr. Stanfield), we have given much proof of our sincere desire to improve and speed up the way things are done in the house. As members of the opposition in this house, we have a mandate and an obligation towards the population.

We do not make representations to the house only in the interest of the opposition, but because we are much concerned with the best interests of the Canadian people. I think it is high time for the hon. members opposite, for the government and for the members of

the Privy Council to stop being as arrogant as they have been up to now and to understand at last that what we are asking for is quite reasonable.

We will not suffer being reduced to silence by the wishes of a couple of ministers. We do not want the public to be deprived of their voice in the House of Commons through their representatives, which, Mr. Speaker, does not apply to opposition members alone. As a matter of fact, while silencing opposition members, the measure will have the same effect on hon. members opposite. I do not understand the fact that the backbenchers on the other side of the house do not have anything to say on occasion to safeguard their constituents' interests.

I appeal to my friends opposite, the backbenchers. I plead with them to do everything they can to make the frontbenchers of their party understand that the national interest is at stake, that the best interests of democracy are at stake, so that we may, in the house, at any time, express the aspirations of our constituents.

Mr. Ryan also said, and I quote:

The government, therefore, did not have, during this session, any serious reasons to complain against obstructionists tactics from the opposition parties.

As a matter of fact, there was only one such case, and that was the omnibus bill, of which the members of the Ralliement créditiste unduly delayed passage. But that case does not, by itself, justify introducing a rule such as 75c.

The government could have taken advantage of the favourable conditions prevailing to increase co-operation between the free men who make up Parliament. Instead, it chose to propose a rule which would have the effect of changing parliament into a college. Unacceptable in principle, such an attitude betrays, in practice, a deplorable disregard for the human factor, without which the most promising technical schemes are doomed to failure.

Hon. members across the floor would be well-advised to give to those comments all the consideration required, having regard to the gravity of the situation.

Since we are short of time, let me only mention the title of some other articles that have been published concerning the proposed motion of the President of the Privy Council.

In the *Montréal-Matin* of Thursday, July 10, Mr. Clément Brown, in an article entitled "Unfortunate Stubbornness" said that the Trudeau government will not increase its prestige by forcing adoption of said 75c.

And in the *Ottawa Citizen* of July 4, one could read an article under this heading:

[*English*]

"Rights imperilled. Closure rule is too drastic".

[*Translation*]

In *The Gazette*, on July 14, there was this heading:

[*English*]

"Compromise needed in rules debate".

[*Translation*]

And in that article one could read the following paragraph:

[*English*]

The government would be unwise to insist on its proposed rule 75c. If this rule is adopted, it would give any government with a majority the power to limit debate at any time. This is a drastic power. And it is needless.

[*Translation*]

Further, one could read and I quote:

[*English*]

If the government is really seeking the power to limit debates, surely rule 75B would be sufficient. Why proceed to the still more drastic provisions of rule 75c?

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we are only asking for something reasonable. We are asking for the possibility to make ourselves heard as often as circumstances compel us to do so, as representatives of the people, in order to express their views.

I do hope that members opposite will take in hand the destiny of this parliament and will not do anything to reduce the importance of the debates in this house. If hon. members are to be deprived of their right to speak, under Standing Order 75c, this will be a very sad day indeed. Such a day will come when the government because it has the majority, reduces to silence the representatives of the people.

I hope that hon. members—the new-comers especially—on the other side of the house will join us and oppose the voice of reason to the arrogance of those who sit in the front benches of the Liberal party.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, about two days ago one speaker on the other side of the house who is here now, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), indicated that one of the reforms that might be very effective in this house would be a reduction in the time used to make speeches. Certainly I, along with other members of the house, was very interested in this aspect of his remarks. This speech was

one of the most absorbing that I have heard from him. Incidentally, I noted at the time that he took 40 minutes to convey that message. I will undertake to say what I have to say today in a shorter period of time.

During the period 1962 to 1968, the government of Canada was formed by a minority party in this house. During this period many changes were made in the practices and procedures of the house. In many respects the proposal that we have before us today is a product of the developments during a long period of minority government. Instead of two major parties we now have four parties. The key to the proposed rules changes that are before us, I contend, is the substitution of a new doctrine, the doctrine of equality of parties for that of equality of members.

The objective of rules changes that must be made and are being made in this house, Mr. Speaker, must be to strike a careful balance between the very necessary right of the opposition to call to the attention of the public any possible errors, mistakes or unwise provisions in government legislation, and the undoubted right of the majority to bring its measures before the house and have a decision made within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. Gilbert: No one has been stopping the government.

Mr. Francis: The issue before us clearly and simply is one of programming government business. Our Committee on Procedure and Organization was instructed by this house on December 20 last to consider again a rule which had been brought forward in the form of 16A. A number of objections were taken by hon. members of the house at that time. The rules were considered in committee and the committee report contained a proposal for three separate rules.

The first of these, 75A, provides that when there is agreement among all the parties in this house, a motion to allot time may be moved. Rule 75B carries this one step further. It provides that when a majority of three of the four parties represented in this house, including that of the government—since obviously a minister of the government will be proposing the motion—have come to an agreement a motion for time allocation may be placed before the house. These two rules work on the basis of agreement. Where there is agreement, an order to limit debate may follow.

The reason for the prolongation of this debate arises as a result of the government's concern that proposed rules 75A and 75B, without adequate safeguards, would lead to the denial of the principle that the majority under democracy has a right to put its measures before the house for decision and have the decision made within a reasonable period of time. Why is rule 75C needed, Mr. Speaker? I should like to make three basic points at this time, but of course I shall offer little that is new since, in a debate that has gone on this long, most points have been fully covered.

People say, for example, that we have rule 33, the closure rule. Why do we not use it? My simple answer is to point to what happened during the report stage when the Criminal Code amendment was before the house. Under the new rules of the House of Commons there is unlimited right to amend at the report stage of a bill, and properly so. Originally 44 amendments were proposed, being consolidated to 30 after Mr. Speaker had made his rulings. Application of the closure rule would have meant that each amendment would have had to be considered for closure, an obvious impossibility under the circumstances since it would involve a disproportionate amount of the time of the house. Those amendments were introduced as a result of the change in committee procedure which permits an unlimited number of amendments to be adopted for consideration at the report stage in the house. Under those circumstances, the application of the closure rule would have been almost impossible. The simple application of closure will not serve as a means of allocating time effectively.

We then come to the other situation to which the government takes exception. The representatives of the N.D.P. on the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization argued their case in this regard very effectively. Section 49 of the British North America Act says that questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices. I, and hon. members on this side of the house, contend that rules 75A and 75B alone, and without any further safeguards, would veto the ability of the government, even if it had the support of the official opposition party, to bring measures before the house and have them dealt with within a reasonable period of time. If one of the two smaller parties in this house digs in on any important question, the other small party will be in an absolutely key position. It will be in possession of a veto because of its right to unlimited filibuster. That is the basic defect of having rules 75A and 75B stand alone, without additional safeguards.

I hear hon. members on the other side saying, "But this has been a very reasonable parliament up to this point." Perhaps hon. members are not quite so reasonable now, after the somewhat protracted debate. As I say, if one of the two parties in this house digs in its heels, it will give the other small party the power to veto and thwart the will of the democratically elected majority of the House of Commons.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And just what have we thwarted?

Mr. Francis: The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) said in effect, at page 10987 of *Hansard*, that there is nothing left on the order paper and that everything that had to be done has been done.

I have been looking at the order paper, Mr. Speaker, and I see there item 61, second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts of Bill C-179, to do with broadcasting. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal said the minister is not prepared to move forward with this item. He is mistaken. The minister would be only too delighted to move ahead with this legislation.

Mr. Peters: Go ahead. We will not stop you.

Mr. Francis: I think hon. members of this house will agree that for a long time items have been left on the order paper.

An hon. Member: We will pass that one.

Mr. Francis: I am looking at item 80, second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-198, an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments. I know the hon. member for Fundy-Royal will disagree with me, since he said the minister is not prepared to proceed with this, but the minister is. Underneath that is item 81, which is very important. This relates to Bill C-200, an act respecting the expropriation of land. The matter is to be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and it is on the order paper because this house has not yet seen fit to deal with it. Then, there is item 85 in the name of the Minister of Finance, items Nos. 87 and 88 also in the name of the Minister of Finance, and a number of other items which represent efforts to reform private members hour and to provide for a means of disposing of cases which have merit. It has been very difficult to get these matters referred to committees. They stay on the order paper and are not dealt with.

Then we have item 92 in the name of the Minister of Justice. This item relates to a bill to amend the Criminal Code and deals with hate literature. Does the hon. member for Fundy-Royal say that legislation dealing with hate literature is of no consequence and the fact that it has not been dealt with in this session does not matter?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Will the hon. member permit a question. Since the government may call any item it chooses when Mr. Speaker calls orders of the day, will the hon. member explain why the government would sooner indulge in this protracted debate than call these important items?

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question by developing my argument. Item No. 96 relates to a bill respecting investment companies. Neither items 97 nor 98 have been acted upon. Unless the rules are amended there will be at all times, as the government develops its program and as the house extends its sittings, measures on the order paper to be brought forward. There is a need to deal with these items and a need to come to grips with the government's program. If rules 75A and 75B were allowed to stand alone, without adequate safeguards, either of the small opposition parties would have the power of veto to thwart the rights of the democratically elected majority.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Who vetoed the pensions of retired civil servants?

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to ask a question or raise a point of order?

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. member, with his permission.

Since the legislative program, according to the hon. member for Ottawa West, is very heavy, does he not agree that the government should impose Standing Order 33, which is of the same nature as rule 75c, so that we can put an end to this futile debate and move on to the legislative program?

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, the government is obliged to present to the house the legislation we have to adopt. But to make sure that we can pass laws, I believe we must first settle the problem concerning the rules of the house.

[*English*]

The basic problem is allocation of time. One of the other devices available to hon. members of the opposition under the new rules we have adopted as we are moving forward to that careful balance between the rights of the opposition and the rights of the government is the use of alloted days for the opposition. There are 25 of these days now provided during a session. Hon. members of the opposition are perfectly free to choose the subjects for debate on these days. Therefore, if they feel there is any abuse or any provision of any legislation which in their opinion should not be passed or has been wrongly presented to the house, or if they feel any measure is being adopted which in their opinion is not in the public interest, they have this additional means by which they can bring about a debate in the House of Commons in order to focus the attention of the public, the newspapers and all the organs of public opinion on these questions. They have this means of safeguarding democratic rights.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit a question I should like to ask whether in fact the allotted days are a substitute for the old supply motion opportunities of the opposition rather than additional opportunities as he suggested.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of questions from the other side of the house which raise fundamental problems which are not easily or quickly answerable by anyone in this house. In attempting to establish new rules there is a desire to balance two things, the rights of the opposition and the rights of the government. The opposition should have the right to bring matters to the attention of the newspapers and the public which they think are wrong or are against the public interest. Against this, we must adopt measures to expedite the handling of government business and permit some reasonable allocation of time.

Among the innovations are the supply motions, the reference of estimates to the committee and the debate in committee instead of in the house. It is for hon. members to judge the extent to which these innovations are successful. We might note that in other houses, such as the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster supply is not even referred to committee any more. I believe it is just a matter of tabling and no debate. If the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) is of the opinion that something has been lost by way of democratic rights in this house, there are avenues open to him to express his opinion and seek to convince other members of this house.

Our rules are changing. We are seeking to balance the obligations of the government to program time against the democratic rights of the opposition in the house. In my opinion, and in the opinion of hon. members on this side of the house, the combination of 75A and 75B is not a sufficient safeguard for a government or for that matter for a party which has a reasonable prospect of having that obligation. These two rules if adopted in their present form in my opinion suffer from a grave difficulty. If one of the opposition parties should object to any one government measure it could place the other two opposition parties in a key position, the control of the house. In the two smaller opposition parties there are 36 members combined. I do not believe that a group that size, as opposed to the 226 members in the other two parties, should have the opportunity to veto and hold up government business. This opportunity should not be granted and, in my opinion, should not be encompassed in the rules of this house.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct another question to the hon. member. I wonder whether in effect he is suggesting that if agreement were reached to drop from the proposed Standing Orders 75B he would also agree to the dropping of 75C which would leave only 75A.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are matters which could be discussed along the lines the hon. member has suggested. However, I am not able to say what the position of the party to which I belong would be.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because there are members here who are willing to sacrifice their summer holidays for the principles of democracy and freedom. They will continue to do so, and either they will win or remain here all summer. We find that in the dying days of this session, after the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) timetable had been met, all at once we are told this closure clause, rule 75C, is to be brought in without any reason or excuse. Mr. Speaker,

the government has no legislation of any kind before this house except the closure rule, 75c. There is no urgent legislation waiting, because the time of adjournment had been set by agreement.

I am amazed at the audacity of the government. What is their purpose? What is the motive behind this? The government set the time for the adjournment of the house and then turned around and brought in this joker, closure, thinking they had a submissive parliament. I think they are beginning now to realize they do not have a submissive parliament. I wonder what the Prime Minister wants now. Last December, as pointed out very ably by the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of the N.D.P. and the leader of the Créditiste, when clause 16A was being considered there were many procedural changes adopted to speed up the work of the house. At that time the government brought in this joker clause. We did not go for it in December and we will not go for it in July. I wonder what the purpose is behind this, because last December the Prime Minister said he did not expect the joker clause to be adopted in any event, but that he wanted to get the other clauses through. That was the lever he used. What is the sinister purpose now? He has not taken parliament into his confidence. What can we expect?

• (3:40 p.m.)

People are getting upset and alarmed about this attempted change. Did he think this was a good time to attempt this change, when United States astronauts are going to land on the moon, and when hundreds of thousands of people are at their summer cottages, not seeing newspapers or watching the news media? Was that his thought, and is that what is behind this? What measure does he expect to bring in, respecting which he intends to use this sinister clause? That is the whole crux of the matter. How can we trust him? Even the students at universities are alarmed. They do not believe in this rule. I have here the Ottawa *Journal* for today, July 16, in which it is stated:

> Two University of Ottawa students' council executives have mounted a Canada-wide public opinion campaign against controversial rule 75c which would limit debate in the House of Commons.
>
> Students' council president Allan Rock, vice-president Hugh Segal and about ten volunteers worked late Tuesday night preparing petitions to be sent to all Canadian university campuses. They are asking for the support of the public and students. The students hope to have at least 5,000 signatures within a week.

Mr. Rock said the apathy of Canadians in general over the proposed debate limiting rule has been "appalling" and now it looks as though the matter may be settled by closure.

> "It is time we did something about it" he said.

It is not much wonder that students are alarmed. One can become alarmed sitting in this chamber because we are not even getting this feeling across the chamber to the government members. The students suggest it is about time we did something about this proposal. The article then continues:

> "We didn't start earlier on this thing because we didn't think there was the slightest possibility the rule would ever pass."
>
> The students have set up an organization called "Students for Free Parliament" to direct the cross-country protest effort.
>
> "The least we can hope for is postponement of a Commons vote on the rule until fall to give people more time to think about it."
>
> In Ottawa the petition will be circulated on both U of O and Carleton university campuses. Write-in signatures will also be accepted if mailed to students council within the next few days.

I have a high regard for students. They value liberty. They are studying history and political science. They know the facts. When the Prime Minister suggested this rule change last December, he was just using it as a lever.

Let us look at the editorial page of today's Ottawa *Journal* in an attempt to find out what this man is trying to do with parliament. The editorial reads:

> Eclectic is an interesting word—

Apparently this is a reference to an article in the *New Yorker* magazine in which the Prime Minister was quoted as describing himself as "very eclectic". Apparently this is a new word, but what does it mean? The editorial then goes on to quote what the Prime Minister said:

> "I bet many people in my position have read more than I have in the field of history and economics. I have probably read more Dostoevsky, Stendahl and Tolstoy than the average statesman and less of Keynes, Mill and Marx."
>
> Eclectic it is; but right now his critics say we need a little more Keynes and a little less Stendahl.

One begins to wonder whether sophism is at work again. Is it fair to assume that the Prime Minister is reacting in the same way he did last December? Perhaps for reasons of sophism he wants this closure rule adopted in order that he can put through other measures he could not get through otherwise. Perhaps this involves a matter of philosophy, whereas we are the masters of this house. We must assume that sophism is at work again. What will this do to parliament?

Some 704 years ago Simon de Montfort called the first parliament together. It was made up of barons, nobles and knights. It was not made up of the common people like the members of this house. It was made up of members of the upper class who were in revolt against the King's Henchmen. Simon de Montfort called that parliament together and down through the years we have developed a democratic parliamentary system. Kings and Queens have lost their heads during the process. People have been burned at the stake, and rulers have been destroyed.

One could get emotional about this whole thing, but we must remember we were handed this heritage; we did not develop it. Down through the years principles, rules and regulations have been fought for and put into our parliamentary system. I think of the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. They have been adopted to build up this system. One can go to the corridor of the sixth floor in this building and observe some mementos of history there, from the first Prime Minister to the present covering over 300 years of history.

When parliament was formed there was no time limit in respect of debate, and that was long before the 19th century. Closure was never heard of until the Irish nationalists, of the end of the last century by prolonging debate in the house, tried to destroy parliament. We did not hear of closure in this house until this century. The rules have been changed in this house from those which existed in earlier days. Let us look back over the records.

On more than one occasion the house sat all night. We did not have many rules or regulations in those days and a member could speak as long as he wished. It was not unusual for Tupper, Sifton and Blake to talk for several hours in this house, and all of them have a record of at least 9 hours. It was not until 1902 when Lord Balfour said something must be done to limit debate in the British House of Commons that closure was introduced. He suggested this to end the long-winded debates that were taking place in Parliament. It was not until then that people started to think about rules and regulations.

In 1906, under the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, this house began to refine and revise our rules and regulations. Down through the years they have been revised and time limits have been adopted. Now, an hon. member can speak for only 40 minutes, without permission to speak further, rather than the previous long hours. We have made great advances. We must remember that we might reach the point where one further step in the direction of revision may destroy what we have built up over the years.

Let me suggest to the Prime Minister of Canada and other members of the government that we now may have reached a point of parliamentary destruction. If the government wants to adopt another system, it should take us into its confidence. If the government wants our support, it should tell us about this new system. We should know what they intend as a substitute when they destroy our system. If that is not what the government is doing it should tell us what it intends. This government has not been delayed during this session by the people on this side of the house. During this session the government has put through a great deal of legislation. To reiterate closure was never used until the Irish nationalists tried to destroy the British parliament. Closure was used in 1913 in this house for the first time. At that time it was brought in by Borden and the Conservative government. It is interesting to note that Arthur Meighen introduced the bill, and then condemned it. He condemned it because it gave the government too much power. On that occasion Borden did go to Sir Wilfrid Laurier to discuss this issue, and asked for a time limit. He offered to allow him to name the time limit but Laurier would not do this. At that time closure was applied in respect of the naval bill after prolonged debate.

At that time Sir Wilfrid Laurier made a famous statement which has been repeated in this House of Commons by other hon. members including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He said he would rather sit in the opposition without power than have to do what the Tories did at that time with power.

• (3:50 p.m.)

That is what a great Liberal, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, thought about closure. Closure was used in the Canadian Parliament on six bills, all in this century. It was used in 1917 on the Northern acquisition bill, and the Wartime Elections Act. These bills were brought in by the government of that day, and there was not prolonged discussion in respect of either of them. The next time closure was used was 1926, during the throne speech, debate by Mr. King. If my memory serves me aright, in 1932 Mr. Bennett used closure in connection with the Unemployment Act after only one clause out of four had been studied.

It is amazing to consider what happens when you give people power and set a precedent in this respect. Twenty-four years later the Liberal party, under Mr. St. Laurent, quoted the precedent that Mr. Bennett had set. This was done in respect of a bill only 3 or 4 clauses of which, out of several, if I am correct in my recollection, had been examined. I have forgotten the exact number of clauses in the bill. In any event, the Liberal government brought in closure at that time. There was no excuse for imposing closure in respect of all these bills because there had not been prolonged debate. It may be said there was probably prolonged debate in respect of three bills, only but I do not believe one could claim there was an abuse of the right of parliament to debate important issues.

A government may believe it is right in saying, "We will stop this nonsense", but human frailty being what it is, its judgment may be wrong. The heat of parliamentary debate can lead one to make faulty judgments. Our fear is that if the government is given that power, they will use it.

The last time closure was used by the government of Mr. St. Laurent was 1956. Mr. Harris, the minister of finance at that time, in a radio address about a week later said that closure was brought in only if, first, the government had a timetable it wanted to keep—he was not concerned about the rest of parliament—and, second, if the government wanted to cut off prolonged debate.

There are in the house many young, capable members. Some of them have not been here very long and have not the experience of other hon. members. I hope they will not fall for the reasons given by the government for imposing closure, because the backbenchers are the ones who will suffer. These decisions are made by the members on the front benches, but the backbenchers will suffer. As the leader of the New Democratic party pointed out so ably every time the rules have been amended it has had the effect of cramping the opportunity of backbenchers to speak.

This has been proven over the years. When our rules have been changed, the ability of backbenchers to adequately represent their constituencies has been impaired. The leader of the New Democratic party also pointed out in his able fashion that backbenchers will never have the opportunity to speak if this closure rule is passed. The leaders of the various parties will speak on legislation, and that will be it. I ask, Mr. Speaker: If this is to be the situation, why are backbenchers brought here? Why not let the executive run the country? Why be burdened with the great expense involved in running parliament? Is this what the Prime Minister has in mind, namely, allowing the executive to run the country? These are questions we have to ask ourselves. They are important questions.

If past governments were able, in retrospect, to reconsider the imposition of closure, I am sure they would not have used it. This is the seriousness of the situation. The Liberals say they were wrong in using it in 1956. I remember Jack Pickersgill. Don't think he was not a clever fellow. I have heard the Four Horsemen, Mr. Chevrier, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Martin and Mr. Pearson, day after day in the question period speak for as long as they were allowed. At that time the question period ran over an hour on many occasions. They were talking about the price of eggs, butter, and so on, and we had a daily diet on the question of unemployment. They even had their own Bureau of statistics. They brought newspaper clippings into the chamber and read them; then they asked, "What does the minister say about that?" They read openly from pieces of paper and asked questions based on them.

There is no doubt that Mr. Pickersgill was clever. He got the transport portfolio and then fixed up a job for himself which was to his liking. You cannot say a man like that is not clever; if anybody does, there is something wrong with his thinking. Some of the ministers across the way were here at that time. Mr. Pickersgill said there was something wrong with the senses of any government that would dare to bring in closure; no government would impose it in the future. One can only conclude that this government has not done its homework; it has not looked at history. One should always go back to history upon which to base ground rules; then you should go ahead and build on those ground rules. We in the house have been handed a great heritage. We have copied the Mother of Parliaments. Westminster is the Mother of Parliaments wherever democracy rules in the world. We have been handed this heritage unsullied, and we must protect it. It was handed to us to protect and preserve. I wonder how many of us realize this. I am not happy about some of the things the government has done. To give it the power of closure in this way would be putting another axe in its hands.

I shall now refer to the committees system. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) is in his seat, and it is very appropriate that he is. I want to say a few words about him. I sat on the drug prices committee. The committee asked for witnesses to be called. They never were called, some experts wrote a letter to the committee, asking to appear. Strictly speaking, they should have appeared before us. Witnesses were sent an invitation to attend, but the invitation was so worded that they could not possibly appear before us. The invitation told them not to come, but at the same time invited them to attend.

The hon. member for York East told us that no amendments were permitted in committees. He said that government members on committees did not change things because they had their orders. This is what happened in the drug prices committee. Not one amendment was accepted. The legislation came back to the house without amendment although there was a great deal of criticism in committee. The Liberals were silent on that occasion. Hon. members can read this in *Hansard*. Not one Liberal member raised objection, although they were in the house to voice their opinions and complaints.

• (4:00 p.m.)

When the members of the other house saw this bill, they said they required expert witnesses because the members in the House of Commons had not done their homework. They called witnesses.

It is very revealing to note that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) did not accept any amendments to the Criminal Code bill from the floor of this house. He said it had been through the committee and we had to protect the committee system. He said that any bill that had gone through a committee should not have changes made to it in this house. How can this government function? Government members receive their orders from the Prime Minister not to make any changes to a bill in a committee. I am not saying this happens in every committee because certain members may not comply with all the orders, but it did apply to that committee. Then, the Minister of Justice said he would not accept any amendments and refused to consider any in the Languages bill.

How can you ever assess how competent this government is because they cast doubt upon themselves. The Minister of Justice said that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) had presented an excellent amendment. The minister spent the dinner hour going over it, but said there were some things in it that possibly we should not consider because they might defeat the purpose of the bill. Ten or fifteen minutes after the Minister of Justice said what a fine amendment it was, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) said it was a terrible amendment; that the member for Crowfoot did not know what he was talking about; that it was such a stupid amendment he could not have read the bill.

How can a cabinet like that function? How can we be expected to have confidence in them? We have been very co-operative with this government. We have allowed legislation to pass. We were nice to them but, now the pay-off is the Guillotine.

Mr. Crouse: We sat extra hours.

Mr. Rynard: As the hon. member has stated, we even sat extra hours. The government would not divide the omnibus Criminal Code bill. Instead, they penalized the conscience of members and forced them to talk until they were understood. They could have divided this bill, but they refused. What would they do with closure when they would not even divide the omnibus bill to allow certain members who had conscientious feelings about parts of that bill to vote on individual sections? The government is asking for closure, the last thing in the world we want to give them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rynard: That is not all, Mr. Speaker. I will now deal with another item. I wish to draw attention to a statement of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). Every morning the Prime Minister has four chaps in his room to decide what the government is going to do that day. I will not mention their names. They are the "thought factory". They not only lead the cabinet, but lay down the rules about what is going to be done. It is a mystery how those fellows stay together in cabinet. How do they get anywhere with their divisive views? The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said the price of beef was too high, boycott it. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said the price increase was the greatest thing that could happen, the farmers were entitled to it.

On many occasions I have quoted the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) because I thought his speech was extremely good. He said that if this situation were not sad it would be comic, or something to that effect. That is about the size of it. Are they jokers? Are they playing games or what are

they doing? Do they feel we are puppets? I have illustrated the divisions in the cabinet. I do not have to tell hon. members that there were other divisions.

One cabinet minister had to quit because he could not get anywhere with housing. He was forced out. I notice the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) is now holding meetings in the anteroom of parliament. I happened to be there today when he was busy explaining the situation that occurred in the House of Commons. This is what goes on with this government. It gives me a feeling of sadness.

I have a lot of sympathy for members opposite. I do not think they are the kind of fellows who would do this sort of thing. They come from Canadian farmlands and cities. I cannot understand why they are being subjected to the psychological brainwashing which they are receiving from the Prime Minister. I do not understand how they can take this sort of treatment day after day. There are many disagreements in cabinet, yet nobody pays any attention to them. While disagreements are being voiced, the Prime Minister has his group of four each morning to decide what is going to be done. He also has regional offices.

What position do government backbenchers have? I do not say this to be critical, I say it out of sadness; what are we doing to parliament? That is the big question. I say to hon. members that if Canada is to be given the service she deserves, and if hon. members are going to play their part in preserving the democratic institutions that have been handed down in trust to us, they should make their voices heard against the Prime Minister and those who wish to push this folly through and destroy parliament.

Many members opposite come from areas similar to my own. They come from good homes and have been educated in Canadian schools. I expect them to rise in the next few days and say to the Prime Minister of this country, "you cannot do this any longer; you have no purpose; you have no reason. You have not taken parliament into your confidence. Why do you want this rule? What do you want to accomplish? Do you want to destroy parliament? Where are you going? I say to hon. members opposite that in the final analysis they will suffer just as much as we will.

Mr. Paproski: They will suffer more when the Prime Minister gets back from the west!

Mr. Rynard: Canadian history and the Canadian parliament will suffer. These are the real issues. Closure is not important. When it is necessary to resort to closure, there has been a failure to communicate. There has been a failure to sell the bill of goods they are presenting. This is the problem with this government. There is no need for closure. If communication lines are working, if the bill is good, if the government is a proper salesman, the measure will be accepted by every one on this side. It is as simple as that. No one refuses legislation which is good for the people of Canada.

Over and over again we have asked for the rights of old age pensioners to be respected. That has been pointed out time and again. The government raised the pension 4 per cent while costs have gone up 16 per cent. We have been asking for help for those men who are unable to help themselves. This government has let things run wild. Surely, the economic position of this country is far more important than anything else. Yet the government is trying to push through a proposal that would give them power they do not need and for which there is no reason to ask at the present time. Why did they not take us into their confidence?

• (4:10 p.m.)

Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite want to say to us in effect: "We want to change parliament and we have some ideas about it. You fellows get elected and we will call you here. Then, following the Speech from the Throne you can go home and an executive council will run the country for the next four years. We will then call you back here and dissolve parliament and have an election". The trouble with that proposition, Mr. Speaker, is that the government might do exactly what it is doing now, bring in closure and stay here forever.

There are some intelligent men across the way. I know there are some good members on the other side. I hope that in the next few days these members will issue an ultimatum to the Prime Minister and demand he stop this nonsense. We have had many trials in our democratic history, but we have yet to suffer at the hands of dictators like Hitler and Mussolini, as have other countries.

Mr. Paproski: Don't forget Joey Smallwood.

Mr. Rynard: Well, he is far enough away at the moment not to bother us. The interesting thing about democracy is that it always destroys itself from within. Civilizations perish

from within. I ask members on the other side of the house carefully to consider that statement. Let it not be said that we in this parliament allowed the government to destroy itself. Let it not be said that in the year 1969 we allowed the Prime Minister of Canada to destroy this institution which all of us, when we came here starry-eyed, hoped in some way to strengthen.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, after hearing the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), I feel very humble as I stand in my place to participate in this debate. It is with a sad and heavy heart that I do so. I am also shocked and ashamed that some of the senior cabinet ministers have not taken a vital part in this debate. I observe the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) in his seat and wonder why he and others of his colleagues have not persuaded the cabinet, and more especially the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), to bring some sense of co-operation into this debate.

Many Canadians have said that we are suffering physically from the heat and are making a great sacrifice. We may be making a great physical sacrifice, but when we think of the consequences that would flow from the adoption of rule 75c, this is a mere nothing in comparison. We intend not only to suffer physically from the heat but also to apply some political heat in order to bring about some changes to this particular report.

Many of us are making a sacrifice by being away from our families and friends and by not participating in some of the activities and work in our constituencies. But this matters not in view of the serious consequences which would flow from adoption of this report. It is sad that we have reached an impasse on the rules, particularly in regard to the proposed rule 75A, 75B and 75C. We have reached a senseless confrontation which has backed the government and the opposition into their respective corners, that has generated firm convictions, ill-feelings and reminded us of the December impasse on rule 16A.

It has been said, and I repeat, that we would not object to remaining here if we were to discuss some of the serious matters that confront Canada today. During the last few days we have been reminded of the crisis on the farms, and the government's inability to cope with it. We have been reminded of the serious problem of inflation and the increase in the lending rate to chartered banks by the Bank of Canada. We would not object to staying here to debate such issues as these. Other matters, such as the serious housing shortage, unemployment and high taxes are also of concern to every member of the house. Yet we are in this house today discussing rules 75A, 75B and 75C, and this fact tends to destroy the goodwill that has been built up since the beginning of the session.

I think of some of the tensions and acrimony engendered in this house since I represented the riding of Broadview during the period 1965 to 1968. I refer to tension not only between persons but regarding some of the great issues facing Canada. For example, I recall the tension and acrimony that was generated when the opposition defeated the government on the postal rates increase and also on the imposition of additional personal taxes. In the result, much ill feeling was created between members.

Then in June 1968, the people of Canada spoke and returned to the house a majority government. An attempt was made to improve the procedure and organization of the house by restructuring the committee system and by imposing time limitations on debates like the Speech from the Throne and the budget, and debate on certain bills. Then, to top it all off, a serious attempt was made to apportion the year so that we might have a definite allocation of time for debating certain business of the house.

All of this was done in a spirit of co-operation, and this was very encouraging. The members of the committee on procedure and organization are reasonable and talented men who are sincere and knowledgeable. They contributed much valuable work, and in many areas there was unanimous agreement. But a bomb was exploded in the house by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) when, after general agreement on rule 75A and 75B, he brought forward rule 75C. It is this which has triggered the ill feeling generated since that time. He has taken a stone wall approach and government members have become mere puppets to be counted only as heads in the votes that ensue.

• (4:20 p.m.)

One looks back to last December and to rule 16A with not too much happiness. I think we all recall the efforts of the opposition to bring about change and how successful we were in making the government realize that it would be a serious mistake to adopt proposed

rule 16A. The matter was returned to committee, and we all remember how the chairman of the committee was embarrassed by the treatment afforded him by the President of the Privy Council. The determination and dictatorial attitude of the President of the Privy Council is unbecoming and unworthy of a minister of the Crown.

Some say the government is trying to blackmail the opposition. This session was to end on June 27. One wonders why the government left this vital matter until the end of the session. Did it hope that hon. members would be tired, anxious to go home, and would therefore dispose of this matter? If so, that indicates government thinking. If the government is not trying to blackmail us then, in the alternative, it is showing a tremendous disrespect and disregard for the principles of opposition members. Its actions are degrading parliament.

Consider the lack of a quorum in this house last Thursday, Mr. Speaker. Without the integrity, intelligence and co-operation of Mr. Speaker and his ruling on that important matter, the government would have degraded parliament even more. We were working to rule when the quorum vote was taken. As I recall, many hon. members of this house and many members of the public were annoyed with the employees of Air Canada when those employees worked to rule during the recent difficulties. I recall an Air Canada employee at Malton Airport telling me to check a small handbag, and I recall being annoyed. Yet that employee was merely working to rule, just as we were in this house when an hon. member drew to your attention that there was no quorum. If our post office employees were to work to rule, the chaos in the post office would be greater even than that brought on by the minister.

An hon. Member: That is not possible.

Mr. Gilbert: Last Friday the Prime Minister made a disgraceful, unworthy and disappointing comment about the conduct of parliament. When I spoke words of welcome to members of the Liberal party on the Friday after the quorum vote, I was greeted in a most unworthy manner. When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rose to his feet, even before he had a chance to say a word, the members of the Liberal party made known their feelings of displeasure. On top of that we had to contend with the Prime Minister's schoolboy sauciness when he described this debate as a stupid filibuster and the attitude of opposition members as hypocritical. It is possible that his arrogance and ignorance at that time exceeded that of Mr. C. D. Howe in the 1956 pipeline debate. This government is a dictatorship by a dilettante. His hatchet man is the President of the Privy Council, and the Liberal party members who support him are mere hush-puppies who play little role in this house. The Liberal party needs a man with the convictions and courage of the former hon. member for York-Humber, Mr. Ralph Cowan. He called a spade a spade, and he acted as the conscience of the Liberal party when it abused the exercise of its powers. We need men like Ralph Cowan in this house. More than ever, the Liberals need Ralph Cowan back.

An hon. Member: Bring back Ralph Cowan.

Mr. Gilbert: The only one remotely like him here is the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) who brought to the attention of hon. members the attitude of the government towards its supporters when they are in committee. His revelation has been very worth while and we only hope that he will be more active in persuading other Liberal party members to stop being mere rubberstamps and to take an active part in the work of this house. When I consider the performance of the portly potentate for High Park (Mr. Deakon), who seems to suffer from mental paralysis when important issues come up, I become disappointed that Ralph Cowan is no longer in the house.

Rule 75c will apply to the backbenchers of all parties and I think the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), who was one of the whiz kids of the Walter Gordon days, who has great experience in economic matters and in matters affecting foreign ownership and who has made a great contribution to our Canadian Indians and Eskimos, ought to remember that. We hope he will take a more active part as a backbencher in the debates of this house. The same goes for the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand), who should be taking the lead here when Indian questions are discussed. He seems to be tongue tied. I hope he realizes that if the government adopts rule 75c he will be even more tongue tied.

During the past year we have heard little from the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens), who is a former mayor of Toronto and has considerable experience in urban affairs, housing and urban transportation. On numerous occasions he has told the press that

he would like to participate in a more active and meaningful way in the debates of this house. Does he not realize that once rule 75c is accepted his opportunities to speak will be very much curtailed?

And why does not the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen), who has had great experience in law, not say more about matters like the rehabilitation of criminals, expungement of criminal records, corporal punishment and the like. If he is under restraint now, does he not realize that rule 75c will tighten that restraint? He, too, should take part in debates and he and others like him should resist the adoption of rule 75c.

The government's backbenchers have deafened me with their silence in this debate. They are silent when most matters come before the house and when many matters are referred to committee. I am thinking of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), who has had wide experience on Toronto city council and who has the respect of the Italian community; I appeal to him to speak up when matters relating to immigration and to the Italian community of Canada come before the house.

• (4:30 p.m.)

These are some of the backbenchers for whom I feel sorry and whom I ask to take an active part. If I may be rather poetic I would say, "On Danson, on Givens, on Hopkins, on Otto" to meet some of these important matters. This problem would never have arisen had we had the present Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) as the house leader. He is a man of reason, sympathy and compassion. He exercises those talents in his portfolio as Solicitor General. We never would have had this problem with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) as house leader. When he was house leader he worked well with the other house leaders to formulate timetables which were acceptable to members of the house. The fly in the ointment has been the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). Some members have said disparagingly that he is "Mac the Gag." I really do not believe he has stooped to that position.

The President of the Privy Council is a representative of the riding next to mine. I might say that it is Rosedale, the upper part of which embraces a great many wealthy people and the lower part of which embraces many poor people. I thought he would be really concerned about putting recreational facilities into Moss Park and would be working toward that end. I thought he would be concerned about housing for the people in the south part of his riding who are suffering from the effects of high interest rates and poor housing. I thought he would be interested in some of the unemployment problems which prevail and that he would co-operate with house leaders to adopt 75A and 75B so that we could move on to a discussion of these particular matters, but that has not been so. Probably he has rightfully earned the tag of "Mac the Gag."

We have heard many speeches from members of the opposition. When one heard the moving speech by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), and the speech by the leader of my party, one could not help but be persuaded that 75c has no place in parliamentary democracy in Canada. When one heard the speech of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), one could not help but be moved. Here we have a member who in his maiden speech said:

> —men should be judged not by the colour of their skin nor by the way they fight, love or sin, nor by the gods they serve or vintage they drink, but by the quality of thoughts they think.

After hearing the hon. member for Hamilton West last night, one appreciates the way he thinks. He is a man of integrity; he is a man who wants to co-operate with members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilbert: His plea seemed to fall on the deaf ears of the backbenchers of the Liberal party who lack the initiative to participate in this debate or take a very active part in their caucus meetings to point out to the President of the Privy Council the error of his ways. We have been fortunate to have a colleague like the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), a man who is knowledgeable and sincere; a man who has brought to the parliament of Canada the dignity it deserves.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilbert: To be treated by the Prime Minister in the way he was last Friday does not belittle the hon. member; it belittles the Prime Minister.

I should like to direct my attention in particular to 75A, 75B and 75C. It has been said we need to know our a, b, c's to understand these particular sections. I should like to read section 75A so that we will better understand

it. According to *Votes and Proceedings* for June 20, 75A reads as follows:

When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to allot a specified number of days or hours to the proceedings at one or more stages of any public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

I have heard no criticism in respect of 75A. This is one of the rules whereby the house leaders of all parties can act and act advantageously. Rule 75B reads:

When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the Government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation; provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 7(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

I understand that this proposal did have a great deal of discussion in the committee, and is the result of a consensus among committee members. I think I am safe in saying most members of the house are prepared to accept 75A and 75B. There appears to be a slight problem with regard to the determination of what constitutes a majority, but I rely on the wisdom, experience and goodwill that prevails among the members of that committee to bring forward a determination of what constitutes a majority.

It is 75C which is the reason we are here. I shall read 75C:

A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

This is the section which puts fear in the hearts of the opposition members, and which should put fear into the hearts of thinking members on the government side, because it is a naked power which many of us in this house are not prepared to give to the government. Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote to you, and members of the house, some of the statements I have read which are pertinent to this particular debate:

Power abdicates only under stress of counter-power.

That was said by Martin Buber in "Paths in Utopia" in 1950. This is the reason we in the opposition parties are bringing forward our counter-power to offset the naked power which is sought by the government.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The second quotation is "the greater the powers the more danger of abuse". That statement was made by Edmund Burke in a speech he made at Middlesex in 1771. One would think that this remark could certainly apply to 75C if it were implemented.

Lord Acton, who has been mentioned many times, said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It is for these reasons we in the opposition party are not prepared to give the government the power contained in 75C.

During the debate last December in respect of 16A, I received a letter from a radio station in Toronto called CHUM in which an argument against this bill was set forth effectively and persuasively. I should like to ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, while I read parts of this letter:

No government requires absolute power to run this country of ours and CHUM cannot understand why the Trudeau government is insisting on absolute power before getting on with the just society's business.

The government's stubborn insistence on the right to determine in advance how long debates of the nation's business shall run—suggests an impatience with the machinery of democracy.

It is hard to believe that our fantastic Centennial year spirit is being followed up by a government bid for absolute power.

It is also hard to appreciate why the Trudeau government isn't content to make do with the generous majority of seats handed to it in the last election.

Surely 155 seats out of 264 is sufficient for this majority government to handle parliament in a businesslike manner. It can always impose closure —after sufficient debate.

This government does not need the right to cut off debate in advance in order to give the people of our country the just society it has promised. Reconsider, Mr. Prime Minister. Especially in view of the popular opposition to your proposal.

Take the section dealing with your right to cut off debate in advance out of your reform book.

And make no further attempts to arbitrarily impose your government's will on parliament.

This letter from CHUM indicates why we oppose the granting of this naked power the government wants. We have heard much talk about the experience of the United Kingdom, and the President of the Privy Council has risen on many occasions to ask members whether they are knowledgeable of the experience of England and the fact that the allocation of time there is far more strict and stringent. Let me remind the President of the Privy Council of the differences which prevail in the United Kingdom. There are differences in numbers of members, differences in respect of independent chairmen, differences in attitude and differences in tradition. There is nothing wrong with studying the views and procedures as well as the rules of other governments, but you only apply those rules which have relevance to Canada.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), who is chairman of the committee, attempted to bring forth a spirit of co-operation not only in the committee but in the house. He indicated the experience in the United Kingdom, as recorded in *Hansard* for July 8 at page 10958:

It is estimated that 50 per cent of the business of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom proceeds in accordance with an agreed timetable; that 25 per cent is so uncontentious that it requires the application of no timetable and that of the balance of 25 per cent deemed to be contentious, the majority or a substantial part, is dealt with through the ordinary process of negotiation, with the result that orders allocating time are not the procedures which are usually or habitually employed at Westminster.

We have the statement by the President of the Privy Council that 75c would probably be applied to no more than one per cent of the legislation. Further than that, we have the experience during this session with the passing of the omnibus Criminal Code and languages bills. The only bill the government singles out is the omnibus bill, and it unfairly and unjustly points that finger of guilt at members of the Creditiste party who exercised their right in respect of certain sections. As a member previously said, when you think of the many sections and subjects dealt with in the omnibus bill in respect of criminal law you can appreciate the necessity of debating time. One should also appreciate the necessity of members reflecting the views of their constituents in respect of these important subjects.

When one looks at the languages bill one will find there was little criticism, yet that bill is a milestone in respect of bringing forth unity in Canada. Therefore, the debate which took place was both proper and in order. When one thinks of the necessity for 75c during the next session, one can only envisage it being applied to certain matters. It may be applied in respect of the problems of foreign ownership. Suppose we do have a limit introduced in a respect of the Canada Development Corporation. Surely, no hon. member would suggest that we should debate it on the basis of 75c, only allowing about four days for this very complex and important subject.

I felt rather sorry for the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton when he made a slip in respect of the ten days of debate rather than the ten days lapse of time. It was only after persuasion by members of the opposition that he corrected himself and said that what he was referring to was the ten days lapse of time. I have heard different members on the government side mention different times. One referred to 30 days and another to two months, as the time period before a bill might be passed.

An hon. Member: Thirteen sitting days.

Mr. Gilbert: An hon. member suggest 13 sitting days. When you start establishing time limits in respect of important matters you will have an indication of the lack of spirit, good will and co-operation which should prevail among members of the house in connection with debates on these important matters.

When I think of the time limits that may be imposed in respect of taxation changes which have been alluded to, it makes me realize that it is only by a spirit of co-operation that this matter can be properly aired. When I think of the possible new mini-bill the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) may bring forward containing further amendments to the Criminal Code, I cannot believe that problems in respect of bail, the expunging of criminal records and corporal punishment can be properly debated with the time limit changes the government has suggested.

Yesterday when I heard the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) talk about the arithmetic of parliament, and observed his attempt to divide the opposition by saying that it should be a majority of the government and the official opposition which should prevail, I realized his inexperience as a result of his short period in the house. This is a man who is interested in the expropriation bill. The debate on that matter should last at least two or three weeks if it is to be properly aired. When one thinks of the legislation in respect of patents one must realize the necessity for the utmost co-operation in dealing with this important matter.

• (4:50 p.m.)

It could be fairly asked: What does the opposition want? It could be simply answered: The opposition wants the amendment to refer this question to the committee to be passed, so that it may delete 75c.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilbert: Why do we want this? The answer is that there has been no past need, there is no present need, and there certainly does not appear to be any future need for it. The experience of the past year indicates a necessity for the co-operation of house leaders in allocating a reasonable length of time to debate important matters. The attempt by the government last Friday to bring forward a subamendment to split the opposition was properly dealt with by the Speaker. We, of the opposition parties, will have no part of splitting the opposition on such a vital matter.

The main issue that prevails today is a decision between dictatorship and democracy. When we talk about democracy we are really talking about the persuasive process that should prevail in Canada, whereby representatives of all parts of the country come to this chamber and deal with legislation on the basis of discussion, co-operation and agreement. This is the proper process to be adopted in parliament; consensus should be arrived at. This is why, if we are to continue on the road of democracy, it is highly necessary that rule 75c be deleted in order that we may restore the good will and co-operation that heretofore prevailed this session.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman resumes his seat I wonder whether he would accept a question.

Mr. Gilbert: Certainly.

Mr. Reid: The hon. member mentioned the British experience. Would he be prepared to accept British standing orders Nos. 31 and 32, which are to be found in *Hansard* of July 10 at pages 11080 and 11081? Is the hon. member prepared to accept the British system in this respect, in lieu of 75c?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised that the hon. member should rise in his place and ask me a question of that nature. I am not sure whether he belongs to the Liberal party or the Liberal Labour party. I am not sure whether he will exercise his right with regard to 75B and say that a majority of the Liberal Labour party will be necessary before we proceed with legislation in the house.

It is absolutely necessary that the members of the committee get together and work out a reasonable compromise with regard to the rules and organization of the house. The insertion into his debate of the standing orders used in the British house is not important; in fact, it is irrelevant. It is important to arrive at a consensus of the members of all parties in the house so that we have a system of rules and orders by which we can abide and with which we agree. If we do this we will restore the friendliness and co-operation that has prevailed this session.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I think at a time when it is estimated that over 500 million people are glued to their television sets watching the Apollo 11 mission, which if successful will probably go down in history as one of the greatest accomplishments of mankind, is hardly the time to assume that there is a great deal of direct interest by the public in what is taking place this afternoon in the House of Commons, or that by speaking on this occasion one is in the spotlight, as it were, of public notice.

The wide effect that electronic communications have had in our lives is illustrated by the story told about a teacher of ten-year-olds who took her class to see the famous painting "Whistler's Mother" and asked them to write a few words about it. One little lad wrote: It seemed it was a picture of an old lady waiting for the repairman to bring back her television set.

I believe we live in an age when we do not give enough time and contemplation to some of the basic things we take for granted. For example, if we wanted to be cold-bloodedly practical it might be more efficient, for the opposition parties, if they could afford it, to

try to buy a 20-second commercial from Walter Cronkite this afternoon to put in a plug for the importance to minorities of the basic rights we are now discussing.

I rise in this debate because I think we are discussing an extremely important issue. It is not my purpose to be offensive to anyone. If anything I say is offensive, it is inadvertent and unintentional. I hold the view that everyone, no matter how exalted he may be in his own view or the view of any other person, can learn something from somebody else no matter how humble that other person may be.

I believe that a great many people in this house, including myself, still have a great deal to learn about the traditions of parliament, its rules, what they really mean and their significance. I think it is ill-becoming for anyone, no matter how brilliant he may be, to stack up one or two years' experience—I have seen this happen in parliament—five or six years, or even ten or twenty against the accumulated experience of 700 years of parliamentary development under the leadership of the greatest men the English speaking world has known. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject we should consider very carefully.

I wish to speak through you, sir, chiefly to members whose experience in parliament is limited. We should remember that we are a parliament whose collective experience is very short; we have only very few members who have served in this chamber for any length of time. Political life expectancy in this institution has been very short in the last few years. Therefore we should pay particular attention to other authorities who have studied this matter, lived with it and in some cases recorded their thoughts.

It is not my intention to be condescending. I am not in a position to take that attitude. My experience in this chamber is limited. It is true that there are many whose experience is even more limited. We should not think lightly of the responsibilities of being a member of parliament. We hold a great trust. We sometimes think too much of the honour involved, the stimulation of political victory, and so on.

• (5:00 p.m.)

We should not forget that each of us is here to represent, on the average, almost 70,000 Canadians who have no means of expressing their views on a subject which is perhaps of prime importance to them, namely the type of governmental system they are going to live under, except through their respective members of parliament. It is our responsibility as members of parliament to serve minorities in our own constituencies. It is our responsibility to represent the people who have voted against us as well as the people who voted for us. It is our duty to speak for them and to represent them in a way which will bring them collectively the best possible government under the best form of government, which I believe to be the democratic form.

If I were to talk to members of parliament who had just been elected, I would recommend to them that the first thing they should do is read some good books on parliament and parliamentary procedure. As a start I would recommend Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. For many distinguished years, Beauchesne served as clerk of this house. I want to quote fairly extensively from Beauchesne, for which I make no apology. On page 16 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, in a general discussion of what parliament means, there is this statement:

> We use the words "House of Commons" very often without pausing to reflect upon what those words mean. The word "Commons" means the people. This is the house of the people, sitting on both sides of this house; and on both sides of the Speaker are representatives of every constituency of Canada. Collectively those of us who meet in this Chamber represent all Canadians. That is our responsibility! That is our duty. Our rights are important only to the extent that those rights represent the rights of the people themselves. If the traditional rights of the members of this House are released, limited or arbitrarily curtailed in any way, it is not our rights that are of concern. What is vitally important is that in that curtailment of rights—there is a limitation of the rights—of the people themselves. The freedom that we have here to shape and guide legislation, no matter on which side of the House we may sit, is part of the very freedom which we cherish here in this country of ours. It is here in the House of Commons, to which all the people of Canada must look for just laws properly considered and properly made, that Canadians in every part of Canada must look for the greater part of their freedom and for the assurance of that type of government which will be itself an expression of the freedom which has come down to us through so many generations of sacrifice and of tremendous efforts.

We hear a great deal about the necessity for speed, Mr. Speaker. We hear that it is necessary to have speed in legislation and that we have to get a list of bills as long as your arm through in each session of parliament. I am the first to admit that government is becoming larger and is impinging into many more fields than used to be the case. As a consequence, there is a great deal more parliamentary business than there used to

be. Nevertheless, I wholeheartedly believe that the theory that the volume of legislation passed by a government is in direct proportion to that government's worth is a complete and fallacious myth. It is the quality, not the quantity of legislation that determines the value of a government and the benefit it may be to the people it governs.

Parliament not only has a responsibility to pass good legislation, but the responsibility to amend or reject bad legislation. In a democracy, that is its most vital responsibility. The notion that because we are living in a modern computer age with instant communication we have to do everything quickly, in less and less time in my opinion does not follow. To hear some people speak, their logic appears to be that the rules of parliament were laid down before the theory of relativity was discovered and therefore they are out of date. They say modern rules of parliament should be such as to expedite the business of parliament at a speed greater than the speed of light. Nothing could be more fallacious.

If we carry through this desperate desire for shorter and shorter debates, more voluminous legislation passed in a shorter period, we arrive at a point of absurdity. We will reach the position where members of parliament will be advised a day or two before parliament is to sit that the legislation the government proposes to consider is deemed to have already been passed and therefore we need not sit at all. We would be in the position of the lady in the limerick:

> There was a young lady named Bright
> Whose speed was greater than light,
> She left home one day,
> In a relative way,
> And returned home on the previous night.

The government would like to be in the position where, when they think something is right, the shorter the time spent on it the better. If we got to the position where the length of time would be a negative figure, that would be even better. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote again from Beauchesne, page 110:

> The mere object of shortening sessions may lead to an undue curtailment of the freedom of speech. The duties of a representative Parliament are too important to be performed in a hurry. No question should be decided until it has been fully discussed. Although some effort ought to be made to economize time, every shade of opinion has the right to find expression and members who desire to give their views should not be prevented from doing so. Canada is a vast country, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The problems of the West are not those of the East. The viewpoints of members of Parliament from British Columbia and the Prairie Provinces differ from those of Ontario; Ontario differs from Quebec; and Quebec from the Maritime Provinces. For this reason debates in the House are necessarily lengthy. A two-month session, if it is mismanaged, is more wasteful of time than a six-month session during which no time has been lost. Debates have to be free and they must also be relevant. In Parliament every corner of the country is represented and no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. Freedom of speech is a sacred principle and if there is a place where it should be fully respected that place is the Parliament of the nation, and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Most people without thinking too much about it, glibly equate democracy with the existence of a parliament. Examples that come to mind immediately are of Canada, the United States, Great Britain and France. In each of these countries there is a parliament; therefore, it is assumed there is also a democracy. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it just does not follow that if you have a democracy you have a parliament, or that if you have a parliament you have a democracy. This is tantamount to saying that because all Parisians are Frenchmen, all Frenchmen are Parisians.

There is a parliament of sorts in Russia which does things very expeditiously. The government tells parliament its program for the year and parliament rubberstamps it in a matter, I think, of three or four days. Then, the parliamentarians go home, and that is their role.

I suggest that what determines whether you have a democracy is whether you have an opposition that is free, that has the right to dissent, to expose to public debate the importance of differing points of view, to expose weaknesses in any program proposed by government. This is the keystone of the democratic system. Democracy has flowered when parliamentarians have held mature and enlightened views, when it has been recognized that in electing them to office the public did not want them to be dictators but rather to hold office for a short period as the servants of the people. Governments should never lose sight of the fact that they are elected to be the people's servants and not their masters.

We should remember that the rules and practices of parliament are the possession of the whole house; they are not the government's possession or the prerogative of the government of the day. It is true that in the

matter of time allocation a minister of the government must move a motion under the rules, but it is not the exclusive right of the government to make rules, or to try to impose on parliament as a whole its view on what the rules should be.

It is true that under the rules the government has certain privileges that are not open to the opposition, such as the introduction of money bills and so on. But, equally validly and truly, the opposition has rights that are not necessarily open to the government. I often hear members, chiefly new members, advancing the plausible but nevertheless invalid argument that the government has been elected and given a mandate by the people to carry out its program and hence the government has the right to make the rules of parliament to suit themselves. No argument could be more fallacious. It is like saying that a football team that won its last game can change the rules to suit itself for the next game. Or it is like saying that the heaviest football team has the right to determine the rules. Or it is like saying that if a lawyer wins a case in court he can determine the court procedure to be used for his next case. All of these examples, of course, make complete nonsense.

May I again at this point quote from Beauchesne, commencing at the bottom of page 54. I am about to make a fairly long quotation, but I do so without apology since I think this is a summation of some of the most important points that are pertinent to this discussion:

The principle that the majority rules was conceded in section 49 of Magna Carta which reads: "In all those things which are appointed to be done by these twenty-five Barons, if it happen that all the twenty-five have been present and have differed in their opinions about anything, or if some of them who had been summoned would not or could not be present, that which the greater part of those who were present shall have provided and decreed shall be held as firm and as valid as if all the twenty-five had agreed in it."

That is the principle of the convention of the majority having its way in the passage of legislation.

This principle is also enunciated in Section 49 of The British North America Act which reads: "Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices other than that of the Speaker, and when the voices are equal, but not otherwise, the Speaker shall have a vote."

(3) In every country attempts have been made to ensure that there shall be some check on the powers of the majority. Lord Bryce said in "Modern Democracies": "That a majority is always right, i.e. that every decision it arrives at by voting is wise not even the most fervent democrat has ever maintained seeing that popular government consists in the constant effort of a minority to turn itself by methods of persuasion into a majority which will then reverse the action or modify the decisions of the former majority."

[Mr. MacLean.]

Decision by majority is not an absolute and unquestionable principle. "Our constitution, to use Burke's phrase, is something more than a problem in arithmetic." There is no divine right of a mere numerical majority any more than of King's. Majority decision is a measure of convenience essential to the dispatch of business, the result, "of a very particular and special convention, confirmed by long habits of obedience." The idea that a majority, just because it is a majority, is entitled to pass, without full discussion, what legislation it pleases, regardless of the extent of the changes involved or of the intensity of the opposition to them, the idea in fact that majority edicts are the same things as laws, is wholly alien to the spirit of the constitution.

(4) A minority party may question ministers, may criticize but cannot control in the ordinary case a Government with a reasonable large majority. There can be no control of the Executive where the supporters in Parliament are prepared without question to obey the leaders of their party—through the Whips. All that the minority party—the Opposition—can do without support from members of the majority party is to question, inquire and criticize, but whilst this does not amount to control it is an important method of checking abuses of power.

I do not want to give the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) any ideas in this regard.

• (5:20 p.m.)

With the support of a majority of Members it would be possible for a Cabinet to suspend the sitting of Parliament, have the minority members arrested, withdraw the safeguards of liberty such as *Habeas Corpus* and freedom of speech, and to establish virtually a dictatorship. All this, too, could be done within the law. It is surprising how few members of the general public appreciate how uncontrolled the Cabinet is where it has the support of a loyal majority in Parliament and that "the supremacy of Parliament" in this sense is absolute and subject to no real safeguards of any kind.

Beauchesne continues:

We may add that the majority of the House of Commons does not always represent the majority of the electors in the country. It often happens that, owing to the redistribution of electoral districts, a party may come out of the general elections with a majority of elected members without having received the majority of the votes given by the electors who went to the polls or whose names are on the electoral lists. That party may form a Cabinet, but the official Opposition together with other anti-ministerial groups, though sitting to the Speaker's left, are the real representatives of the people; and their right to challenge by legitimate means every measure or proceeding sponsored by ministers cannot be disputed. In such cases, when the House divides, members who oppose the Administration may act on behalf of the majority while

Government supporters represent the minority of the people of Canada.

That is the position we are in at the present time. Although the government has a comfortable majority in the house, it represents a minority only of the Canadian people. I do not say that to be belligerent or to depreciate the government's electoral victory. I say that because I hope the government will listen to my plea. I plead with the government to pause and to consider what it is doing. They should realize that they have no divine right to govern.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean: We heard a great deal about the allocation of time. I have heard it said that we should follow the example of the Mother of Parliaments. That is the example we are admonished to follow. The trouble is that our two situations are not comparable. In many cases comparisons are not valid. The rules under which the U.K. parliament works in many cases have been misinterpreted. There are many reasons, of course, for allocating time, one of them being that there is an increase in government business. Also, the allocation of time idea is attractive to governments because they put through much second grade legislation. Since I have been a member I have seen governments introduce legislation which they have told the people of this country was the paragon of all virtues and must not be changed. Having refused to accept all opposition amendments, the government has been forced, sometimes one year after the original enactment, to bring the measure before the house again to have it amended. Parliament has had to go through the entire process of considering the matter again.

The notion of limitation of time is likely to appeal to those members, and they are mostly new members, who because of inexperience do not know just what parliament is all about. They are not fully conscious, perhaps for four or five years, of the great trust they hold, for the Canadian people. They are custodians of our treasured rights and freedoms and it behooves them to follow in the great traditions of their predecessors who looked on themselves as the servants of the people.

I appreciate the many difficulties facing governments. Often when a government is elected it has among its supporters many inexperienced members who may misinterpret the significance of their election. They have the impression, mistakenly, that they have been elected because their electors think they can do no wrong. Nothing is further from the truth. Having been a member of a government I realize, in retrospect, how difficult it was for a small group of 50 experienced parliamentarians to lead and set an example for 150 new members who had no experience of this game. And this process has been gone through several times in the past. As a result, many members do not realize why the rules of this house, which are based on tradition, are as they are.

Since the election of this government we have changed the rules drastically. The parties making up the opposition, and private members on both sides of the house, have forfeited vast numbers of rights which our predecessors enjoyed. For example, estimates are no longer considered in this chamber but are considered in committee. That is a tremendous concession on the part of the opposition, and it should give weeks of additional time for the government to bring forward government business.

Why does the government demand these new, extraordinary and arbitrary powers to limit debate? I am, of course, referring to the effect of proposed rule 75c. What legislation can the government possibly have in mind that requires this severe restriction on our freedom of speech? Why does the government need this gag? What legislation would a right thinking government wish to introduce that would require a rule like 75c to force it through? I have racked my brains about this, and I cannot imagine what the legislation could be. Of course, since the government this year permitted homosexuality under certain conditions it may wish next year to make it compulsory—that is about as far as my imagination extends. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, why does the government require this power?

My experience has always been that when an opposition debates for a long period any measure that the government has brought in, and sometimes such debates can go on for many weeks, the opposition has usually been right. Experience, time and again, has proved that in these cases the opposition has been right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean: Therefore it should be an axiom that no government ought to introduce legislation that will need to be forced through the house by the application of a rule that limits the freedom of speech. Time has shown that the government's attitude in the pipe line

debate was wrong. I remember that when we were in government we proposed to give the Minister of National Revenue power to decide by himself the classes and kinds of certain articles manufactured in Canada. The opposition debated that proposal I believe for only three weeks. I believe the opposition of that day was right. I believed it at the time, although I did not wish to admit it. The result was the Senate refused to pass that legislation, and it was never implemented. The smart thing for the government would have been to have never made such a proposal to parliament, because I believe it was wrong.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I support the amendment which is before us because its intent is to eliminate 75c. The amendment reads as follows:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c.

That amendment has been put forward in good faith, in the belief that it is a reasonable proposition. I would appeal to the government to consider the acceptance of this amendment. If they should find that unpallatable I have an even simpler suggestion by which the government could get itself and us out of this log jam. I suggest that the government just move the adjournment of this debate and then adjourn the house until October. In the meantime, the government would have an opportunity to do some thinking about this situation. There is no urgency about this rule. If we should adjourn for the summer, which I understand is the idea after this motion is passed, the rule could not be operative in any event until parliament sits again in October. There would be no parliament on which to impose it. I could see more logic in this situation if what we were involved in were legislation which would come into effect at a certain deadline during the summer, such as the business of supply or something like that. This rule, however, will be useless until we return in October. As I said, there will be nobody here to impose it. I should like the house leader and members of the government to think this over and take some advice from experienced members and others, not necessarily on this side of the house.

I suggest that the government take some advice from their own caucus. If the President of the Privy Council does not feel it appropriate to seek advice of this nature from his own colleagues, then I wish he would ask someone for advice. I would like to feel he had at least asked his wife about the wisdom of this procedure. Then he could perhaps think it over and in the fall come back with something more sensible.

A great many comparisons have been made between the situation here and the allocation of time in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, the pressure under which parliament operates is even much greater than it is here for obvious reasons. Therefore the pressure for allocation of time is even greater. That does not mean that the allocation of time is good. It is something which should be avoided if at all possible. In the United Kingdom, however, it is more difficult to avoid, because they have a unitary system of government. Roughly speaking, the parliament of the United Kingdom deals with all the things with which we deal and many other things in addition. The Parliament of the United Kingdom deals with everything the ten legislatures in Canada deal with in the course of a year, and deals with these things in relation to more than twice the population. In addition, in the United Kingdom there are more nationalized industries.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed that the hon. member may continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacLean: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to the house for giving me unanimous consent. I shall wind up my remarks quickly.

I was making the point that the two situations are not comparable. Canada is a diverse country with great distances, many ethnic groups, many regions, two languages and perhaps more important than anything else so far as the population being conscious of what is happening in parliament is concerned, in Canada we do not have a truly national press. Any press which aspires to be a national press generally speaking is not even located in Ottawa, the capital city. On the other hand, in the United Kingdom there is a national press located right at the heart of parliament and anything which takes place in the House of Commons is common knowledge throughout the United Kingdom almost immediately.

I should like to make one more reference to the situation in the United Kingdom. The position of the Speaker—and I am not speaking of personalities—is much stronger. He is appointed for life or until he wishes to retire. He may be a person who formally was associated with an opposition party. He appoints to the business committee men whom he knows to be objective and as non-partisan as possible. The business committee is responsible to the Speaker. The committee is composed of a chairman and members appointed by the Speaker. In that way, in the United Kingdom the Speaker has been given by parliament the undoubted power to act as referee, as it were, in contentious situations to a much greater degree than is the case here. This is an important matter. I wish to point out, for example, that not only does the Speaker have special powers but also, for instance, in relation to the closure rule when a member rises to propose a motion of closure the Speaker decides right there and then whether or not it is appropriate that the motion be put. If he does not think it is appropriate, because he believes the rights of minorities are being infringed, then he does not accept it at that time and allows the debate to proceed.

I should like to see Mr. Speaker here given some such powers by parliament so that he could be the adjudicator, the referee or umpire. In that way we could get on with rules which would be acceptable to everybody. Only in that way can we function adequately as a parliament. A great deal of talk has been heard about the guillotine rule in the British House of Commons. What the government is asking for here is not a guillotine. It is asking for a blunderbuss. Considering the government's refusal to divide the omnibus bill into various sections and allow a free vote on that, and considering the vast concessions made to the government in respect of changes in the rules, it is my belief the government has acted in a way which should lead us to think it cannot be trusted with a blunderbuss at this time, especially when it wishes to have it on the shelf so that it will be convenient for use when we reconvene in October.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate but I should like to say at once that I am sorry about the present situation. I am sorry to see that after hundreds of years, we still have to fight for our rights and our prerogatives.

While the Canadian people fought so hard and with such dedication, while our ancestors worked so hard to promote and protect the interests of the people, we are still faced with the same conditions.

This, Mr. Speaker, breaks our hearts and we are disappointed to see that this parliament, in 1969—in the 20th century, a century of science and progress—still has to waste time, to fight and to protest strongly in order to preserve its rights.

I think that these rights are dear to us, Mr. Speaker. They should be protected to the utmost because they are what is most precious, noble and great in a country where democracy has a right to exist and where everybody has a right to insist on his prerogatives. At present, this government wants to force upon us a real dictatorship. Now, if they were in the opposition, perhaps they would not say the same thing.

I have been here since 1962 when the Liberals were in the opposition. They were then taking part in the debates and wasting the time of the house. In those days, they were fighting vigorously to maintain their rights. They claimed that the government was interfering with their rights and prerogatives.

Indeed, the Liberals monopolized the time of the house to the extent where no rule could be adopted.

The situation has now changed. The opposition has accepted certain reforms. It has been quite reasonable; it has taken several steps in the right direction to improve the Standing Orders of the house. There is not one member of the opposition who is not in favour of making some improvements. There is not one of them who does not want progress and to do something for the people.

As for us, we have been forced to take certain steps to be recognized, to be heard. To represent the elite, and the people, the opposition has been forced to do that because the government has introduced impossible laws, laws that are unfair to the people.

When the government introduced the omnibus bill, to which 80 per cent of the people were opposed, we used every right and prerogative at our disposal in order that the rights of those who did not want it should be respected. The bill was adopted just the same. Unfair laws like that one will be used to hold up the business of the house.

If social, humane laws were introduced, if improvements were made to our economic system, if the rights of the individual, the human being, were recognized, it would be something new, and the opposition would then be happy to co-operate with the government.

Indeed, when the government introduces social laws, humane laws, with which the people agree, the opposition does not oppose them; it votes for their adoption.

We vote for any good legislation that happens to be introduced.

That is what we have been sent here for. We are not here to filibuster. We have been elected to administer, to represent the people, to take part in the making of legislation, in the best interests of the people. That is the reason why we have been elected.

Such is the position of the Ralliement créditiste and that has been our approach, so far.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government is practically denying the rights and the principles of the opposition. It has decided to relinquish the safeguards of the laws and to curtail the prerogatives of the opposition.

We are against that and we are going to fight to the end so that the opposition may preserve its rights and prerogatives..

There would have been many subjects to discuss if the government had allowed, for example, a debate on agriculture. We barely had time to discuss agriculture. Canadian agriculture is in the worst state of stagnation it has ever known. We did not have enough time to discuss its plight because the government did not see fit to introduce legislation in that field and because it was afraid of being forced to do something for agriculture. It preferred doing something for finance, not for agriculture.

Many other measures concerning industry could have been introduced.

Indeed, the government could have proposed measures, Mr. Speaker—

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Papineau wishes to ask a question of the hon. member for Compton.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member if he agrees with me that if the Creditiste members had not engaged in a filibuster on the omnibus bill, the government would probably have had the opportunity to bring forward the legislation he is talking about.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

With all due respect, I wish to point out that the authority of the Chair is unmistakably put in question while the hon. member for Compton is making his speech.

I have noticed that since the beginning of his very interesting remarks, the clowns opposite have not had the decency to listen to them. They are busy talking among themselves and joking.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this is detrimental to the authority of the Chair and that we, from the opposition, are ready to cooperate with you so that your authority may be respected. If you need our help, we could tell off those clowns across the way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I am very grateful indeed to the hon. member and I shall follow his advice.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, as for the filibustering to which the hon. member for Papineau was referring, I had already answered by saying that we were filibustering because the legislation was unfair and that 80 per cent of the people were against it. That is why we have used this tactic.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to make laws and a laws is the result of several factors. Before passing a law, we must examine every aspect of it, we must put it through trial. A law should not only be conceived by lawyers, because even if they represent their profession well, if they are good at drafting laws, a law applies to every citizen. In order that a law be socially just, it must reflect the image of the nation as a whole.

Well, here, the whole nation is represented. The house has farmers, industrialists, businessmen, lawyers and doctors in short all classes of society are represented here.

Therefore, any bill that is passed must reflect the aspirations of Canadian society, and must not merely be a written text prepared by lawyers who handle words with great skill to make the laws incomprehensible.

The measure that the government is now proposing, that is rule 75c, does not reflect public opinion. Canadians are living in a

democratic country and have not yet accepted a dictatorship. The Canadian people do not approve of this rule which was written by a few members of the government party who appear to be determined to ram it down the throats of the people and of the opposition.

The people of Canada still want democratic principles to be respected, and you of the government party have been elected under the label of democracy and not under that of dictatorship because at the present time, dictatorship has no place in Canada.

I should tell the government that we are sorry to see the character of this debate. If the debates of this house were protracted and there was a filibuster, as my hon. friend said a while ago, the fault lies not with the opposition but with the government. The reason was rule 75c that the Liberal party wanted to force on the population in spite of objections from a large majority. That is not democracy but dictatorship, actually. That is contrary to democracy, a type of government that we cherish and want to preserve.

If the Liberal members were sitting in the opposition, I feel that this house would be in a turmoil. I believe that none of them would have the courage to accept such a rule, a rule devised by some of them who turn up their noses at democracy. Today, they are all prepared to give in, to follow like sheep and to vote in favour of such a rule, and that against the will of the Canadian population.

Mr. Speaker, we heard all kinds of comments during this debate and, in my opinion, hon. members have brought out all that is important. They have tried to explain conditions, to give their views and they have asked the government to give in. They said that we from the opposition had up to now made several attempts in order to improve the rules and to speed up the business of the house.

The opposition has tried to attain a certain goal, but from now on the party in office must make concessions. It must catch up with the opposition so that an agreement may be reached and so that the sovereign rights of democracy may be fully respected. It is the duty of the government at the present time to take the lead and meet the opposition, in order to reach an agreement.

I agree with the previous speaker who asked the government whether it would not be possible for both parties to agree and postpone the debate in order to bring the session to an end, in accordance with general consensus. It is certainly not to the credit of Canada that the house is sitting under conditions such as those existing at the present time, without any agreement or settlement in sight. Therefore, parliament should adjourn and proceed with the debate later on.

Until then we might all have time to find other solutions and other steps liable to give to the Canadian nation a real goal, that is, the existence of a sound and lively democracy, of a democracy which will give Canadians security and some freedom, and not only yokes, as it is presently intended.

Until now, Mr. Speaker, high finance has been favoured, it has received everything. Interest rates have increased, as well as those of bonds. For instance, as of July 1, 1969, bonds for which the rate was 5 per cent were renewed at 8 per cent. Those who used to get $50,000 in interests on a million dollars worth of bonds will now receive $80,000.

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Latulippe: That is what was done, Mr. Speaker. Nothing has been done for the people. Finance got everything—Let us think about the people, and—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. It being six o'clock, the house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

[*English*]

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 17, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDER 42(1) TO ADJOURN AT 4 P.M.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a motion under the authority of Standing Order 42(1). Your Honour has in recent days had to deal with a number of motions tendered under Standing Order 43. This one is under Standing Order 42(1), which reads in part as follows:

> Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the order paper; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

My motion will have to do with the time of the adjournment of the house this day. May I point out that citation 51 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, to be found on page 40, reads as follows:

> No notice is required for a motion relating to "the times of meeting or adjournment of the house."

There appears in parenthesis "S.O. 45", which referred to Standing Order 45. That was its number when this book was published but it is now Standing Order 42(1). I continue with citation 51:

> The word "times" is translated by "heures" in the French version of S.O. 41. It seems therefore that if a motion does not relate to the hour but to the day on which the house is to sit, a notice must be given. See decision given by Speaker Rhodes on May 21st, 1920.

There are a few more words in that citation, and the concluding sentence is:

> The reason why no notice is required is that Standing Order 41 which provides for notices to be given says that the rule shall not apply "to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house".

I would also draw Your Honour's attention to a ruling made in the course of a debate which took place in the house on Thursday, December 20, 1951. It just so happens that the motion made that day was in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Its procedural validity was contested by certain members of the house who were not very friendly to us on that occasion. Times have changed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When the Conservatives objected to the validity of the amendment I moved that day, a point of order was raised and Mr. Speaker Macdonald made a ruling which appears at pages 2257 and 2258 of *Hansard* for December 20, 1951. My motion on that occasion—it was perhaps a bit novel—proposed that the hours of sitting for that day be altered, specifically that we not rise for the luncheon or dinner breaks and that we sit, if necessary, after the evening time of adjournment.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am not moving that one today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When the matter came to a head procedurally, Mr. Speaker Macdonald made a very clear ruling. He went back to Mr. Speaker Rhodes and read the Standing Order in both languages, and so on. He made it clear that if my motion had had to do with days of sitting it would have required notice, but since it dealt only with the hours of sitting on that day, and that day only, it was in order. Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald so ruled at the top of page 2258 of *Hansard* for December 20, 1951.

I have carried out further research on this matter and I find there have been other such occasions and it has always been held that if an effort is being made to determine the days the house might sit, 48 hours notice must be given, or it requires unanimous consent; but a motion dealing only with the hours of sitting on that day does not require

notice. That provision is still in our rules under Standing Order 42(1) which I read a few moments ago.

• (2:10 p.m.)

It is on the basis of these precedents that I wish to make a motion which I shall read in a moment. I want to speak briefly to it because, under the Standing Order, it is a debatable motion. Therefore, I do not want to present it in such a way that I will have to resume my seat. We can deal with points of order if necessary, but in any case my motion reads: That the house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m. I point out, although it is crystal clear in the wording, that this relates only to this day's sitting; it relates only to the question of the hour of adjournment. This is fully covered in Standing Order 42(1). My purpose in making this motion at this time is also clear, I hope, namely, that it will provide an opportunity for us to try to cope in a different way from what we have been doing with the problem with which the house is now seized.

The president of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in statements made to the press yesterday, which surprised some of us but which I accept at their face value, declared that he found it difficult to arrange a meeting with the opposition house leaders to discuss the procedural battle in which we are engaged at the present time. I practically live on the hill and I do not see any difficulty in being called to a meeting. I am ready to attend a meeting with the other house leaders at any time. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a good idea, that it would be common sense, and that the country would approve of this course, if we were to adjourn the house this afternoon at four o'clock so that the government house leader can call a meeting of the house leaders, or even go further and call an informal meeting of the members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to see whether, within the confines of such a meeting, we can come to some understanding on the problem that is before the house.

I recognize, from the communications we seem to be having through the press, that our positions seem to be irreconcilable. The President of the Privy Council says that he wants the principle of rule 75c without question. We on this side say that we want rule 75c to be dropped. However, I submit that our positions are no more irreconcilable than they were in December on rule 16A. Yet in December, as a result of a conference of several hours, we did come to an understanding

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

on the basis of which the members of this house went home for Christmas. I submit that that conference produced more than that. It produced a package of rules under which the house has operated very well for the past six months. I believe that by holding such a conference this afternoon we might be able to achieve more than we can by carrying on a debate in which we have reached an impasse and in which neither side seems to be giving in at all.

That is my main reason for the motion. Some hon. members may have thought I was moving that we adjourn at four o'clock because it is such a hot day. That is an ancillary reason, and I am sure that the staff in this place would be delighted if we adopted this course. I would also point out that I have fixed the time so as to allow for a short debate, if that is necessary, and also time for the question period. I would not quarrel if someone wanted me to change the motion to five o'clock so that we could have the question period and a somewhat longer time for the debate, but I do think it makes common sense to follow a course of this kind.

This is my response to the appeal that the President of the Privy Council made through the press yesterday and this morning, namely, that he would like to meet with us. I did not think it was necessary to go about it in this way, but this is my response, the suggestion that the house not carry on this debate today, a debate which seems to be getting nowhere, but that there be an appropriate kind of meeting in the office of the President of the Privy Council or, if necessary, I would invite the meeting to be held in mine.

Therefore I have pleasure in moving, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch):

That the house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order in connection with the proposed motion?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion has not yet been put to the house. Although I may have some doubt concerning the motion, in view of the fact that it has not been questioned procedurally I will put it to the house at this time.

The motion, moved by Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre, and seconded by Mr. Winch, is that this house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I was rising originally to support the admissibility of the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might now like to speak to the motion itself.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, without wishing to appear to curry any particular favour may I say that perhaps this motion had a happy origin in the gathering Your Honour convened yesterday afternoon where people were able to, shall we say, get together and look at things from a slightly different point of view. So we would hope, having Your Honour's happy inspiration as a precedent, that the house would now take the example of the initiative of Your Honour, and of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in moving the motion.

I think it is quite clear to Your Honour and to hon. members that this would appear to be a logical outcome of the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition in a press conference on Monday in which he indicated there was some approach, some modification or some form of agreement that could be reached on certain terms. The reply yesterday by the government house leader was to another version, but I do not consider that the versions are self-excluding and I would urge hon. members, particularly on the government side, to accept this opportunity to convene a meeting to see what kind of a meeting of minds there might be to resolve this problem.

I am sure, on the basis perhaps of something that was indicated by some ministers privately and indicated by house leaders or representatives of the various opposition parties, that there is some common ground on which to move. After all, this is the way a consensus may be arrived at. This is the way a solution is sometimes found to a problem that all too often appears impossible of rationalization. After all, the opposition is composed of reasonable men and so is the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, they do not all wear horns and have forked tails—just some of them. In any event, let us see whether an attempt can be made at this time. I think we would be much poorer in our attempts to resolve this matter if we did not make this effort because, if there is not to be a solution, at least no one can then point the finger at members of the house and say that they did not really try to explore all avenues. To that extent I would support the motion put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, for some days now the House of Commons has found itself in an unfortunate dilemna. The standing orders governing our proceedings are under consideration.

Both parties are far apart and apparently a solution cannot be found. I am reminded of labour conflicts which can sometimes hurt a lot of people before they are settled.

Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for the adjournment of the house at 4 o'clock, to enable the committee on procedure and organization to hold an important meeting, in order to find a compromise or to negotiate, is an excellent idea. We must congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre for having thought of it and for having introduced that motion.

As far as we are concerned, we, of the Ralliement Créditiste, would like to support and encourage Your Honour to give his approval, so that consultations among representatives of all parties in the house may begin, in order to restore the understanding and co-operation that have always existed among the parties, and to avoid the virulent and unreasonable attacks we have been witnessing recently.

We are not getting anywhere. We find ourselves in an impasse. The government says: You are wrong. The opposition tells the government: You are mistaken. And day after day, discussions go on and on without any light or solution. Mr. Speaker, this is a ridiculous situation, because of a lack of co-operation, good will, and consultation among parties.

In a word, if this motion is ruled in order by the Chair, we hope it will also have the support of government members, because I feel the stalemate we are in must come to an end and negotiations must begin.

I should like to join the other hon. members so that it may be said that the House of Commons has kept its prestige and has been

willing to set an example showing to the Canadian people that, when things are deadlocked, it is always better to negotiate than to attack.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the first thing I should do is to welcome the change of heart on the part of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Hees: There he goes again.

Mr. McGrath: That is not the way to do it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I appreciate his statement that he is available for consultation. I would have appreciated some consultation in advance in connection with his intention to move this motion, but I make nothing of that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have been here all the time for the past three weeks.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member was presumably available this morning and could have consulted me about the motion. However, I make nothing of that. I note that the hon. member is accepting the description of his and other opposition members' participation in the debate as a filibuster, that it has been a useless and pointless exercise. This is an acknowledgement on their part.

I would be very glad to hear from the hon. member. I have been sitting with him in the committee since Christmas. He has taken a certain position that I respect and for which he has held out, and he knows what my position has been. But I would be delighted to close the gap if we could and therefore would be quite prepared to meet with him. I notice the house leader for the Official Opposition is not here, but I would be prepared to meet an appropriate representative of that group, and also of the Ralliement Créditistes, with the hon. member. On the whole I think this will probably be a useful initiative. It will not serve any useful purpose if we continue hearing speakers from the other side in this regard. We will therefore accept the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) agreed to.

[Mr. Fortin.]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

TABLING OF PRICE SCHEDULE FOR SPECIFIED DAYS, MARCH AND JULY, 1969

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, under Standing Order 41(2), copies in English and French of the Canadian Wheat Board wheat price schedule for specified days in March and July, 1969, as promised.

ORAL QUESTIONS

AGRICULTURE

REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE RESPECTING ASSISTANCE TO WESTERN FARMERS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he or his colleagues have located the telegram dated July 15 which was sent by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture? If so, what response has the government made to the urgent representations made in that telegram? At the same time, can the minister say whether his attention has been drawn to a public statement by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, dated yesterday, in which it is presumed that the federation's proposals of May 28 have been rejected because no response has been made? Does the minister agree with that interpretation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of agricultural policy is, needless to say, under very active consideration by the government. The problem, as the hon. member knows, is extremely complex, and I have no apology to make for saying that the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the position of the government of Canada that it has a moral obligation to see that farmers receive the equivalent of the floor price they would have received under the International Grains Arrangement? It is my understanding that the government subscribed to that agreement.

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker. That was an international agreement that we supported very strongly. We had every hope and reason to hope it would work satisfactorily. Of course, if other countries are not complying with the agreement and we have to meet competition, I do not think it would be

appropriate for the Canadian government to guarantee domestically those international minimum prices.

TRADE

WHEAT—INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT—EFFORTS TO RE-ESTABLISH MINIMUM PRICE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a further question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. In view of the disorganization resulting from the abandonment of the minimum price under the International Grains Arrangement, as reported by the minister, and in view of continuing pressure on world wheat prices, can the minister say whether any continuing consultative committee representing the various countries involved is operating on a day to day basis with a view to restoring order in the market and re-establishing the minimum price under the agreement? I am referring to a consultative group which might meet day by day as opposed to occasional meetings of ministers representing the various countries.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition is ahead of events. He and some members of the press have been ahead of events for the last couple of days. Reference has been made to a collapse in prices, to a dramatic price decline, and so on. Of course, all these things may happen, and I have been perfectly frank with the house in my assessments. They may happen but they have not happened yet. That being so, it is wrong for anyone to leave the impression that they have happened. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the meeting in Washington was to avoid such a happening. In order to do so, it was essential to restore co-operation among the exporters. I am not in a position to say that will happen, but I have been perfectly frank with the house in saying what the situation is and what is being done.

The working group representing the I.G.A. exporting members, established in part as a result of agreements reached in Washington, is about to become operative. In the meantime I am in touch with the I.G.A. exporting members. The maximum communication exists between the different capitals of the exporting countries participating in the I.G.A. The meeting in Washington last week might well have prevented a price collapse from happening.

Mr. Stanfield: I thank the minister for his statement regarding the functions of the working committee. Anything I said is based on the minister's own statement in the house that the minimum prices under the I.G.A. were under suspension at least temporarily. Those were the minister's own words.

Mr. Pepin: The words I used were: "have been *de facto* temporarily suspended." Perhaps I could have made a better choice of words but, as hon. members know, I am limited in English. I should possibly have said—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pepin: —they have become *de facto* temporarily inoperative—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the minister's statement that the floor prices under the International Grains Arrangement are temporarily suspended and a lower plateau was agreed upon by the exporting nations in the I.G.A., can the minister tell the house what that plateau will be and within what price range the exporting nations will be selling wheat from now on?

Mr. Pepin: We are debating very fine points. What I said in my report to the house was that at the meeting in Washington it was realized that there had been "distortions" and that "adjustments" were needed and would have to be made. I do not know exactly at what level the adjustments will finally be made but it has to be presumed that in the present circumstances the level would be slightly lower than the minimum of the I.G.A. pricing schedule. All depends on the willingness of some exporters to restrain their aggressiveness. As I said the other day, there are different ways in which this could be done. So far as Canada is concerned, the lowest decline if there must be one is the objective at this time. We are trying to avoid an accentuated, a dramatic price reduction. This is our objective, and I would like the hon. member to believe we are working hard at it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the minister met with the Wheat Board last Monday, can he give the house any information as to the outcome of those discussions with the Wheat Board and whether he

conveyed to the Wheat Board on behalf of the government the latter's willingness to make up the difference between the price received by the Wheat Board and the floor price under the International Grains Arrangement, $1.95½ a bushel f.o.b. Fort William?

Mr. Pepin: My discussions and the Prime Minister's discussions with the Wheat Board were connected with the efforts made by the Wheat Board to market wheat internationally. I do not think I should be asked to report on that. With respect to the government making up the difference between the I.G.A. minimum price and the present and future price, this would have to be a government decision. As the Acting Prime Minister stated, we are obviously working at preventing a government commitment too high to contemplate. Any success that we have in preventing a downward movement will result in less compensation being requested from the government in the future.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask a further—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands might be allowed a further supplementary. Other hon. members are anxious to ask supplementary questions on the same subject.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): My supplementary will be brief, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact the crop year has only two more weeks to run, how soon will the government reach a decision with respect to guaranteeing the farmers the minimum price established under the I.G.A.?

Mr. Pepin: The Acting Prime Minister has already answered that.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF REDUCED WHEAT BOARD PRICES

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the schedule of wheat prices which the minister tabled a little earlier today shows No. 1 reduced 5⅞ cents, No. 2, 7 cents, No. 3, 10 cents, and Nos. 4 and 5 only one cent each, I ask the minister whether these prices are now competitive with those being charged by the United States, Australia and the other wheat exporting countries?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, that is much too complicated to answer in the question period because the situation varies in different parts of the world. It varies because of so many different circumstances that it is unfair to expect me to give an answer. The general attitude in the world of exporters at this time is that through "advantages" they had some exporters have gained more than what I might call their fair expectations and others have not. The purpose of the exercise is to try to equalize advantages by price "adjustments" and co-operation.

Mr. Harkness: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not able to say that these prices are competitive? Are sales actually being made at the present time at these prices? Have the government and the Wheat Board made a firm decision to continue to meet prices if they continue to fall?

Mr. Pepin: This decision was made on March 14. It applies today, it applied yesterday and it will apply tomorrow. But as I said one day to the right hon. member for Prince Albert, we are trying to be competitive at the highest possible level and not at the lowest possible level. Again we are trying to be competitive at the highest possible level.

Mr. Harkness: The minister did not answer the question whether sales are actually being made at these prices. If so, can the minister say whether two or three such sales have been made?

Mr. Pepin: I am being asked to give market information. A couple of weeks ago a rather important sale of 7.5 million bushels was made to Peru. That sale was made by the Wheat Board with the full co-operation of the credit facilities provided by the Canadian government.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ABILITY OF GRAIN HANDLING SYSTEM TO ABSORB FIVE BUSHEL QUOTA

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I wish to direct a further question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As a result of the minister's meetings with the Canadian Wheat Board, can he give the house any assurance that the grain system will be able to take in the five-bushel quota as of August 1?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I have before me the usual daily report on progress made. I have been very generous in showing these reports. It is still the opinion of the board that it can

physically be done. What is physically possible as the Creditistes say, could be done materialistically also. I can assure the hon. member that maximum efforts are being made by the Wheat Board and by the railways in order to reach this objective. I will be relieved if and when they achieve it.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, I fully accept the assurance and the intent of the minister. Will he agree that if this objective is not achieved he and those responsible under him are prepared to consider an extension of the crop year until the five-bushel quota is achieved?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This appears to be a hypothetical question.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all due respect to Your Honour, the question is very close to not being hypothetical.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider extending the crop year, whether or not deliveries are made, so as to enable the farmers to receive their final payments within the coming year to help them in financing the following year's operations? With the crop year terminating at the usual time, it will be some 18 months before the farmers are in a position to receive their final payments.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends on the other side are too knowledgeable for me to have to explain to them the disadvantages of extending the crop year, one of which is that people who are not in a position to deliver before the end of the present crop year might find ways and means of delivering afterward if the year were extended. This would be unfair to those people who could not deliver as much as they would have liked and had been able to deliver, but were not allowed to do so. That is one of the obvious disadvantages, and there are others. Again, as has been said, the question of whether or not we will reach this objective of a five bushel quota still remains unanswered but we are working with the Wheat Board in an effort to make sure this can be done.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any discussions with the Wheat Board or the Board of Grain Commissioners with a view to authorizing the elevator companies to use off-track, off-site or other storage facilities, or has he considered authorizing the elevator companies to store grain on the ground at those shipping points which have not got the five-bushel quota by July 31? If these discussions have not been held, will the minister hold them or will he authorize the board to allow the elevator companies to do this?

Mr. Pepin: Some of these points were discussed at the last meeting and they are still being considered.

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ROBERVAL COMPOSITE SCHOOL

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I shall give the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce some respite and direct my question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

In answer to my question of May 29 with regard to the federal contribution to the cost of building the composite school in Roberval, I was told that the amount of that contribution had not yet been determined.

Can the minister tell us today what progress has been made in the negotiations with the local school board and if the amount of the federal contribution has been determined?

Mr. Speaker: In my view, that question should be put on the order paper. If it is urgent, the hon. member could ask the minister to discuss it with him at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, should the house keep on sitting, we will then have some additional evenings. I therefore ask that my question be dealt with at ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we might come to some arrangements in order that it be discussed during an additional evening, even if the house is not sitting.

[*English*]

TRADE

DECLINE IN SURPLUS—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Canada's trade surplus has decreased by more than $300 million during the first six months of the year, is it the intention of the government to take steps immediately to correct this serious trend in order that serious unemployment will not develop as a result of the volume of imports into Canada increasing much faster than the volume of exports?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think in any economy like ours it must be expected that in some years the growth in exports will be higher than in other years, depending upon what is taking place in the country. I understand that when you have industrial development imports are bound to increase. Such growth in imports is not necessarily bad. I have nevertheless issued a paper in which I have invited exporters to become even more aggressive than they were when the hon. member was Minister of Trade and Commerce. It may not have been possible at that time, but it may be now as we have improved our facilities with the Export Development Corporation coming into effect in September. For the time being, the E.C.I.C. is more active than before because—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the minister for interrupting him. I appreciate that the hon. member has a supplementary question. I expected he would have one. I had some doubts about the question in the first instance. Had I suggested it be placed on the order paper we might now have an easier situation. Hon. members know that the Chair always hesitates to allow questions which ask for general statements by ministers and to which ministers respond in a proper fashion by making lengthy statements. This places the Chair in a different position because the Chair must interrupt the minister who is in effect only answering the question which has been allowed. I would think that normally this type of question should be placed on the order paper. However, in view of the fact, as has been pointed out by another hon. member, we are not going to be here for an eternity, perhaps the hon. member should be allowed to ask the supplementary.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, having great respect for your rulings and the way you control the house I shall desist from asking my usual supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the hon. member might not want to change his mind later. If he does I shall accept it.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask the minister a similar question. Is the serious reduction of over $300 million in six months in great part the result of reduced wheat sales and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I will find out the extent of its effect. It certainly has had a part, but there are other factors involved. For example last year there were strikes in the United States and other circumstances which helped to increase our exports. I would think that the decline in the sales of wheat has not been so important this year compared with last year—exports of wheat was 310 million bushels this year as opposed to 325 million last year. It was in comparison with the previous year that the big decline took place.

EXTERNAL AID

DEVELOPING NATIONS—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASE IN ASSISTANCE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question arises from a report in todays' newspapers emanating from the O.E.C.D. which suggests that Canada is the lowest among members in respect of assistance in external aid in relation to gross national product. I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government is preparing plans to increase Canada's assistance to developing nations this year?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am aware of this report and have been for some time. I gather it has now been published. I share with the government the hon. member's desire to increase the volume of our aid. One of the rather unusual factors that arose last year was the replenishment of I.D.A. The International Development Association was allotted certain amounts which we would ordinarily have contributed last year. Our expenditures in the first six months this year in respect of development assistance as officially defined are $149 million compared with $76 million last year. This indicates that not only are we increasing our aid but that there were some very special factors operating last year.

Mr. Lewis: I should like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that during the last number of years the amounts actually spent by Canada in aid to developing nations were sometimes as much as one-third below the amounts voted by parliament, whether he and the government will consider picking up the lag in these amounts, particularly through the provision of wheat and flour to needy countries throughout the world in view of our wheat surplus?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of the government to try to overcome this lag.

I might point out to the hon. gentleman that one of the reasons our aid sometimes lags behind appropriations is that it does not lapse at the end of the year, whereas some other contributing countries insist that the money be used during the year. Since we have been concentrating on development we had allowed the amounts to accumulate, and sometimes they are not expended as rapidly as would otherwise be the case. With regard to aid in the form of wheat, if there are people who need our wheat I can assure the hon. member that we will be only too happy to increase our appropriation in this respect.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would suggest that we move on to another subject. There is only a short time left in the question period and several hon. members wish to ask questions. If there is time at the end of the question period we might return to this very important matter.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—HAIL AND RAIN DAMAGE SUFFERED BY MARKET GARDENERS AND APPLE GROWERS

Mr. Walter Smith (Saint-Jean): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture through his parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Would the Minister of Agriculture have received a telegram from the Association of truck gardeners of the Montreal area in connection with damages incurred through hail and rain in the Sherrington, Saint-Michel and Ville-Laval areas? Would he also have received one from the Hemmingford and Covey Hill apple growers?

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is out of order. The hon. member cannot ask simply whether a telegram or a message has been received. In that sense, the question is out of order. On the other hand, the Chair will perhaps allow the Parliamentary Secretary to answer the question of the hon. member.

Mr. Côté: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the week, when the hon. members for Saint-Jean, Laval and Laprairie (Messrs. Smith, Roy and Watson) made representations in this regard, we had not received that telegram. However, we have received the telegram since then.

In general, the problem of crops damaged by bad weather is entirely one for the provinces and, in the past, when the provincial authorities could not cope financially with the damages caused by bad weather, they would ask the federal government for help.

But in the last few years, the federal government has established crop insurance and has granted close to $1,200,000 to the province of Quebec.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe I have already shown a certain generosity by allowing the question. The hon. member might want to continue discussing it at the time of adjournment, if there is urgency, as he seems to suggest.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY—ATTITUDE OF PROVINCIAL INDIAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the recent announcement that representatives of British Columbia Indians would not meet the minister, will the minister advise the house as to the number of provincial Indian associations that have taken a similar stand toward his new policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think the hon. member is asking for the type of information which would normally be asked for in written form. However, the house may want the minister to reply.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am just back from British Columbia where I met many Indian chiefs. I put myself at the disposal of those who wanted to talk with me and most of them were quite reasonable. They discussed the Indian policy and I think that Indians are now interested in examining it. If they have alternate proposals to make, we shall be pleased to consider them.

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister

assure the house that the special departmental study group will not go into those provinces in which recognized leaders of Indian associations are not prepared to discuss this question directly with the study group?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, a distinction has to be made. We are prepared to talk with the Indian people. However, nobody should be allowed to forbid the minister or his officials to meet with the said Indian people when it is deemed necessary.

I have started on a visit of all the Canadian provinces and talked with the Indian leaders who were willing to meet me. I consider that I shall always have the privilege, on behalf of the citizens of Canada, of meeting any Indian in Canada without having to proceed forever through the medium of certain people whose sole purpose is to create a sensation.

[*English*]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the minister. I am trying to help him not participate in this divide and rule policy. When does he intend to make funds available to the native Indian people so they may make arrangements to meet the minister themselves and participate amongst themselves in a consultation process that is meaningful in order that they may come to a consensus on this question rather than selecting, as is being done, private groups and individuals to meet and obtain prepared answers?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the hon. member. I make no selection at all. I make myself available to all Indian leaders who want to talk to me. I would tell the hon. member that I hope to have these funds available soon.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could ask another supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether I could have the co-operation of the hon. member, as I have had in respect of other hon. members, so we may get on with the question period.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICAL RESEARCH—REQUEST THAT GRANT BE INCREASED

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the institution of an increased training program to provide doctors in Ontario, will the minister state whether he will give further consideration to restoring the cut of 30 per cent made in respect of medical research?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I do not agree with the conclusion the hon. member has reached, Mr. Speaker. There has not been a 30 per cent cut in medical research.

LABOUR RELATIONS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—POSSIBILITY OF LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a most important question to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister in a position to bring members of the house up to date on the situation regarding negotiations between employers and the longshoremen's union in Vancouver, in view of the fact that a lockout or strike in August would have a deleterious effect upon the already serious position of Canadian grain growers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I received the conciliation board report yesterday and have mailed copies of it to both sides, the employers and unions involved. I do not know, of course, what their reaction will be to the report. I understand that talks are continuing. There is a grave possibility that there will be a strike in the Vancouver area at the end of July, which would have an effect upon wheat that would normally be shipped through that port.

I must remind hon. members that if a strike occurs it will be a perfectly legal one, and if a lockout occurs it will be a perfectly legal one. It is not the policy of the government to interfere with the legal rights of either companies or unions involved unless the situation develops into a national emergency, and it is certainly too early to think in that vein.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister considered changing the approach of his department to this matter and having observers present so that the negotiations will assume a more official status?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question, coming from a member of a party that is closely allied with labour. Surely the hon. member knows as well as anybody in the house that so far we have followed the law explicitly and that a conciliation board has heard union and management representations. The report of the conciliation board was received only yesterday by my department. I think it is a little premature to suggest openly, if I am prepared to suggest it at all, what the next step would be. I do not think it would be in the best interests of anybody to report unofficially, or officially through the question period, what steps will be taken, if any, by the Department of Labour.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

MILK—REQUEST TO ABOLISH TAX IMPOSED BY CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence, I put it to his parliamentary secretary.

Does he intend to recommend to the minister to review the 52-cent tax per hundredweight of milk imposed by the Canadian Dairy Commission and to abolish it in respect of the unsubsidized surplus production?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the question as asked is in order. The hon. member is not allowed to ask the parliamentary secretary if he intends to make a recommendation to the minister.

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

METHOD OF IMPOSING FINES

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, and I wrote this one myself.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It might be allowed, then.

Mr. Cullen: Would the minister discuss with the Unemployment Insurance Commission their procedure of imposing punitive fines by way of penalty unilaterally without giving the alleged offender an opportunity to be heard either on the question of whether a fine is warranted or on the amount of the fine?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure as to the urgency of the question or even as to its significance. May I advise the hon. member that I am tempted to interpret it as a representation made to the minister, and I am sure the hon. member can assume the minister will take his suggestion into consideration.

An hon. Member: Get another writer.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order may I say that it was necessary for me to bring this matter to the attention of the house because of the publicity it received. I find that sometimes this is a very effective way of getting a message across to politicians and to the public.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries, and I welcome him back from his fishing expedition in Nova Scotia. Has the minister any report to make on the results achieved at the important international fishing conference which he recently attended in Halifax?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that while this is a matter of importance he is asking for a statement by the minister which I suggest should be made on motions.

Mr. Crouse: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could we have the unanimous consent of the house for the minister to make a report since international fishing regulations and the conservation of fish are involved?

Mr. Speaker: I hear the hon. member's confirmation that this is a matter of importance. If the house wishes to revert to motions for the purpose of allowing the minister to make a statement—

An hon. Member: Never.

Mr. Speaker: Apparently that consent is not forthcoming.

Inquiries of the Ministry

VETERANS AFFAIRS

WOODS REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS—REQUEST FOR ACTION

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have a most urgent question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Inasmuch as over 10,000 pensioners have died in the 16 months since the tabling of the Woods report, can the minister give us any assurance that the recommendations made in the report will be implemented before many more veterans pass on?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the House of Commons Committee on Veterans Affairs will meet on September 15, and at that time it will study both the Woods committee report and the government white paper which should be ready by that time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SIMILARITY OF CANADIAN AND BRITISH COINS—INQUIRY AS TO CONSULTATIONS

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has there been any consultation between the Canadian government and the government of the United Kingdom regarding the introduction by the United Kingdom of the decimal system of coinage among which there is a coin with the physical properties of our quarter but only half its value, which can be used in coin machines in Canada, including post office stamp vending machines?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether this question is not one that might be placed more properly on the order paper or debated at the time of adjournment.

Mr. MacLean: May I say with deference, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very urgent matter because people in Canada have been known to collect large numbers of these coins in an attempt to fight inflation.

An hon. Member: What is the value of a quarter?

FINANCE

INTEREST RATE—STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN, TORONTO-DOMINION BANK

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister and draw his attention to a statement made by the chairman of the Toronto-Dominion Bank which seems to be a direct challenge to the hopeful aspirations—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has to ask a question.

Mr. Saltsman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was coming to it. The Minister of Finance has indicated he is hopeful that the prime rate will hold. In view of the fact that this has been challenged in statements by the chairman of the bank, is the Acting Prime Minister, as a former holder of that office, willing to come to the defence of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked is not in order.

HOUSING

URBAN RENEWAL—REQUEST FOR DATE OF STATEMENT

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of housing. In view of the fact that the municipality of Oshawa is being pressed to make an urgent decision on an urban renewal scheme and, further, in view of the fact that certain members of the city council had reason to understand that the minister would make a statement on the federal government's urban renewal proposal on the 15th of this month, would the minister give a clear indication to the house of the date on which he intends to make such a statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member reiterates a question which, if my memory serves me correctly, was asked on Tuesday.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the statement attributed to the Minister of Supply and Services that talk of western alienation simply melts away with the Prime Minister's presence in the prairies, will the Minister of National Health and Welfare send a team to the west to ascertain whether the Prime Minister has been affected by sunstroke or whether he has fallen foul of sillabub?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WESTERN AGRICULTURE, SUGGESTED DEBATE —PROCEDURE COMMITTEE REPORT, SUGGESTED ACTION

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the President of the Privy Council. Since it is likely that the hon. gentleman will be meeting with the other house leaders later today, would he consider the possibility of discussing with them the use of one of the opposition allotted days to discuss the serious agricultural situation in the west, and at the same time discuss the possibility of asking the house to refer the report of the Committee on Procedure and Organization back to that committee in order that the committee may reconsider those portions of the report which have been found objectionable?

An hon. Member: Don't you trust your own house leader?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I will be glad to consider the hon. member's suggestion, particularly the one with regard to agricultural policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION BY MINISTER

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. During his visit to western Canada was the minister in contact with either or both sides in the British Columbia Telephone Company dispute?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Not officially, Mr. Speaker, but I did meet with officials of the Department of Labour in the west and discussed with them very thoroughly the B.C. Telephone Company dispute. I can only reiterate what I have said on other occasions, that it is a perfectly legal strike. The Department of Labour has no intention of intervening, but I am sure we will take the initiative in bringing the sides together when we think the time is appropriate and when talks would be meaningful.

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have almost gone beyond the time allotted. There is time for one additional question. Perhaps the Opposition might be allowed to ask the last question.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIAN RADIO BROADCAST OF ALLEGED STATEMENT BY BRIGADIER GENERAL HAMILTON

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, following the tabling of the message of the High Commissioner at Lagos dated July 14, he has ascertained that Brigadier General Charles Hamilton was misquoted on the Nigerian government radio with regard to the use of starvation as a proper means of waging war? If he has not ascertained this, would he undertake to do so?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether any record is kept of what is said on the Nigerian radio, but I think the main point is that Brigadier Hamilton did not say the things he was alleged to have said.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, July 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (page 10963).

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, may I comment at the outset on the dandy position in which I find myself when called to make a speech on procedure. What a time to be elected to that job! First the house leader says it is a useless filibuster. Second, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) says it is a stupid debate. Now at four o'clock we are about to adjourn for a meeting of minds. However, I have certain ideas and opinions which have been formed over the last few days on why we are in this impasse.

Today my opinions are confirmed when we see the arrogant, overbearing attitude of the government house leader. He could not be even civil or gracious in accepting the offer of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). This was an olive branch offer that the minister, had he had common courtesy or respect for his own colleagues, should

have made himself. He is a very decent guy outside the house but terribly obnoxious inside the house.

In beginning my remarks I have one quotation which I should like to place on the record. It is the following:

> It is not up to a particular man, convinced of the soundness of his opinion, to express the will of the house.

I take that to mean that no one man should presume unilaterally to take unto himself the right to express the will of this house. I submit that that is a pretty sound statement. I could lend support to that position, and I intend to do so. As a matter of fact it seems to me this has been the crux of this whole debate. This is the central theme of this so-called stupid filibuster. The parties in opposition feel that proposed rule 75c does exactly what is mentioned in the quotation. In other words, a particular man, convinced of the soundness of his opinion, can in effect express the will of the house. May I repeat the quotation:

> It is not up to a particular man, ... to express the will of the house.

Do you know who said that? The Prime Minister of Canada, who was then Minister of Justice, said that on February 27, 1968. It is to be found at page 7038 of *Hansard* of a year and a half ago. That was his opinion. Does he still subscribe to that view? It does not look very much like it. The government he heads in effect says that what is good for the Grits is good for the nation. I am reminded of a famous cartoonist, Al Capp, who depicted a character called General Bullmoose, who always ended up by saying that what was good for General Bullmoose was good for the nation.

What do members of the government say to the opposition? They say in effect, "Here is a piece of legislation, fool around with it but do not try to change or improve it because we know what is best, and at ten o'clock a week from Thursday"—or whatever date they select—"it will become the law and that is it."

Perhaps it is an oversimplification to refer to just one particular man expressing the will of the house. It might be more accurate to say it would be the troika, plus two, who make the decision to express the will of the house. A troika is a three horse hitch. We have a triumvirate over there of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). That is the troika or triuvirate. Then that is augmented by the addition of two men, the government house leader who fires the balls, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) who is on there because of his vast knowledge of the rules. It is a pity he does not know a little bit about agriculture.

Since that day in 1968 when that profound statement was made a lot of things have happened. We have had an election and the man who made the statement, "It is not up to a particular man...to express the will of the house", has become our Prime Minister. Since that time we have operated under some new rules, or modifications of the old ones. I submit that they have not worked too badly. Nothing of course is perfect. I am sure, however, there has been quite a marked improvement over days gone by. There is no question about it; we in the opposition have co-operated. We have tried to give them a chance. The fact that they have muffed their opportunities is really not the fault of the opposition. But they would like to suck in someone on whom to blame some of the trouble.

The hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) came up with a dandy proposal on Tuesday. He had a complicated mathematical formulation which involved the opposition in implementing 75c. I believe the hon. member for Peel South was quite sincere in his proposal to end this impasse in the house. The fact that his suggestion was most impractical does not detract from his obvious sincerity. It does, however, point out a favourite Grit ploy—when things go well take all the kudos; when they go bad try to lay the blame on something the opposition did. In severe cases where neither of these devices works, do as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) does and imply that things are not as bad here as they are in the United States, or in the United Kingdom, and that there is really nothing we can do about it anyway. You see, they know full well that 75c is a bad rule. The hon. member for Peel South in typical Grit fashion tried to arrange it so that the use of this iniquitous rule could in the future probably partially, if not totally, be blamed on the opposition.

If you do not think that is correct, let me quote from page 11231 of *Hansard* for July 15:

> The important thing is that the Official Opposition and the government would constantly share the responsibility concerning whether we would ever use 75c.

Well, we are not buying it. During the past year there have been certain evolutionary developments, some of them quite noticeable and some not so noticeable. But a trend certainly is discernible, a trend toward an absolute power cell control, more centralized control by the central committee, control by the troika, ultimate, absolute control. That is the plan. The first step already has been taken. That was to muzzle the government backbenchers. The second step is to muzzle the opposition. The third step is under way right now—to control the press. They have already pretty well got the C.B.C. and certain other press people and reporters who have prostituted themselves, but thank God there still remains a corps of dedicated independent reporters and publishers who tell it as it is.

The press can see the trend. Members of the press were rebuked in London and lately they have been blamed for not properly explaining the government's languages bill. Indeed the Prime Minister has felt constrained to write an explanation himself.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Another development over the years has been increased committee activity. Every member has had to serve on at least two committees. The committees have met at all hours and dealt with any number of subjects. Some committees even travelled across the country on fact finding missions, so-called. But one thing that became abundantly clear was that the emphasis put on committees had but one purpose in mind, and that was to keep the "silent service" occupied.

The real reason for the great emphasis on committees did not actually become apparent at first, though it soon became obvious. We were told that matters would be referred to committees where the less formal nature of the proceedings would elicit more information. We were told greater opportunity would be given to examine witnesses. In effect it was said that the committee system would do such a thorough job of examination as to guarantee much closer scrutiny of witnesses and documents. This would make it much easier to modify legislation or to effect amendments. Then, hopefully, when a committee reported to the house its report would merely need rubberstamping by the whole house.

With such a promotional scheme under way I am told there was great competition among hon. members opposite to be appointed committee chairmen. The committee system had a new look and was going to revolutionize the old House of Commons. We were going to resemble the U.S. Congress, and the hopefuls opposite imagined headlines similar to those that appear in the U.S. press. For example, they imagined a headline like this: "Senator Upjohn"—or some such person—"chairman of the all-powerful committee on ways and means, said today that if the executive did not agree to his demands he would withhold his committee's support from the President's anti-poverty program".

Our backbench friends opposite pictured themselves in this light. If only they could get the nod and be appointed committee chairmen they would become power brokers, forces to be reckoned with. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the rumour, but I am told some of them even considered taking elocution lessons so they could cut records, as Senator Everett Dirksen does. As a consolation prize those who did not make the grade were invited to intimate luncheons at 24 Sussex Drive.

I now return to rule 75c. Did this dream world of which I have spoken materialize? I guess not. The heroes, those who became chairmen, were given a certain bill, their material and kit of instructions, and were told to follow those instructions. They were told to vote the party line, to accept no amendments or changes. This is what the triumvirate had decided was best.

Although these chairmen have their committees, one thing the government neglected to give them was authority. Rule 75c will further emasculate them. If the backbenchers opposite were not so naive they would be a disillusioned lot by now. They would have realized that all the committee system has accomplished is to keep the silent service occupied so no embarrassment is caused. It was impossible to avoid embarrassment with such an awkward squad, but the purpose of the exercise was that the embarrassment to the executive caused by the Trudeau coat-tail riders would be minimized.

The troika knew that the election posters bearing the inscription "Come work with me", and showing a surrealistic picture of the Prime Minister urging Canadians to join him, had attracted a lot of political neophytes, people who were long on ideas but short on common sense and practical judgment. What should the government do with these people? It decided to keep them busy on committees but cautioned them to accept no amendments because the troika knew what was best.

And so we have in this country a new silent service. The silent service used to be the navy, but that was in the years B.H.—"before Hellyer". One would think these hon. members would realize how they have been silenced by this power cell. Surely they realize that if the opposition is muzzled as effectively as they have been, there is little opportunity in this country for democratic government.

If any of them do have the temerity to rise in their places it is because the government wants them to fill in a little time. After all, they have not been heard from for so long, and they cannot do any harm anyway. I am sure the government thinks that it will keep them so occupied that they just will not realize how unnecessary they are to the brains trust.

If the Liberal backbenchers are prepared to pay such a price just to be members of the Trudeau team, then that is a matter for them. But this is too high a price for me to pay as a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I will not be bound and gagged, allowed only the privilege of sitting in the house to rubberstamp legislation fed to me by a power mad, small group, power cell.

Last June 25 approximately 55 per cent of the people who cast votes in the riding of Lambton-Kent supported me. They gave me a mandate to represent them in this house to the best of my ability. In giving me that honour they did not suggest for one minute that I monopolize the time of the house. Nor did they want me to be irresponsible or frivolous. They wanted me to speak out when their interests were involved. They wanted me to co-operate with the government when that co-operation was for the good of Canada.

The people of Lambton-Kent do not want their representative in this house silenced. I am the current member for that riding, but this can be said with equal emphasis of my successors in the years ahead.

I am concerned about what is happening in the house. It is most depressing to see such a confrontation in the chamber at this time in our history. There is so much in this country of which to be proud. Although we have many problems to solve, we are hamstrung because of the intransigent attitude of three or four members.

Mankind is capable of fantastic feats for the common good at this juncture in our history. Today three men are embarking upon a journey to explore the unknown on another planet. When you stop to think of the thousands of sincere, dedicated people whose fantastic know-how has made possible the Apollo moon shot, do you not wonder why it should be necessary for this little group of power hungry people to try to regiment an institution like parliament?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. McCutcheon: If we are to accomplish anything worth while in the future we must make full use of our human resources. We cannot hope to do that if we permit ourselves to be dominated by two or three men, no matter who they are or what their intentions. One has only to pick up any daily newspaper to realize that this is so. I suppose if I were a member of the legal profession I should say that the evidence speaks for itself.

As I said before, although mankind is equipped now as never before to do good, this parliament is fiddling around over rule 75c. This situation, according to Bill Robinson of the London *Free Press,* has one virtue. Time being used in this debate is time that would normally be spent on vacations or in constituency work. Consequently, this debate is not interfering with the progress of legislation.

The tragedy is that we could have spent our time to better advantage by doing something to curb water and air pollution, instead of adding to it. We have been promised action on a new water policy for two or three years. Of course there has been more promise than action. In the meantime our precious resources of clean water and clean air continue to deteriorate.

When the government is questioned about these matters in the house, the answer is always the same. Spokesmen for the government say, "Give us the right to dictate and we will talk about agriculture; give us the right to dictate and we will talk about the high cost of living; give us the right to dictate and we will talk about everything else that affects the life of the average Canadian." Sure! The government will talk about these things and make sure the opposition is gagged.

When I consider that the members of this house belong to the same race of beings who are capable of sending a man to the moon, and when I consider that the people of today's world are very far advanced in technology but very little refined in the art of co-operation, it makes me wonder just where

we have gone wrong. What has happened? Where have we gone wrong?

I think an article by Mr. Lubor Zink in the Toronto *Telegram* of July 14 puts the entire matter of rule changes in fair perspective. He writes:

> The key to a way out of the impasse is in the wording of the opening sentence which stipulates that rule 75c can be invoked only after a Minister of the Crown "has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of standing order 75A or 75B."
>
> The catch in this conection is in rule 75B which says that, failing unanimous agreement among the four House leaders under 75A, allocation of time for debate can be decided by "a majority of the representatives of the several parties," i.e., by three of the four House leaders.
>
> In other words, if the opposition groups agree among themselves on time allocation under 75B, the Government cannot truthfully say that "an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of standing order 75A or 75B."
>
> On the other hand, rule 75B in its present form does not make it mandatory for the Government to implement the agreement reached by the House leaders of the opposition parties. It says that "a Minister of the Crown—may propose a motion—" There is nothing to compel him to do so.
>
> Both the Government and the opposition have thus been caught in the ambiguity of the wording of the proposed time allocation rules. Both sides must insist on a redraft of the whole thing which can be accomplished only through agreement.
>
> The Government, which spotted the pitfall too late for correction in the standing committee on procedure and organization, tried to remedy the oversight by the highly irregular procedure of presenting to the House a suitably changed version of the committee's report as its own motion.
>
> The opposition protested so vigorously that the Government House leader, fearing adverse public reaction to the tricky manoeuvre beat a hasty retreat and the report of the committee was presented for debate in its original version.
>
> The problem both sides are facing now is how to get rid of the two-edged ambiguity on mutually acceptable terms.

I hope the house leaders will be able to come to an agreement in the meeting that is about to take place. Much of my remaining material is not relevant, Mr. Speaker, and I will not refer to it now that the house leaders have decided to meet. Nevertheless, perhaps what I am about to say could be a yardstick for the people negotiating on our behalf.

I am probably as unskilled in the technicalities of house rules as is any hon. member here. I am sure I could qualify as a non-expert, if there is such a designation. Nevertheless I suggest that it is not reasonable under 75B to have a majority that does not include the government. In the hope that some of our negotiators may overhear what I have to say I suggest to the government, why not forget all about 75c? It is unnecessary and unnecessarily restrictive.

Let us change rule 75B so that it clearly indicates that the government must be a party to a majority decision. It must be one of the majority. As Mr. Zink has suggested, the government and opposition are caught by the ambiguity of the wording of the proposed time allocation rule. Let us redraft the whole, dashed thing, Mr. Speaker, remove the ambiguity and make sure that the rule says that the government must be included in the majority. That is only reasonable, I think. I say to the silent service on the government side, do not let three or four power hungry people in your party destroy democracy. Who knows, next time you may get here on your own without having to ride in on someone else's coat tails.

I will close my remarks as I began them, Mr. Speaker, by echoing a worth-while sentiment expressed by the Prime Minister. He said it is not up to a particular man to express the will of this house. I wish he would practice what he preaches.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of most supporters of the government when I express the hope that negotiations now under way will be productive of results. As most of us who have served in any elected assembly know, if matters relating to rules can be resolved harmoniously the entire institution of democracy benefits.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I say that most of the government members, indeed all of them, feel that way. We hope a fair agreement can be achieved. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I prepared a speech I feel is rather complete. Time will not permit full delivery. Like the last speaker, there are certain paragraphs I think would be best left unsaid under the circumstances.

I wish to spend a few minutes discussing the need for rule changes relating to the limitation on the length of speeches. A point which has been made time and again and, I think, very well by the spokesmen for the various parties, is that the business of the Canadian people must be expedited more effectively. There is no disagreement on this point.

And we all feel, especially those of us who have served at some point in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, that democracy must never be sacrificed for efficiency. It must never be sacrificed in the name of expediency. This is

very difficult under modern circumstances. We are faced with a vast volume of public business which must be done not only in this assembly but in the provincial assemblies across the country. The two concepts must always be mutually compatible.

One aspect of the present need for reform can be illustrated by examining the vast increase in public spending since the turn of the century. Today we, as Members of Parliament, are being asked to authorize the spending of moneys in the order of $13 billion a year. That is a vast increase over the budget of 1899-1900. The total budget at that time was $46,286,550. That is a 28,000 per cent increase since the turn of the century.

We all know that we live in a new Canada with new and pressing problems, yet there remains the basic and fundamental question of how we compress into the same 365-day year more business, more subjects, and more issues. The question remains how we can sensibly and logically allocate the vast amounts of money which have been placed at the disposal of the government by the Canadian people?

Obviously we need changes to accommodate these facts of modern day life. Some of us have served in opposition. It is a worthwhile experience. Indeed, if we all stay here long enough we will all be in that spot some day. Those of us who have served in opposition have every respect for the role of the opposition in this house. In many ways it occupies a position as important as government. Every day we are reminded of this fact by political science texts.

One of the opposition members has spoken eloquently in this debate. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has made a number of speeches before non-political forums. In 1964 this acknowledged parliamentarian, speaking at a summer conference in Ontario, said:

> If you are on the opposition side, you usually contend for freedom of speech; if you are on the government side, you contend for arrangements to get the business done.

I must admit the hon. member did not make this statement in the House of Commons but at the Couchiching Conference. I continue with the quotation:

> The amount of business is increasing so much that I think ... that we have to think more in terms of getting things done, and I think that this can be done without interfering with freedom of speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Perrault.]

Mr. Perrault: This is what the hon. member said. As we all know, he is perfectly right. I repeat the words he said on that occasion:

> The amount of business is increasing so much that I think even as an opposition member that we have to think more in terms of getting things done, and I think it is possible for us to do this without interfering with freedom of speech.

Again, I turn to this opposition source, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who has considerable experience in this house and a great and deserved reputation. He was not speaking in the house but was speaking candidly and frankly to a summer academic forum in that same year. He stated:

> Parliamentarians start with a notion that freedom of speech somehow means freedom to talk forever. Cutting off debate is felt to be a denial of a basic, democratic right. But the fact is that we do this in many ways in Parliament. The 40-minute limit or the 30-minute limit or the 20-minute rule that we have are denials of unlimited free speech—

He continued:

> Although years ago there were no time limits on any debates, we did, in 1955 impose a limit of a certain number of days on the debate on the address, the debate on the budget, and on debates on supply motions. When the point is reached when these debates must end, nobody ever says that free speech is ended.

This is what a spokesman for the New Democratic Party said on that occasion. I am sure he remembers this address because it was a good speech. He also said:

> We accept the proposition that it is good to organize such things.

I am sure the hon. member feels the same way today and that his sentiments have not changed. But there is a difference; in this debate he has been far more vehement in his belief that all party agreement must be obtained in the matter of allocating time. This is what he has been emphasizing during this debate. Significantly, however, he admits that implicit in rule 75B, the rule which would permit house business to move along with the assent of three parties in this house, is the belief that the government party should be one of the three. This is an acknowledgment of the fact that a majority, and not the minority, must ultimately assume the responsibility to move along the business of the house. I refuse to believe the hon. member would seriously contend that one or two parties in this house should be endowed with the power to frustrate the will of the people for any inordinate length of time. He cannot hold this belief and still subscribe to the principles of parliamentary democracy about which he

has spoken so eloquently on so many occasions.

Is freedom threatened by restricting debating time in this house? Regardless of what happens at four o'clock this afternoon that is still the real question. The former prime minister, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), made a very colourful and controversial speech in the house the other day. He said that 75c is a measure designed to subvert parliament. What did he say in the house when he had the important responsibility of being the Queen's first minister? I quote the right hon. gentleman's remarks as recorded in *Hansard* of July 21, 1960:

> I see no reason why that debate should not be reduced so far as the number of days is concerned. Immediately, I suggest that the opposition will say that they are being throttled.

That is what the right hon. gentleman said when faced with the monumental responsibility of government. He said in order to expedite the business of the Canadian people it was necessary effectively and responsibly to limit the length of speeches in the House of Commons. On November 26, 1962, again speaking in the House of Commons, the right hon. gentleman said:

> I am not one of those who argues that there should be any interference with the right of hon. members to express themselves, but I do agree with the hon. member that if the house leaders of the parties could get together and apportion the time, it would be a most effective and welcome expedient in order to achieve a high degree of efficiency in parliament. They do it in the United Kingdom, but we have never been able to do it here—

• (3:50 p.m.)

Unfortunately for Canada the reforms about which the right hon. gentleman spoke so wistfully never came to pass under his Prime Ministerial guidance. Perhaps the government of the day, and I do not wish to be critical of that government because things are accomplished by most governments at one time or another, did not present to the house a firm proposal to modernize the house rules, and it is unfortunate for Canada that this was not done years ago.

Is freedom of speech truly being threatened? That is the question about which some fine speeches have been made. The changes proposed in the rules are less stringent than debate limitation measures in other commonwealth jurisdictions. I have here the rules of all the Commonwealth governments—of India, New Zealand, Pakistan and Australia. Perhaps someone would like to hear how they do things in Australia. That is a country which has been mentioned during this debate. At page 26 of the standing orders of the Australian House of Representatives it is stated:

> When any motion of any kind whatsoever has been moved, a minister may at any time declare that the motion is an urgent motion, and, on such declaration, the question "That the motion be considered an urgent motion" shall be put forthwith—no debate or amendment being allowed—and on such question being agreed to, a minister may forthwith move a motion specifying the time which shall be allotted to the motion.
>
> Upon such motion or motions with regard to the allotment of time being moved, no debate thereon shall be allowed for more than 20 minutes, and in speaking thereon no member may exceed five minutes. If the debate be not sooner concluded, then forthwith upon the expiration of that time the Speaker or the Chairman shall put any questions on any amendment or motion already proposed from the Chair.

This is more stringent closure than we have in the House of Commons here.

An hon. Member: That is ordinary closure and you have it now.

Mr. Perrault: No, that is more stringent and it is totally apart from the schedule of government business proposed by the government. We could go through all these Commonwealth standing orders and rules.

An hon. Member: Do it now.

Mr. Perrault: I will do it when I have more time. We are looking at the spiritual cousins of our friends second to my left down there. These proposed changes they say are an affront to the British parliamentary democracy. Last week the device called the guillotine was used by the Labour government in Britain. It is a measure to bring a debate to an end.

Let me read the headline which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of July 9. It said, "Wild scene as M.P.'s protest move to impose Guillotine". The article states:

> The biggest row in years broke out in the House of Commons Tuesday night as members hurled books, paper missiles and invectives at each other in a dispute over parliamentary boundaries.

The report then continues:

> Nearly 500 parliamentarians mounted a clamour of insult over a decision by the government leader in the commons, Fred Peart, to impose a guillotine on a controversial bill affecting parliamentary boundaries ... The guillotine, a parliamentary procedural device, sets a deadline for pushing the bill through into law by next Monday—

That is a six day period.

Mr. Winch: Did you hear of the pipeline debate in 1956?

Mr. Perrault: We are not talking about the pipeline debate of 1956, we are talking about the situation in 1969 in Canada, and the sooner we forget about the class struggle in parliament in 1969 the better it will be for this country.

An hon. Member: You tell them, loudmouth.

Mr. Perrault: It is nonsense that somehow democracy has been damaged in Canada as a result of 75c and other measures. This suggestion is clearly ludicrous and is not supported by any fair examination of the facts.

The distinguished professor of political science at the London School of Economics told Canadians in a national television interview a few weeks ago—and I might say that he is not unsympathetic to the views of our friends to the left—that:

> The government here never has any doubts about how long parliament will take over any given measure. And when we read occasionally in the U.K. of your pipeline debate, your flag debate, it just seems ludicrous ... I mean it's unbelievable that a government trying to get through a piece of business that it thinks important should be in doubt about when the debate ends ... You can't have debates that go on indefinitely.

Let me quote further from the same interview. Mr. Charles Lynch then went on to make the comment:

> Well, there's also a point, I think. Canadian public opinion being more sluggish, I think, or more difficult to reach than British public opinion, because of geography if nothing else, needs a little time and it's been argued that it's not a bad thing for the public understanding of an issue to have a prolonged debate.

Mr. McKenzie of the London School of Economics then replied:

> Arguably, yes. Although I hope you're not going to suggest to me that you believe in government by public opinion. This is not something that exists in Britain and doesn't really exist here. Governments are elected to do a job ... and as long as there's a fair opportunity for the opposition of the day, one or several parties, to make the alternative case, we aren't really sitting around surely in the case of the pipeline debate or the flag debate waiting for the public to decide. It's governments that are elected to decide. The public chooses the decision maker. It doesn't make the decisions itself.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker, and these are the words of an expert on parliamentary procedure who has told us exactly the way things are done in Britain and other Commonwealth jurisdictions.

Professor McKenzie closes, as I do now, by saying:

> There's nothing revolutionary about them—

He is referring to measures such as 16A. He goes on to say:

> —that's all I'm saying. I'm not now saying that because I happen to live in London I think they do things inevitably better there, but this is an absolutely clearly established principle that governments control parliamentary time—

That is the way it should be.

I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate and point out the fact that it is four o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being four o'clock, pursuant to special order made this day, the house stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a.m.

At four o'clock the house adjourned pursuant to special order made earlier this day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 18, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON CRISIS IN WESTERN CANADA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. In view of the statement attributed to the Prime Minister in Saskatoon to the effect that some form of cash injection into the western farm economy is necessary, and in order to give the cabinet time to consider the specific nature of such an emergency program, would the President of the Privy Council consider arranging an opposition allotted day, say on Tuesday, so that a member of the government may be in a position to state a conclusive policy in this regard?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have discussions on this and other points. Perhaps this would be the best opportunity to suggest that immediately following calling of orders of the day the house leaders meet in my office to discuss this and a number of other matters which fall within the house leaders' realm.

FINANCE

COMMERCIAL INTEREST RATE—INQUIRY AS TO MEETING WITH CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the senior officers of two or three chartered banks have indicated that they are seriously considering increasing the prime commercial rate on bank loans and as the minister has already said that he thinks no such increase is justifiable, does the minister intend to meet with the heads of the chartered banks in an attempt to dissuade them from increasing the commercial bank rate at this time?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, I have given them my opinion.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I assume from the minister's reply that despite the fact he does not think an increase is justifiable he is now washing his hands of the matter and abdicating his responsibility?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is argumentative, to say the least.

[*Translation*]

BANK OF CANADA INTEREST RATE—PURPOSE OF INCREASE

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Would he tell us if the Governor of the Bank of Canada has increased the prime rate for the sole purpose of preventing the flight of capital to foreign countries?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the governor of the Bank of Canada said in his statement, this was the primary purpose.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE—SUGGESTION THAT MR. SPEAKER ACT AS CONCILIATOR

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a most sincere suggestion to the President of the Privy Council. In view of his statement a few moments ago that after oral questions there is to be a meeting of the house leaders in his office, would he give consideration to transferring the meeting to the Speaker's office with the Speaker present as a non-partisan conciliator?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would hate to introduce you into the middle of any partisan controversy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Inquiries of the Ministry

SPACE EXPLORATION

APOLLO XI FLIGHT—SUGGESTED HOLIDAY

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether, in recognition of the realities of life and in tribute to that momentous day in history when man will step from one planet to another, the government will consider Monday as a government holiday?

Mr. Lewis: The government has been on a holiday for a long time.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest tribute that can be made to this day is for us to continue to carry out our responsibilities as members of parliament.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I think the Acting Prime Minister should refrain from imputing motives or trying to put my question in—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nowlan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, my question about a government holiday was very deliberate and sincere and had no reference whatsoever to the House of Commons. I referred specifically to the realities of life and I had in mind the fact that people are going to be watching television at two or three o'clock in the morning. I am wondering how much hope—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's point has been made.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps my supplementary question has been stated, Mr. Speaker, but could we have an answer from the Acting Prime Minister to the question whether consideration will be given to making Monday a holiday for federal government employees?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the spirit in which the hon. member has put forward his suggestion. May I say that I did not intend in anything I said in reply to impute any motive or anything like that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: May I say I believe that all of us as members of the human race will be watching with great interest on Monday the landing of the astronauts. I do not think it is really necessary for the government of Canada to take the kind of action suggested. I believe all our civil servants will rejoice just as much at their desks over the success of the astronauts as anywhere else.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he, in addition to the members of the human race, will be watching?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

FISHERIES

OFFSHORE BANKS—CONSERVATION CONTROLS —REACTION OF F.A.O. CONFERENCE DELEGATES

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, will the Acting Prime Minister state whether the more than 250 delegates from 42 countries who attended the fisheries conference in Halifax, sponsored by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, indicated any agreement to his suggestion that conservation controls be implemented internationally in respect of our offshore fishing banks?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the conference which was convened by the Food and Agriculture Organization was concerned with the inspection of fish and fish quality, not with the other matter to which the hon. member referred.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REMOVAL OF AGENCY HEADQUARTERS FROM OTTAWA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the contradictory statements being made by the Minister of Supply and Services for the benefit of western ears, and by the Minister of Justice for the benefit of Ottawa ears, on the subject of moving the headquarters of various government agencies from Ottawa to other parts of the country, will the Acting Prime Minister indicate what is the official government position in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that his question as asked is not in proper form. Perhaps we might overlook the first part of the question and allow the minister to answer the second part.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it would take more than a short answer at this time to outline government policy in this respect. It has been the policy to introduce some decentralization. For example, this is evident in the fact that some government offices are being moved to Hull. There may be other occasions when it would still be consonant with efficiency of government operation, which I think must be the first consideration, to locate some of our agencies outside of this area.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Acting Prime Minister say whether the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice is actually in charge of patronage in the Ottawa area?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the Minister of Justice was stating government policy when he said that the national capital is the national capital and cannot be subdivided nationally? In addition, was the Minister of Supply and Services stating government policy when he said that the movement of certain offices and government agencies now established in the national capital to other parts of the country was actively under consideration?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly well aware that there are many government agencies located outside this area. One example is the National Film Board which is in Montreal. This is not at all extraordinary.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister was in relation to the movement out of Ottawa of agencies now established here.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the example I gave is one where a national agency was moved to a place outside Ottawa, and it was not thought that this changed the capital of Canada, which is Ottawa.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not sure we are going to achieve anything by allowing a series of supplementaries inasmuch as we have now embarked upon a debate. However, I will recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on a supplementary.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Supply and Services a direct question: Is consideration being given to moving the Mint to Manitoba?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, there is always some speculation about moving government agencies and departments, but no recommendation is before the cabinet at the present time in regard to moving the Mint.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Acting Prime Minister. Is the head office of the Cape Breton Development Corporation being moved from Ottawa to Cape Breton, where it is supposed to be doing its work?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any information about this, and so far as I know no recent decisions have been made in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: I again express reservations about the line of questioning upon which we are embarking. We have had many questions about moving many departments to many cities and towns across the country, from Victoria to Cornwall and from St. John's to Cornwall. We might pass on now to another subject.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, there was a question earlier to which I never had an opportunity to ask a supplementary. I would appreciate it if I could have the opportunity now of presenting that supplementary.

In view of the Prime Minister's studies of economic isolation on the prairies and in view of the fact that the west must be given a sense of participation in Canada and must share in the economic benefits of Confederation if it is to overcome its feeling of alienation, will the government consider establishing the Mint in Edmonton—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a related question; it is a related speech.

VITAL STATISTICS

BIRTHS—REQUESTED EXPLANATION OF 1968 FIGURES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, this is a new subject. I shall address my question to the Minister of

Industry, Trade and Commerce inasmuch as the Bureau of Statistics falls within his jurisdiction. Would the minister say what studies, if any, have been made to determine why the birth rate last year in the province of Quebec was the lowest in Canada while that in Newfoundland, a neighbouring province, was the highest?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is a question for the late show.

TRANSPORT

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE AND LABRADOR RAILWAY—MOVEMENT OF FUEL TO WABUSH AND LABRADOR CITY

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Will the government confirm that an order has been issued by the Canadian Transport Commission to the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway to resume transportation of fuel to Wabush and Labrador City?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to confirm that that is the case.

Mr. Peddle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this order include both domestic and automobile fuels? Will it also include automobiles so that residents of the area can get out of there on vacation? Also, does it include shipments consigned to Churchill Falls?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question, so far as I am aware it involves all forms of fuel. Automobiles were not included in the representations made to me directly. Whether the C.T.C. has included them I do not know, but I expect not. Also, the shipments do not include consignments to Churchill Falls.

LABOUR RELATIONS

CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES DISPUTE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Since it is not the Minister of Labour's turn to be in the house, has the Acting Prime Minister anything to report on the Canadian Pacific Airlines dispute? I am referring to the strike that was to be called at ten o'clock this morning.

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say I was informed just a few minutes ago that a strike has been averted and that an agreement has been signed which, of course, is subject to ratification.

An hon. Member: You could have listened to the radio.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

"MANHATTAN" PROJECT—LACK OF CANADIAN NEWSMEN ON SHIP

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will he say whether he has investigated why Canadian journalists are not being allowed to join United States newsmen aboard the oil tanker *Manhattan* which is to sail through Canadian waters under Canadian coastguard escort next month?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have inquired into this matter. I understand Canadian newsmen are to be given the opportunity of being there on that occasion on Canadian vessels. I think they will be able to report fully.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister not use his good offices to bring pressure to bear on the United States authorities so that Canadian newsmen may be allowed to be present on the tanker *Manhattan* itself?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker. I think it is better that Canadian newsmen should go on Canadian vessels.

TRADE

WHEAT—AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET UNION—BALANCE OF COMMITMENT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Have there been any discussions between Canada and the Soviet Union recently with respect to the wheat agreement which is to expire at the end of this month? If so, or even if there have been no discussions, are there any indications that the Soviet Union will be taking the balance of its commitment? Is there any possibility that the terms of that agreement may be extended?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, contact

exists between the Canadian Wheat Board and Export-Khleb, but I am not in sufficient touch with everyday developments to say more. With respect to the second part of the hon. member's question my information is that there is no indication now either that the Soviet Union will or will not take its commitment. There is still one month to go, I think—

An hon. Member: Two weeks.

Mr. Pepin: There are still two weeks to go. They may get in touch with us in the meantime, but at present there is no indication either way.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate whether the government is agreeable to extending the agreement? Also, has the question of present pricing policies of the Soviet Union in exporting grain to countries such as the Argentine entered into the discussions?

Mr. Pepin: I am considering these matters, Mr. Speaker. I do not think we have to decide today because there is still two weeks to go before the end of the allocated period. We will advise the house in due course.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—INQUIRY AS TO REDUCTION IN IMPORTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Considering the problems currently facing egg producers in Canada, could the minister tell us whether there has been a decrease in imports of that commodity have fallen in the last weeks and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the hon. member is asking for statistics, but if the minister has the information required, he could perhaps give it to the house.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I am taking this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—REPLY TO CANADIAN OFFER TO PROVIDE NEUTRAL RELIEF FLIGHT OBSERVERS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has he received any word from Lagos about the proposal he made some days ago which was designed to be of assistance in the furnishing of relief?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Not yet, Mr. Speaker, but at least we have not received an adverse reply. I might add that I also had the opportunity to meet Dr. Johnson yesterday afternoon. He was here with me. Both of us are very anxious to do whatever we can to promote daylight flights. It is in that spirit that we are acting.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the delay in obtaining a response, and in view of what I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs will agree is a very grim situation in Nigeria-Biafra, have additional steps been considered in an attempt to secure an answer from Nigeria?

Mr. Sharp: The short answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

ARMED FORCES WALKING-OUT UNIFORMS—QUALITY OF CLOTH

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a most interesting and important question to the Minister of Supply and Services. In view of the fact a multimillion dollar contract was granted to one company for the production of cloth for walking-out uniforms for the armed services, will the minister immediately investigate reports that the quartermaster stores of the armed services are issuing the green uniform in seven different shades and sometimes two extra yards per uniform because of defects in the cloth?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question might be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Winch: It is now being supplied and is costing the taxpayers a lot of money.

AIRPORTS

CHARLOTTETOWN—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF FACILITIES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the minister from the prolific province, the Minister of Transport. Can he advise whether he is making any progress in the provision of

interim increased facilities at Charlottetown airport where the situation is very serious?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, some progress is being made. We have done an assessment of the situation. It really does not appear to be reflected so much in the increase in air traffic as in the number of people coming out to see other people off. The first step appears to be to get a larger parking lot and a bigger coffee urn. These are facilities which are very easy to set up.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I feel the minister is confused. I am sure the crowding is due to people coming out to welcome people to Prince Edward Island rather than to see them leave.

Mr. Jamieson: I am quite happy to concede that I put it in the wrong order.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

VANCOUVER—TREATMENT OF PRISONER AT AIRPORT

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Is he aware that the R.C.M.P. brought a shackled and manacled prisoner through the concourse at Vancouver airport? If so, what is he doing to check this kind of barbarity?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. I will look into the matter immediately.

An hon. Member: It was in all the papers.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): I wish to ask a supplementary question in support of the member for Vancouver Quadra. Will the Solicitor General look into the fact, proven by photographs, that this man was taken through the Vancouver airport in a strait-jacket as well as being manacled?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be very glad to look into all the circumstances surrounding the alleged incident.

PUBLIC SERVICE

ACTIVITIES OF ECONOMISTS AND OTHERS FOLLOWING WAGE INCREASE

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the President of the Treasury Board. With regard to the announcement that a 19.5 per cent wage increase over a three-year period has been granted to economists, sociologists and statisticians in the federal public service, will the President of the Treasury Board say whether these economists, sociologists and statisticians will be spending their time studying the so-called inflationary demands of organized labour unions?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is interesting and important, but the way it was asked precludes the Chair from allowing it to be answered.

NATURAL RESOURCES

TOUR OF NORTHERN CANADA BY U.S. GROUP

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the recent tour of water and other resources in northern Canada and Alaska by a group of 68 United States representatives including Senator Moss and in view of their expressed wish to obtain Canadian water from northern Canada for United States use, I should like to ask the minister whether his department has been notified of the reasons for the trip and whether any officials from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources accompanied the group?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that this question should be placed on the order paper or considered at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO EXPATRIATION OF CANADIAN CAPITAL—EFFECT ON ECONOMY

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the discount rate was maintained by the Bank of Canada for 22 years, including a period of war, depression and inflation, can he tell us whether during those years Canadian capital was exported in such a way that our economy became more unbalanced than it is today?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question seems to be much too general in nature to be asked at this time.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

BASE CONSOLIDATION—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my

question to the Minister of National Defence but first may I congratulate him on the performance of the *Bras d'Or*. Can the minister advise the house whether the Department of National Defence or the government will enter into consultations with provincial or municipal officials prior to the announcement he intended to make concerning the base consolidation program, which he hoped to be able to do by August 1?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to accept in the name of the services the hon. member's congratulations concerning the *Bras d'Or*. I do not know whether I am right in saying that this is the first time we can say we have something which is either the biggest or the fastest in the world.

With reference to negotiations and consultations with municipalities or local authorities concerning possible base closures, may I say that we have a procedure whereby in such cases we consult with and inform the local authorities ahead of the announcement. In this instance, however, I believe there will be an accompanying statement on the base closures regarding a possible form of relief or assistance to the people who will be affected. This has not yet been determined, but it is a recommendation which has been presented and is being studied. This is the reason I previously said in answer to a question on this same subject that I might not meet the target date of August 1 which I announced previously.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, the point I have in mind is with regard to the question of school opening and so on. Can the minister indicate whether there may possibly be an announcement or a report prior to September 1?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): All announcements pertaining to base closures would involve in any event at least a year's notice and in some cases a little longer. I think the shortest period we have considered so far is at least a year.

[*Later:*]

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence supplementary to the question asked earlier. Do I take it from the minister's remarks that no announcement on base closures will be made until there has been consultation with the area concerned and with other departments of government with a view to finding substitute government employment in the area in order to relieve the economic dislocation caused by the closure of bases, or will that process take place only between the time of the announcement and the closure?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will be involved in the study of each base which we plan to close. The form of the help that will be provided has not been determined yet. So far as consultation with local authorities are concerned this will be done, except that we must proceed from a firm decision to dispense with the base. The cases which can be discussed on this basis are limited. In some instances we will be able to give longer notice but in any event it will not be done in isolation. We will discuss the matter with the local authorities.

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of National Defence. Would the minister agree that before any official announcement is made he will inform any member of this house who may represent a constituency in which a base might be closed?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on previous occasions we have had to close bases and our regular procedure is first to give priority to the Member of Parliament by informing him of the impending announcement and after that the local authorities. We also have a special team which goes on the base itself to brief the people involved in the closing. The same kind of procedure will take place this time.

STUDENT LOANS

EASING OF REQUIREMENTS BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the difficult employment situation faced by university students this summer, has the Minister of Finance considered discussing with the provinces programs to ease the requirements for students to qualify for loans next term?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. In reply may I state that financial assistance is available, of course, to students under provincial programs and from private sources as well as under the Canada Student Loans Act. As I have reported to the house from time to time, federal

officials have regular consultations with the provinces on the student loans program. We have all been very much aware of the more difficult employment situation for some students this summer. This was taken into account, for instance, when the house approved my recommendation that the basic provision for students loans this year be increased to $100 million. The loans are available to students who need financial assistance, and I can assure the hon. member that the criteria applied for this purpose take into account the fact that a student has not been able to find summer employment.

FISHERIES

F.A.O. CONFERENCE—REQUEST FOR PAPERS DELIVERED

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries which relates to one asked earlier about the F.A.O. conference in Halifax. Is the minister proposing to make available, either through tabling or distribution, copies of the papers presented, in particular the basic position paper reportedly delivered by Dr. Needler on the effect of the use of d.d.t?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look into this and make copies of the papers available to any interested members.

AIRPORTS

PELEE ISLAND—REQUEST FOR IMPROVEMENT

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Has the minister had an opportunity yet to study the representations made by the citizens of Canada's most southerly territory, Pelee Island, with regard to the modest improvement of their airport, and to arrive at a decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this question should be placed on the order paper.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF PRESENTING

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect the white paper on tax reform which we were led to expect in June, then in mid-summer or September, and which we now learn from the press may not be available until October?

[Mr. Benson.]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, parts of the white paper are now being written. I can assure the hon. member that as soon as some important decisions are taken by the cabinet I will present the white paper. I am as anxious as the Leader of the Opposition to have it completed.

Mr. Stanfield: Do I take it from that, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is either unable or unwilling to state a date now when the white paper will be available?

Mr. Benson: It is just impossible to do so, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RISING INTEREST RATES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the minister in charge of housing. In view of the continuing rise in mortgage interest rates, what measures, if any, does the minister intend to take to stop this upward spiral?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking for a statement which would normally be made on motions. To that extent the question is not in order.

Mr. Gilbert: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot ask a question supplementary to one that is not accepted. However, I invite the hon. member to ask another question while he has the floor.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister make a statement on motions with regard to the continued upward rise of mortgage interest rates and tell us what steps, if any, the government will take to correct this situation?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I will examine this suggestion, but I do not think I can compete very adequately with the Governor of the Bank of Canada at this time.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE—REQUEST FOR PAIRING PROGRAM WHILE UNDER DEBATE

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Official Opposition are obviously using the platoon system and taking their vacations during what was to be the summer recess,

will the minister use his good offices to suggest to the President of the Privy Council that while in session today with the house leaders he arrange a pairing program so that government members can also enjoy at least a partial vacation before we commence the second session of the 28th parliament?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

AIRPORTS

CHARLOTTETOWN—INQUIRY AS TO EXTENSION OF FACILITIES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a delayed supplementary question for the Minister of Transport, delayed because I was mortally offended by his implication that the islanders were becoming mere coffee drinkers. Would he give thought to providing space at the terminal so that they might leave their automobiles there? Also, would he think of such things as an instrument landing system?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I was a little facetious in my answer. The truth is that it is a complex problem in view of the very large increase in the amount of traffic during a short period of the year and the relatively limited traffic in other periods of the year. I am taking a serious look at this matter and we are trying to do something worth while about it.

HOUSING

URBAN RENEWAL—REQUEST FOR DATE OF STATEMENT

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question essentially similar to the one I asked yesterday which Your Honour ruled out of order on the ground that you thought it had been asked previously this week. However, I have checked *Hansard* and I do not think that is the case, and I hope Your Honour will recognize the question. It is directed to the minister responsible for housing. Would the minister consider informing the house now what the outside date will be for his announcement of government policy on urban renewal schemes? There have been many requests on this subject. Will the minister say what will be the outside date for his announcement?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, my desire as I have indicated on previous occasions, is to do it as soon as possible. I hope it can be done within two or three weeks.

FISHERIES

COHOE SALMON—BANNING OF OPERATION IN STRAIT OF GEORGIA

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Some time ago he indicated that he was considering restricting commercial fishing on the Pacific coast on weekends. Has he reached a decision whether such a restriction should be put into effect? If so, for what period of time, and will the restriction include sports fishermen?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I hope the final announcement concerning restrictions on commercial fishing has been made. It is to the effect that fishing for cohoe salmon must be restricted to week days and not carried out at weekends. We are faced with the lowest run of cohoe salmon on record and we are very concerned about the resource.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the run of cohoe salmon is low and the minister has found it necessary to restrict commercial fishing to week days, will he apply the same restriction to sport fishing for cohoe salmon?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the number of sports fishermen is much greater, but their take is a small fraction of the take of commercial fishermen.

ST. MARY'S BAY, N.S.—DISPUTE BETWEEN SEINERS AND WEIR FISHERMEN

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Now that the minister has had an opportunity to view at first hand fishing conditions along the coast of Nova Scotia, especially the herring fishing industry in St. Mary's Bay, when can we expect a decision concerning the future operations of herring seiners and weir fishermen in this area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I hope before the end of July, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INFORMATION

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF TASK FORCE

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Has the government reached a favourable decision with regard to tabling the report of the task force on government information?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the report of the task force on government information has not yet been discussed by the cabinet.

POLLUTION

BRITISH COLUMBIA—HERBICIDAL SPRAYING ALONG BORDER WITH U.S.

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has any action been taken regarding the possible pollutant effect of herbicidal spraying along the Canada-United States border in British Columbia?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I have asked my departmental officials to look into this matter and report back as soon as possible.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TRAINING OF ITALIAN AIR CADETS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that may be answered by either the Minister of National Defence or the Acting Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the Italian government asked Canada to train Italian air cadets and, if so, has a favourable decision been reached on the request?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure of the urgency of the question. I would think it is the kind of question that would normally be placed on the order paper or considered at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

BANK OF CANADA—SUGGESTED RESIGNATION OF GOVERNOR

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a further question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that the economic situation of the country is getting worse and that the Governor of the Bank of Canada can find nothing better than to increase our troubles and our problems, would the minister consider asking for his resignation?

[*English*]

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

POSITION RESPECTING ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO, CONTINENTAL SHELF AND INTER-ISLAND WATERS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of recent statements by the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt that there is no question of Canada's sovereignty over the Arctic Islands, the continental shelf and the spaces between the islands, could the Acting Prime Minister indicate whether this is in fact the case and whether all the problems have been resolved with respect to Canada's sovereignty? What is the situation in this respect?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members will agree that the complexities of international law are such that it would not be possible for me to answer this question in a short time even if I had the competence to answer it.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Acting Prime Minister indicate whether the problems connected with Canada's sovereignty, particularly with regard to the waters between the islands, have been resolved? That was the purport of the statement of the Minister without Portfolio. Would the Acting Prime Minister deal with that aspect of the situation?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the position is that Canada has a view about Canada's sovereignty. Unfortunately it is not universally accepted.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Thursday, July 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at four o'clock yesterday afternoon I attempted to relate a number of statements made at various times by spokesmen for the other parties in the house in support of time limitation on debate. There is a vast catalogue of speeches made in the house, or before non-political forums, supporting the concept that governments have a responsibility to govern and must ultimately express the wish of the majority of the people of a nation. I quoted the N.D.P. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the remarks he has made on a number of occasions. I quoted the former prime minister, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Basically, we are faced with the question whether after reasonable opportunity for full debate and discussion has been accorded all parties in the house, the government of the day, be it the government of Canada, one of the provincial governments or one of the governments of other parliamentary democracies throughout the commonwealth, has the right to expedite the business of the house and determine when a debate shall end.

• (11:50 a.m.)

There are a number of peripheral issues here. There is a question with respect to how this may be accomplished fairly and within reasonable limits, but our basic question is one of principle. Again we come back to the basic problem, the challenge of attempting to fit into the 365 days of the year the vast proliferation of matters which must be considered on behalf of the Canadian people, and at the same time ensuring the maintenance of a high standard of parliamentary democracy.

The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) made an excellent speech the other afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: I have only 20 minutes left.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: I know hon. members are enthusiastic about their member who is a good member, but he suggested a very exotic thought, namely, that somehow freedom of speech is endangered under proposed rule 75c because it would restrict the right of members of all parties to express fairly the views held by their constituents. Yet, the same hon. member and his colleagues are enthusiastic supporters of proposed rule 75B. What does rule 75B do? It would expedite the business of the house with the support of three parties in the house. These members would effectively cut off the right of a fourth party to unlimited free speech. Of course they accept the principle that there must be responsible limits to speeches made in the house.

Let me quote a well known Conservative, a former member of the house, to establish the point which I am attempting to make with respect to limitation of time. The hon. Davie Fulton, speaking to the Couchiching conference in 1964, in a moment of candour perhaps, said:

> An important restraint which members should impose upon themselves is to accept as a matter of routine an "allocation of time" system as it operates in the United Kingdom parliament, by which representatives of each party meet in advance to decide how many days will be spent on each major matter of government legislation.
>
> In the unusual circumstance where it is not possible to obtain agreement, the government itself takes responsibility for—and there is a vote upon—a motion for allocation of time on the matter in question.

This is precisely what we have been considering these long and dreary summer days.

Mr. Paproski: Why doesn't your house leader say that?

Mr. Perrault: In that non-political forum a respected Conservative spokesman stated very explicitly that the government indeed has the responsibility to govern and also to exercise the mandate conferred on it.

Again, speaking for that great party sitting to my left in opposition, Mr. Fulton spelled out the following in the same speech:

> No matter what mathematical disposition has been arrived at by the voters, parliament has the duty to get on with the business of the country. And the government has the right and the responsibility to govern, so long as it enjoys the confidence of parliament, or at any rate unless and until parliament accepts the responsibility of defeating it.

This is precisely the position which the government of Canada is taking during the course of this debate. This is a crystal clear presentation of the facts of parliament, whether it is at Westminster in Great Britain, in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or any other Commonwealth country. But how different in his philosophy from that expressed by some opposition spokesmen during recent days in this debate!

In the face of an earnest desire on the part of the government to initiate reforms in the public interest, words have been heard in this chamber which have done little credit to

those who uttered them, words like "restriction of freedom", "dictatorship", "the extinction of parliament", and all the rest. Yet, paradoxically, the same government which members in the opposition attack with such vigour, voted the opposition a quarter of a million dollars in research funds, made available to opposition backbenchers and which were not available to government backbenchers. This was done so that opposition members could do a better job in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Stanfield: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker I know the hon. member does not want to exaggerate on a point which can be checked immediately, but he had better check the figure he mentioned, which should be $125,000.

Mr. Perrault: I know that if the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) makes a request and provides a justification for it, the increase may come along next year.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Perrault: The right hon. gentleman who presided over the affairs of Canada between 1957 and 1962 may be a colourful and interesting orator, but the promise he made in 1949 to strengthen the role of the opposition in the House of Commons faded like a prairie violet at high noon when he propelled his way to power in 1957. Nothing was done to help the opposition in this house.

Opposition members have engaged in a vigorous and personal attack on the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). May I remind them that one of his first actions as Prime Minister was to extend these grants to the opposition, and not only that but also to attempt to ease the lot of the backbenchers of all parties. For this he should be thanked.

May I suggest that if the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert had taken action during those years of Conservative government to organize more efficiently the business of the Canadian people, then our political history might have been written differently today. Today's government is willing to establish the areas where reforms are required and is willing to act, even if controversy ensues, to correct abuses and to improve procedures.

On October 27, 1949, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) said the following:

> An opposition does not properly perform its functions unless it examines all expenditures made with a searching eye and fearless criticism, yet members of the House of Commons have no proper facilities to enable the full examination of the public accounts and estimates. Debates on estimates are futile—An expenditure of millions of dollars that are totally unjustified could conceivably be passed without much danger of detection. Canadians have become so used to the expenditure of billions that a million here or there seems of little consequence.

The budget in the fiscal year 1948-49 was $1.9 million. The budget in the fiscal year 1956-57 was $4.528 million, but no reform was initiated by that government to correct this abuse.

Let them attack this government, Mr. Speaker. It is a government which has the courage to say that the status quo is not good enough, that we are going to have a committee system which, when it becomes fully operative, will be a safeguard against an imprudent waste of funds something which was charged by the right hon. gentleman 20 years ago. And some of the opposition critics accuse this government of attempting to trample on democracy!

It was 20 years ago that the right hon. gentleman made the following statement:

> If parliament is to be made as effective an instrument in the modern world as it should be, the procedure of parliament should be modernized and brought up to date.

That is what he said, but what did his government do about it?

Today we have a government willing to initiate procedural reforms with all of their strength and possible weaknesses, and if there are weaknesses in this package of rules 75A, 75B and 75C, at least there is a government in power with the courage to initiate the proper reforms to correct these weaknesses.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Perrault: Members may recall the speech of the former prime minister made on March 11, 1960 at page 1973 of *Hansard* of that day. At that time he said:

> We are now in our forty-second day and the order paper does not seem to be diminishing at any great rate of speed. I hope that after a number of matters are dealt with in the legislative program, the subject of defence may receive early attention in committee.

Then on July 21, 1960, almost nine years ago, he appealed for shorter speeches. He said:

> Do not tell me that once an item has been dealt with repetitious utterances by other members having similar views add either to the forcefulness of the argument or the effectiveness of the examination.

This is a point which the government has been making in this debate. Of course the time of parliament and the money of the Canadian people have been wasted by an inordinately long debate on certain matters. That former government complained, and this government is taking action.

Changes are being sponsored by a government with a sense of responsibility. The former prime minister said:

> I say that nowhere else in any other parliamentary institution is so much time taken in the examination of particular items as is taken here in connection with estimates.

He was right of course, but absolutely nothing was done to correct this abuse.

• (12 noon)

This government, criticized and villified by the opposition, is prepared to act and will act on the basis of suggestions articulated by the right hon. gentleman long ago. Time does not permit me to go through all the other examples about which the opposition parties have complained, but spokesmen for all parties have said insufficient time is being given to the consideration of estimates, and that speeches are too long. This government has acted. We simply say that those of us on the government side have been asking for co-operation. Some of you may say you have co-operated and 75c is not needed. We have been co-architects of many reforms which have taken place in this house but leadership has been given by this government.

Given reasonable co-operation by the opposition 75c may never be required. Who will question the right of the government to exercise power, when no agreement can be reached under 75A and 75B, to set in motion a procedure which would allow it to limit debate? To repeat those words of the former distinguished justice minister for the party to my left:

> In the unusual circumstance where it is not possible to obtain agreement, the government itself takes responsibility for—and there is a vote upon —a motion for allocation of time on the matter in question.

In other Commonwealth jurisdictions, those nations which cherish zealously the tradition which we have inherited in Canada, the guillotine, closure and other devices are employed to limit debate. These are devices employed without any protestations and without any motions from the opposition.

If it can be demonstrated that 75c allows insufficient time, then let more time be allowed, but the right and responsibility of this or any other government to invoke 75c or equivalent rules cannot be challenged successfully. Surely the members in opposition, in view of the statements of their former leaders and spokesman, will at least test 75c. Let them give this package a trial.

The minority right to dissent must never be jeopardized, but it is true that in the ultimate the wishes of the majority must prevail. Nowhere in this package of 75A, 75B and 75C is this principle violated or placed in jeopardy.

Some have alleged that closure is sufficient and that there is no need for 75c, yet closure permits a minister unilaterally to stifle all debate. Rule 75c only imposes the obligation for advance consultation with the opposition under 75A and 75B. In virtually all cases 75A and 75B would be sufficient, and 75c would be employed only when the majority opinion of the nation, represented by a majority of members in the house, supported action on a matter of importance to the country.

Rule 75c as it is, or modified to provide greater time for consideration and debate, will be a safeguard. I do not oppose this concept at all, or the idea of giving the opposition more time under 75c, so long as the principle remains that the government must have the right to schedule the work of the house when it comes down to the crunch. That is a right which must be observed.

Rule 75c as it is or modified will be that safeguard and a symbol of the determination of the majority of Canadians, after fair debate and after opposition members have had their opinions heard, that the government be able to proceed through a democratic vote in this house and get on with the people's business.

Speaker after speaker has made reference to the fact that this has been one of the most productive sessions in the history of this parliament. Members of the opposition parties have admitted the government has been successful, and have suggested that we do not need 75c because this has been one of the most productive parliaments we can recall. The only dissenting voice was from a member of the N.D.P. who said that so far as his party was concerned there has not been any legislation good enough to block or oppose. One wonders what their qualitative standards might be.

The rule changes made earlier in the session have strengthened the Commons without doubt, and they have made this institution

more meaningful to the Canadian people. The wonder of it all is that previous governments moved so slowly to reform the rules. While our Commonwealth cousins have been initiating changes and reforms in all directions, our parliament has become more and more ineffective in the face of modern challenges. When a committee of this house visited Westminster and conferred with British leaders a while back, the U.K. government house leader, Richard Crossman, told Canadians bluntly that we have been living with 19th century rules of procedure.

Those very spiritual cousins of our friends to the left have been telling us that it has taken time but change has come. Many people resist change because they cannot abide it. They say, halt and stay awhile. Let us adopt a few tentative reforms. Some say we cannot and must not contemplate anything like 75c. Progress has been made during the past months, and there have been some major steps in spite of the failure of previous governments to initiate progressive and regular rule reforms.

What have we accomplished? Despite all their shakedown problems the standing committees have a new status in the house. After years of complaints by members that estimates were given too little time, our standing committees are being entrusted with detailed examination of the estimates, and they have been accorded a new role in the matter of examining public bills. For a government which the opposition alleges is hell-bent on the destruction of the parliamentary system it must mark a new departure from the standard plot of subversion to accord opposition parties so many days wherein they can bring forward policy issues in a series of motions that they can bring forward with notice and have debated.

The report stage of public bills now provides opportunities for members to direct attention to amendments and to stimulate debate in a way that has not been possible in the past. Is this another way of subverting democracy and crushing parliament? For a government which the opposition charges is against democracy, surely it was unwise for it to fulfil a long standing Tory promise to provide research budgets for all opposition parties in order that they might make a more helpful contribution to parliament?

This debate has continued long enough. Conversations should be resumed, and we are hopeful they will lead to the settlement of difficult differences.

[Mr. Perrault.]

An hon. Member: Don't believe it.

Mr. Perrault: There is no doubt whatsoever about the determination of the government to adopt 75c. If there is majority agreement to extend the time limits under 75c, or in respect of other modifications which would make it acceptable, I would not dissent or disagree with such a decision. No one in the house could reasonably dispute the fact that the government, after all other negotiations have failed, in the last extremity has the right to establish the limits of debate with the full and certain knowledge that if, in the mind of the public, the action is unfair it will be turned out of office and given time to contemplate its sins of omission and commission.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, it seems strange to be locked in debate in mid-July in a session of parliament which has had 192 sitting days. It is stranger still when there was supposed to be a clear understanding that we would break off our deliberations and debates on June 27.

The recommendations of the committee on procedure concerning the virtues and values of the semester system—a word which I always thought was rather inappropriate—now seem strangely unreal. While I appreciate the beauties of our nation's capital, I would prefer to be amid them in the weeks after Labour day and prior to Dominion day. This is not only because I come from a part of the country where summer is a glorious season when warmth and winds are alike, kind and gentle, but I think there is something wrong when a parliament cannot so organize itself that its members and its staff are out of here in July and August.

This is wrong, but there is here a greater wrong being perpetrated. That is why we are debating, and that is why I join in this debate. That is why I have no idea how long we may be engaged in this important debate. This must be obvious after the performance of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) last night.

• (12:10 p.m.)

If the performance of the President of the Privy Council on television last night is indicative of the attitudes of hon. members opposite, then I must confess to great anxiety for the future as far as compromise and reasonable conciliation is concerned. His performmance, his suggestions and their implications did no service to him or to this parliament. They were a total misrepresentation of what

was suggested by some very able and sincere parliamentarians yesterday.

This is a very important debate, but it has become a very painful one as well. Much of the reason for this stems from the fact that the person who should have brought most to this debate and raised its tone, who should have given it fine and noble emphasis, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself, was one of the chief of those who cast denigration upon it by suggesting that members battling for the rights of parliament were indulging in a "stupid filibuster".

Denigrating parliament is a serious matter. We as individual politicians are used to being the stereotyped butt end of jokes; that is part of the game. But when the institution of parliament itself is denigrated in the eyes of the public, and the leader of the institution from within joins in that denigration, then the situation is serious. Never in the history of this country have we had a Prime Minister who has led the ranks of those who would belittle this institution.

Sir John A. Macdonald, the father of this country, was a member of parliament at the age of 29 until his death at the age of 76. He loved parliament and sometimes played it like an organ. But he always recognized its importance and value. As Arthur Meighen said of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, parliament was the home of his intellect and he liked it. Sir Robert Borden from Nova Scotia, our second last Nova Scotian prime minister, found it a workshop. He worked hard and well. Arthur Meighen electrified and glorified its debates.

A former Prime Minister, the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), was one of the great performers in parliamentary institutions. I may say that of all the criticisms that I have heard levelled against the right hon. gentleman, today was the first time I had heard him criticized for not imposing closure and for not limiting the rights of the minority.

Certainly this could have been done in the years after the election of 1958 when the Liberal opposition was decimated. Even the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was gone. The opposition consisted of hapless and hopeless remnants. The hon. member for Prince Albert led a triumphant group of 208 members. But never did he or his associates ever suggest that the smart thing to do would be to bring in some device whereby the opposition might be muzzled. I think this is to his eternal credit, not to his detriment.

I, much like my colleague for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness), do not pretend to be an expert on the rules. I leave this subject to those who are. I also agree with him that some of our most lengthy debates are those devoted to discussions about saving the time of parliament.

This debate is more than a discussion of the rules. It is not just a narrow discussion of a law, a regulation or a rule, but of the spirit behind it. This is what we are reflecting upon in this debate. There is more involved than the mere words of rule 75A, 75B and 75C. I think it is the essence of representative government that we are evaluating and appreciating at this time.

We all know, of course, that parliament should be efficient. While precedent and tradition are important to us, we do not necessarily weaken the institution when we change its rules or guidelines. There have been in recent years some real contributions toward achieving greater efficiency and I welcome them heartily. Over the years members have adopted many self-denying ordinances. We limited set debates such as the Throne Speech and budget. Time limits on speeches of individual members have been set. Then we reached the stage where we limited the question period, and I think that was a good step. I welcome these measures, but I think the committee would find it profitable to consider further improvements.

Although there has been a proper limitation of time in the question period, there has been an improper limitation of participation on the part of ministers. Therefore, I think we may have to take a look at the question period in a new perspective.

I also wonder whether consideration might be given to putting into our order paper some concrete and definite guidelines on the question period which would be more practical and contemporary than the provisions of citation 171 of Beauchesne. In fact, I wonder whether, under the existing restraints, we need consider other guidelines than those of relevancy, propriety and brevity to steer us through the question period.

I believe that Standing Order 40 has been a contributor to more meaningful debate in the house. On the other hand, perhaps further consideration should be given to Standing Order 26. Waste of time while waiting for votes has long been a pet beef of mine, and I would welcome improvement in this regard. We need constantly to improve our procedures and to revise our standing orders.

But the proposed rule 75c is something more than procedural; it is fundamental. The discussion that has been evoked in this debate has indicated clearly that we are not just arguing about form but about substance. Certain people in this house, such as the Prime Minister, have scorned this debate. Some of the press representatives are sadly unaware of what it is all about and spend more time in measuring the length of debate than in appraising what is being debated. This is one of the most serious and fundamental subjects that could be discussed in these torrid July days.

In parliamentary debates and in politics generally, I suppose we do not need much encouragement when it comes to the art of dramatization. Perhaps we are inclined to hyperbole, and certainly understatement is not the most outstanding attribute of the politician. But this debate is not one that needs the art of the dramatist. Exaggeration for emphasis is not necessary. The subject itself is sufficiently serious as to require no adornment, no additional or external calls for urgency.

What we, the people's representatives, are dealing with today could mark a great watershed between a parliament which, with all its imperfections, was and is a meaningful instrument of democratic action and something that is much less valuable, much less significant and much less expressive of the popular will. As I say, we are dealing today not with the routine, but rather with the essence of parliament. We would be less than true to the spirit of parliamentary democracy, that precious but sometimes frail product of centuries of human achievement, if we did otherwise.

We should remind ourselves always that popular democracy is not an easy or a natural human development. It has not flourished universally. Indeed, it has often failed and faltered. Men of wisdom and perception like Abraham Lincoln, and Wilfrid Laurier after him, have warned that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty". Especially has this been so in reference to political liberty. So, it is well that hon. members are sensing that there is great danger in what is being imposed; there is great danger in this seemingly innocuous rule 75c.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Before coming to this chamber I spent a good many years perusing *Hansard* and other parliamentary papers. It is my view that, in general, the speeches of hon. members in this debate have so far been of very high quality. I am not particularly referring to speeches made today. Speeches in this debate have been thoughtful, perceptive and, in the main, they have been utterances of men who realize that what is happening is very serious in the evolution of our parliamentary system. This is not just another debate, not just another argument, not just another confrontation between parties.

An hon. Member: It is not just a stupid filibuster.

Mr. Macquarrie: I am not one who is given to criticizing the C.B.C. or the media generally—not that silence is to be taken as enthusiastic endorsation. Nevertheless, in this vital phase of parliamentary deliberations I think the free press has generally failed, and there are important exceptions to this, to realize that without a free parliament there will be scant room or scope for a free press.

I must confess to being an avid C.B.C. listener and I report with sadness, Mr. Speaker, that little has come from the many representatives of the *cognoscenti* whose views it airs concerning the true inwardness of the situation confronting the House of Commons of Canada today. I believe in this respect—and I do not know whether the weather has had anything to do with it—the press has been less alert to the dangers at hand than was the case with rule 16A last December. I agree with my friend the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), that Frankenstein is still Frankenstein and his monster is still the monster.

There are important exceptions to the general run of press coverage, and my hon. friend, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard), mentioned some of them. It is significant that one man who knew at first hand the tyranny of a political system which banished free institutions should be in the forefront of those who see the dangers lurking in this current effort on the part of the government. Lubor Zink, with whom I do not always agree, has from the first syllables uttered in this debate given this issue the emphasis it properly deserves. I congratulate him and salute his perceptiveness. I salute him and others like him who are fully awake to the importance of this debate. I say that they are acting in their own interests, in the interests of the fourth estate, when they direct attention to the importance of what is going on.

Some time before we had a parliament in Canada there was another newspaperman

who analyzed the parliamentary institutions of his own land, Britain. So shrewdly did he perceive and so succinctly did he record that his writings have become a classic, if not the classic, dissertation on the British parliamentary system. As my colleague from Halifax-East Hants said in the house the other night, John Stuart Mill was a man of tremendous intellect and prestige, and a giant in parliament. Unfortunately, as my hon. friend said, John Stuart Mill has been relegated if not forgotten by many who should cherish his views. On the other hand what Bagehot had to say is still read. While his style may be quaint, and the political society in which he moved vastly different from ours, he is as contemporary today as the best efforts of our modern editors. I wish to read Bagehot's comments about the House of Commons in Britain. He said:

> The House of Commons needs to be impressive, and impressive it is: but its use resides not in its appearance, but in its reality. Its office is not to win power by awing mankind, but to use power in governing mankind.

He went on to say:

> The second function of the House of Commons is what I may call an expressive function. It is its office to express the mind of the English people on all matters which come before it—
>
> The third function of Parliament is what I may call—preserving a sort of technicality even in familiar matters for the sake of distinctness—the teaching function. A great and open council of considerable men cannot be placed in the middle of a society without altering that society. It ought to alter it for the better. It ought to teach the nation what it does not know.

And no teacher can teach when he is gagged, Mr. Speaker. No one can teach when freedom to do so is denied to him. Then he went on to say that the fourth function of the house was to enable the government to legislate. My hon. friend from Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) touched on this matter the other night. This house is not a bill passing machine, Mr. Speaker. This is a great, deliberative assembly and it can be great only if it is free.

One of Canada's great men in the field of political science, a man at whose feet many of us worshipped, as we began our studies, MacGregor Dawson, had something worth-while to say when he looked at our Canadian institutions. Some of the things he had to say are worth saying again. He said this:

> The House of Commons is the great democratic agency in the government of Canada; the "grand inquest of the nation"; the organized medium through which the public will finds expression and exercises its ultimate political power. It forms the indispensable part of the legislature; and it is the body to which at all times the executive must turn for justification and approval.

If I may interpolate, it is not the other way round. I continue:

> The fundamental importance of the House of Commons is thus derived from its essential representative character, the fact that it can speak, as no other body in the democracy can pretend to speak, for the people. It presents in condensed form the different interests, races, religions, classes, and occupations, whose ideas and wishes it embodies with approximate exactness. It serves as the people's forum and the highest political tribunal; it is, to use Mill's phrase, "the nation's committee of grievances and its congress of opinions." One of its greatest merits is derived from the fact that it is not a selection of the ablest or most brilliant men in the country, but rather a sampling of the best of an average run, an assembly of diverse types and varied experience, the members of which are genuinely and actively concerned with the promotion of the national welfare as they see it. No Cabinet which keeps in constant touch with this body can be very far removed from fluctuations in public opinion, for the House is always acting as an interpreter and forcing this opinion on the attention of its leaders; conversely, a Cabinet which grows out of touch with the Commons is courting disaster.

He goes on to say:

> The companion function of the Commons and one which can scarcely be separated from the first is that of educating and leading public opinion on many questions. The House is much more than a mere mouthpiece to repeat and advertise the views of the constituencies. It will, of course, do that to a large extent, but it will also discuss many questions on which the voters have as yet no certain convictions or on which they may need further information and guidance. The House will talk, argue, investigate, oppose, decide, and frequently postpone action on many matters, and in doing these things it arouses interest and helps to create a more enlightened opinion throughout the country.

Can it do that under rule 75c, Mr. Speaker? I say it cannot. Dare we, sir, if we take our duty seriously, forget the imperishable truths which Walter Bagehot and Dawson set forth so cogently? Can we assume that an institution so precious, so delicately balanced, and with such immense demands upon it can sustain the assaults of those who see only narrow administrative or partisan aims or goals?

While the House of Commons or any dynamic parliamentary body is of course a proper arena for debate, vigorous controversy and sharp conflicts of opinion, there must be values which are above and beyond the clash and clamour of partisan conflict. The rights of hon. members and the place, honour and role of the institution itself are in this category. These things belong to parliament—not to the

executive, not to the majority, but to parliament itself.

My leader said the other day, and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was of the same opinion, that there are indications that people in high places believe or are persuaded that we should be governed in this country by a presidential system of government. My friend from Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon) mentioned it again yesterday.

• (12:30 p.m.)

When we used to study the presidential versus the parliamentary system in our political science classes, we made many analyses and comparisons. It was a favourite question of the examiner. There is much virtue in the Congressional system as it is known south of the border, but the presidential system which the government has in mind is not the healthy, vigorous system of the United States. You would have to go farther south than that to find the Congressional system which is in the minds of some people today.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Or to de Gaulle.

Mr. Macquarrie: Perhaps if it is not found in Latin America, it will be found in certain countries in Europe whose parliaments may be an instrument of adornment, but they are not instruments which function. No self-respecting United States congressman or senator would tolerate for one moment the pusillanimous role given to committees by this parliament. I refer to what is an actuality, and that is bad enough, not what may be envisaged by those who would do away with this nuisance and diminish the stupid filibustering and the bother of the people's representatives expressing themselves on the people's business in the people's chamber.

An essential ingredient in the successful working of the parliamentary process is compromise and common sense. You can see this in 75A and 75B. There is something in 75B which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would probably describe as stupid. It was an omission. I would say in a more gentle piece of phraseology that it seems a bit strange. Proposed rules 75A and 75B could be made suitable repositories for compromise and common sense.

Any debate which produces quotes from Edmund Bruke cannot help but be a good debate. Edmund Burke said:

> All government,—indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act—is founded on comprise and barter.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

The system cannot work of course unless on the vital issues there is an attitude of accommodation, a desire for consensus and a reasonable approach to compromise in the institution itself.

Rule 75c represents and reflects something entirely different. Not there do you find the wisdom of compromise and the value of consensus, but the impatience of the autocrat, the power madness of the arrogant and the brittle abrasiveness of the technocrat. That is what 75c reflects. What saddens me most is the chance we had when this new parliament came into being. We could have had reasoned and reasonable reform far beyond that which we attained in some of the items which we passed last December. Where would one find a more moderate man than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield)? Where would we find a man more reasonable and patient? Of course some people believe because he is consultative, he is indecisive, because he is reasonable he is weak. These people are now finding out these are misconceptions.

Where could we find a more understanding man than the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin)? Who is less given to fractious activity than that man? Who could we have chosen to typify goodwill more than that man for our house leader? And the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)? I sometimes call him venerable. He has been here a long time, he has said a great many things, but I have never heard him say a mean or little thing about any member of this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Inside or outside the house.

Mr. Macquarrie: As his leader says, inside or outside this house. There were opportunities for goodwill. How much better it would have been had compromise been the vehicle instead of the bulldozer. Bulldozers wreck and destroy, and sometimes the surface is never the same as it was before.

The lessons of last December have not been learned. Once again parliament is hungup in an angry debate. What is the reason? One of the perspective political writers in our country today is Mr. Dalton Camp. I read from one of his columns:

> The trouble with the Trudeau administration which the *New Yorker* did not report, is that it is overlayed with arrogance and it is hell-bent to impose its authority upon the Canadian Parliament to a vastly greater extent than any previous government, which is saying a good deal. Mr.

Trudeau's demand for further rules changes represents another invasion of the shrunken ground of authority and self-respect still held by the members of the Commons, after years of steady attrition.

If imposed, the rules will ensure not only that less will be heard from the opposition but a good deal less from government backbenchers as well. What are they to do with their time?

Given the Prime Minister's distemper the other day, few Liberal members are likely to expose themselves to his charge that all who oppose him are "stupid" or "hypercritical."

And Mr. Macdonald, the Prime Minister's jack-of-all-troubles, has told them, at a recent caucus, not to forget the fact that they are in parliament because they were borne there on the coat-tails of their leader. But the life of a parliamentary acolyte must be hard! It is only too bad that some of them will not say publicly, about now, what they are saying privately.

I do not like to enter into harsh, unkind debate. In my political career I have never developed an instinct to go for the jugular. I do not care where a man's jugular is because I have not the intention of going after it. However, there are certain things one must note and, noting, must react to. I have been wondering in this interesting poltical phase if there is some elixir of arrogance which is quaffed by members of the present cabinet before or after their meetings. Dicey used to talk about the "endless audacity of elected men" and I think of the presumptuous arrogance of some of those who are ministers of the Crown today.

Is there some cloak of condescension which must be worn by the sacred group who sit at the great table? Even the Postmaster Genral (Mr. Kierans), whose administrative actions when they are not failures are fiascos, even he can be arrogant. Do some members miss this arrogance because they are not exposed to the centre of things? Is this why the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) is always such a reasonable, gentlemanly man? Is this why the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) do not possess these attributes, because they are farther away from the new era and the new type of politics? Because I mentioned those two I do not want to suggest I have exhausted the list.

I do not enjoy this sort of debate but I cannot in all conscience find any good or worthy reasons for what is being attempted in 75c.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The convictions I had were made more grim last night as I watched the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) try to convey to the Canadian people what is going on in this house. I think his performance was shameful—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: —and the reason we are not in agreement today. I do not know why such a man was chosen for such an important position as house leader. Where was the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith); where was the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen)? Why could one of these men not have been designated? Not only do they have a knowledge of the rules of the house but also they have the kind of parliamentary maturity which is necessary in dealing with hon. members and which perhaps would have ensured to them success. I suggest with all respect that the designation of the President of the Privy Council for the delicate role of negotiation in a matter of such importance is just about as wise as would be the nomination of Genghis Khan as Moderator of the Presbyterian Church.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): And with the same result.

Mr. Macquarrie: I hope I did not hear someone across the way cast aspersions on the Presbyterian Church. Say what you like about me but mind yourself when talking about the Presbyterian Church because I might have to forego my usual role of humble gentility if this should come about. Like my fellow Presbyterian, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—you are calling for my confession here—I am angry, I am disturbed, I am anxious and worried about what is happening. But also like the hon. member for Broadview I think perhaps the heaviest emotion I have at the moment is one of sadness.

I say why is this necessary? Why must this vital national institution be so torn and traumatized as it is at the present time? Why do we have these recurring efforts to block free expression of opinion in this chamber? In a day and age when many established institutions are under severe stress and strain why are we not all uniting to buttress and strengthen this one instead of having to fight within ourselves against efforts which would debilitate it?

There are too many things today being assailed by unreasonable anarchists. Surely we should preserve this institution. I should like to say in passing that I do not commend

those who showed some lack of manners in dealing with the Prime Minister in the west, but I would say that part of the trouble is that in this house the sound suggestions which have come from this side of the house to deal with western problems have been repudiated. I would say also that he should show a greater respect for organized, reasonable and proper debate in this chamber and not thereby encourage that kind of thing outside.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macquarrie: All around us we see ill organized, ill directed patterns of dissent and hear on every hand the raucous cry of those who would destroy and not build. Why do we not unite to preserve, to sustain and to strengthen this essential forum of national opinion, this indispensable organ of the people's will? That is what it is. It is not, I hope, too late for these people across the way to reconsider. This is my plea to the government: desist before it is too late; reflect, consult, and abandon rigidity in favour of reason. Let us preserve the essence of the parliamentary system to which at our best we are all or should be dedicated, every one of us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions it has been my privilege to have listened with pleasure to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie). I cannot recall an occasion in the past when he has been more eloquent, more sincere, and has expressed more adequately his concern for this great institution. I therefore would wish my first words to be ones of congratulation to the hon. member for Hillsborough, and indeed to all hon. members who have participated in this debate.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to observe the special nature and condition of this debate. Surely it is obvious that never have so much effort and thought been put forward by a united opposition as in this debate. I have observed that members who in the past have normally spoken from very rough notes, as is the practice in this house, have engaged in a great deal of preparation and thought about what is involved in rule 75c. They have come here well prepared to express their great concern over the effect 75c will have on this institution.

I wish to observe also that in my recollection this is one of the few occasions when not a single member of the opposition has risen to support a government measure. This is unusual. As I look back on most of the debates in this house I can recall that seldom has the government brought in a proposal when there has not been a willingness on the part of one of the opposition parties, or of some members in the opposition, to support the measure. A member of parliament does not like to break with his party. Yet there are occasions when a member feels compelled to do so. You will not find this situation in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to recall previous occasions. Let me speak about the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who, at great risk to his own position in his party, and to his eternal credit, had the courage to stand up and support the government measure in respect of the language bill, even though he wanted some changes made in it. Here was a new leader of a party who had the courage to say to those in his party who did not agree with him, "This is necessary." This is a tribute to his leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: I can also recall a previous occasion when the former leader of that same party, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), stood up in this house, with most members of his party opposed to him, arguing for everything he was worth for the abolition of capital punishment. To me it was a memorable occasion and one I shall never forget. Again it is a tribute to the character of the people who are members of parliament that on matters of principle which concern them they are not afraid to dissent from their party's position. I believe there is hardly a member in the opposition who, at some time or other, has not felt compelled because of reason, conscience or principle, to differ with his own party and take exception to some issue. But not on 75c.

• (12:50 p.m.)

If it is not obvious to those on the other side of the house, let me spell it out: We in the opposition are prepared to stay here as long as we can, and as long as it is possible to continue this debate. We shall do this to indicate our defiance of a measure which we believe will have a profound effect upon future freedoms of the house.

Yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rose and in a graceful gesture offered the olive branch to the government. He offered them a chance to get out of the terrible position in which they have put themselves. The government could

have got out of this position with dignity and grace. What happened? I have never heard a more arrogant speech than that made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: Even if we forget that this kind of response was designed to heat up tempers in the House of Commons rather than cool them, it was a disrespectful act for a member of parliament to make toward another who was offering him an opportunity to move forward with the business of the house. One could have forgiven the house leader had he said he was caught by surprise and this was the reason for responding as he did. He could have been forgiven had he said he had not prepared an answer. But he left the chamber and deliberately repeated this piece of arrogance to the entire nation. Surely there is no forgiveness for that kind of discourtesy.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

An hon. Member: He does not know any better.

Mr. Saltsman: The members of the government and those of the opposition are in this sense very much alone in this debate: men are on their way to the moon and public attention is focussed on that historical event. Many people outside the chamber cannot understand—and the press certainly has not helped them understand—the vital issues involved in this debate. They wonder frankly and honestly what all this is about. They ask: What are these two groups doing to each other? The public has not really made up its mind who is right and who is wrong in this regard.

It may take a while for people to make up their minds on this issue. Important as this debate may be, it will not strengthen people's confidence in the parliament of Canada. If we were debating the interest rate, if our debate built one more house in Canada, created one more job—

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Sold some wheat.

Mr. Saltsman: —helped one farmer, or sold some wheat, people would understand. It is difficult for people to understand this issue when grown men, the elected representatives on one side take one position and the elected representatives on the other side take another. We recognized this yesterday when we said to the government: Let us sit down and talk about it. But we were rebuffed in a rude, crude, crass manner.

It is interesting to note that the whips are very happy these days. Normally the whips have a great deal of difficulty finding enough members to take part in a debate. There is difficulty because members have other commitments, they are in committees, have speeches to make and constituency work to do. Now the difficulty is that the whips have to placate all those who wish to speak on this subject; they have to find spots for those who are determined their voices shall be heard in the debate on an issue so vital to their future and the future of this institution.

It should have been recognized from the beginning, when the committee chairman brought in the report, that we were heading toward this difficult situation, particularly with a stubborn government on our hands. I cannot recall a committee report that did not have the endorsation of at least some members of the opposition. In this case it was not a committee report at all; it was a government report. There was no agreement on the committee. The flag debate was the most contentious issue that I can recall, but even in that case some opposition members endorsed the committee report which was put before the house. That is not the situation here. It has been obvious from the beginning of this debate that as much as we in the opposition have been prepared to give, the government has been prepared to give absolutely nothing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: From the beginning the government has displayed a determination to have its own way. There has been no spirit of consultation, no spirit of compromise. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, "We are masters of this house", the whole body politic was adversely affected. I like to recall the President of the Privy Council as he was before assuming his exalted position. We sat on committees together. I remember him as a reasonable, intelligent man who in those days understood the various positions being adopted. I like to think that when we have statements emanating from the President of the Privy Council he still has some reservations about them. I suspect that although it may be—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m. this afternoon.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TAX REFORM

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there might be unanimous consent to revert to motions for the purpose of dealing with the proposed order with respect to the tax reform committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is there agreement to reverting to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house having reverted to the order for motions:

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned there have been discussions regarding the best procedure for dealing with the order of the house with respect to the establishment and terms of reference of the committee on tax reform. If the house is agreeable to the special order which I am now going to suggest, I suggest that my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gray) will propose a motion and make a statement.

But before doing so I should like to ask for the unanimous consent of the house to the following terms which, I think, will be found generally agreeable: First, that the notice of motion required of my colleague be waived under the circumstances; second, that there should be one speaker representing each group, who would have the opportunity to speak on the matter; and third, that there be no amendments but that the question be put after each of these representatives has been heard. As I said, if there is general agreement perhaps that could be made a special order of the house.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This is agreed, Mr. Speaker, but may I make the point that it is the result of consultation.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Before beginning to move the motion may I ask for the indulgence of the house with reference to a related matter of order. Ordinarily, once I have moved the motion and made any remarks connected with it I would not be able to speak again. I was wondering if it might meet the satisfaction of the house if I begin by simply moving the motion and reserving any remarks on it until other hon. members have spoken, thus enabling me to answer questions or give explanations arising out of the remarks of the spokesmen for the other parties. I am making this suggestion in order to be helpful.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): May I speak on the point of order raised by the parliamentary secretary. The hon. gentleman opposite would not expect me to make a comment on such an important subject without knowing the government's intentions. If there are questions to be answered surely the house would find it appropriate to have the parliamentary secretary make his remarks on the motion now and deal with the questions later.

Mr. Gray: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen):

That the House of Commons do unite with the Senate in the appointment of a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, to be known as the special Joint Parliamentary Committee on Tax Reform, to consider the government's proposals for tax reform, with powers to report from time to time its opinions and observations thereon; to send for persons, papers and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the house; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;

That Standing Order 65(5) be suspended in relation to this special joint committee;

That 20 members of the House of Commons, to be designated at a later date, act on behalf of the house as members of the said committee, 11 of whom shall be required for a quorum;

That the presence of a quorum shall be required whenever a vote resolution or other decision is to be taken by the committee, provided that the committee by resolution may authorize the chairman to hold meetings to receive and authorize the printing of evidence when a quorum is not present;

That any member of either house who is not a member of the committee may, unless the committee otherwise orders, take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but may not vote or move any motion, nor shall such a member be part of any quorum; and

That the committee be authorized to retain expert, technical and secretarial assistance;

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that house accordingly.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which I believe may be helpful. In following the text read by the parliamentary secretary it has occurred to me that perhaps there is an inadvertent omission in the first paragraph which reads that the committee may sit during the sittings and adjournments of this house. This implies that it could not carry on following the period of prorogation. This being a special joint committee I do not believe it will be appointed only for the life of parliament, as is the case with the standing and joint committees of the house. There might be a procedural difficulty there in that the committee may do a considerable amount of work before the prorogation of the present session, whenever that may occur, which would be lost following the prorogation of the session and would have to be repeated in the next session. Perhaps this might be cured by the addition of the words "during the sittings and adjournments of the house and periods of prorogation".

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for bringing this to my attention. I think he has a valid point. I think that what we should want to do is not only to enable the committee to sit during any period when there may be a hiatus following the prorogation of one session and the beginning of another but also to enable it to be in the same situation as are the standing committees which carry on during the life of parliament. Perhaps in the course of our remarks on this I may, with the assistance of the table, draft appropriate wording and, with the unanimous consent of the house, add that wording to the motion because, as I said, I think my hon. friend has in fact made a most useful and valuable contribution.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether, if the wording is changed, their Honours in the other place will be called back to change their part of the motion?

Mr. Winch: If I am wrong, I apologize, but my understanding of what we have just heard is that this committee will be able to sit during the summer recess, if we ever have one. I understand that the other house has adjourned until October 14.

Mr. Gray: I am informed that the motion for adjournment of the other place is such that it can be called back on a 24 hour notice, and I have been informed that it would be possible for this to be done, if it were necessary, to ensure that this particular motion be in the form most conducive to carrying out the aims sought for it. I think that the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) has also raised a good point, that is that the change which the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) mentioned may in fact require the concurrence of the other place to modify their own motion. As far as I am concerned I would have no hesitation in asking, through the proper channels, that the Senate be asked to come back to carry on such work as may be necessary for this purpose.

• (2:10 p.m.)

While some thought is being given to the proper wording which will enable the committee to carry on beyond any prorogation of this present session, perhaps I can say that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) attempted several weeks ago to obtain leave of the house to move the motion to set up a special joint committee of the house and the other place to deal with matters of tax reform. When unanimous consent was not obtained there occurred a period of consultation not only with spokesmen of the opposition parties but also with members on this side of the house. This resulted in the form of the motion being changed substantially, such that it now reads in the way I have just stated.

If I am not misinformed, and I do not think I am, it is fair to say that the provisions of the motion, at least with respect to the participation of members of the House of Commons, reflects the consultations that have taken place with members on both sides of the house. Let me review these provisions briefly.

I think the most significant is the one calling for the appointment or designation of 20 members of this house to make up the House of Commons component, if I may call it that, of the special joint committee. You will recall that the original motion called for the appointment of only 12 members.

Having 20 members from the House of Commons on this special joint committee will, of course, mean a widening of the opportunity for participation of members of this house in the discussions on this important matter. The practical effect will be that members of the finance committee of this house will be in a position to act on behalf of their respective parties on this joint committee. Also this will

make it possible for members of the committee, if they wish, to ask the present chairman of the finance committee to act as the House of Commons chairman of the joint committee.

I believe it is the intention of various groups in the house to give their members on our finance committee the opportunity to serve on this joint committee on tax reforms. The provisions of this motion about the use of quorums are in effect identical with the wording of our standing orders on the use of quorums by standing committees. The motion is designed to ensure that the special joint committee will follow the same provisions on this as are presently followed by our standing committees.

The next paragraph deals with the right of someone who is not a member of the committee to participate in its public proceedings. This again is taken from our standing orders and is designed to give members of either house, who want to do so but who are not members of the committee, the same opportunity that is given in our standing orders with respect to participation in the work of standing committees.

There is also a provision in the motion which will authorize the committee to retain expert, technical and secretarial assistance. I think the need for this is self-evident. By putting this provision in this particular motion we will make it unnecessary for the committee to come back to this house at a later date to ask for this authority.

To conclude, let me say that this motion asks this house to unite with the other place to create a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to be known as the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on Tax Reform. The wording dealing with the participation of members of the house has been modified from the wording of the motion originally presented several weeks ago. This is the result of consultation with members on all sides of this house. The creation of a joint committee of the house and the other place I think it can be argued, will bring about a measure of convenience for the public. All those who are interested in presenting briefs on the government's initial proposals on tax reform will not have to do so twice—once in the house and again in the Senate. They will make only one appearance before this joint committee.

I certainly commend to the favourable consideration of the house, this motion to set up this joint committee. By accepting this motion we will be empowering it to sit although the house itself may not be sitting until some time in the fall. If that should turn out to be the case at least some necessary preparatory work could be carried out thereby enabling us to begin, all the more quickly, the study we all agree should be given to the forthcoming proposals of the government on tax reform.

[Mr. Gray.]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gray) for his explanation of the motion before the house. In respect of the point of order I raised I should like to say there is another point I might have raised in relation to the events and circumstances surrounding a potential white paper on this subject.

It is quite conceivable that this house will be prorogued and reassembled before the white paper is presented. Any question of the committee considering the white paper after it has been considered in the house in proper order is merely academic at this time.

This matter of tax reform has been with us now for seven years. If my memory serves me correctly a commission was appointed in 1962, the report of which was tabled by today's Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp), on February 24, 1967. Like a knight in shining white armor he proudly, and with a degree of what he felt was self-satisfaction, promised us a white paper for January, 1968—

Mr. Stanfield: He was held up by parliament.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):—not withstanding that fact a number of members, particularly those to my left, thought the minister should be prepared to implement some of these provisions by June of 1967. We have now reached July of 1969 and there is no sign of this white paper. All we had this morning was an indication that this famous white paper was being written.

There are original drafts and original drafts. The paper may be written but I do not know through what maze of government our committees may have to circumnavigate, or attempt to wiggle through, before the government will dare let us and the public proceed to examine its ideas, not only on tax reform but on other measures. This is the thing I find extraordinary. There was never any indication in 1967 about the presentation of this limited report.

I do not know how many times the then minister of finance said the white paper on tax reform was being prepared. On many

occasions he said it would be presented before too long. This apparently was a delightful and classical expression from the never never land.

Hon. members will remember that last year the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) completely disavowed any intention of presenting a white paper. He said there would not be a white paper but there would be legislation. I suppose someone got to the Minister of Finance and put a little sense in his head about this subject. Last spring, in March or April, we saw a shift, and we all observed the shift which was made in respect of the white paper. We are now going to get it, but it was supposed to be presented in April, then June, and then July. We are now on the eve of August.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I do not know when the house will reconvene, if it ever adjourns, and then prorogue. Let me take, for example, a target date of October 1. I am willing to wager one of our Canadian quarters against its equivalent in the United Kingdom that it will be much closer to October 1 than to any earlier date before we see this white paper.

The Minister of Finance has told us that it will deal only with income and corporation taxes. The Carter report is the report of a royal commission on taxation. Does the minister mean by this statement that we will be presented with a white paper on income and corporation taxes, which will then be followed by legislation; that we will then be presented with a white paper on sales and excise taxes and customs duties and that we will then be presented with a further white paper on estate and succession duty taxes? In other words, is the matter to be proceeded with on a piecemeal basis?

If that is the case, this house is going to be asked to reform our taxation system slice by slice, not knowing what each successive slice is likely to involve. With what has been deemed by many to be a taxation system that has gotten out of joint, there is the very grave danger that we will be asked to assume some other taxation system that may be even more out of joint. Consequently I am not at all happy with the approach that is being adopted by the government.

I think we have already been given a clear indication of what is going to happen in the budget presented on October 22, 1968, in which there was quite a shift of government policy in regard to estate and gift taxes, a shift that bore the influence of the Carter royal commission. I suppose the minister will ultimately tell us that the government have accepted the Carter proposals with regard to state and gift taxes. We are now going to be asked to accept what the government think about income and corporation taxes; and five years from now we will likely complete our study of the whole of the Carter commission report.

I should like to refer to some of the things the Carter commission dealt with under the heading of tax reform. I ask the house to note that they dealt not with income tax reform but with tax reform. I have in my hand a summary in the *Canadian Tax Journal*, published by the Canadian Tax Foundation in April 1967 of various sections of the Carter report. Among other things the Carter Commission studied the use of the tax system to achieve economic and social objectives. In other words they asked what the purpose of a tax system was. I should like to know whether we are going to be able to study this subject when we are dealing merely with income tax reform. I do not think we will, yet the question is most important.

The second item was taxation of individuals. I suppose we will be able to talk about this when we consider income tax.

The next heading related to taxation of income flowing through intermediaries. Possibly that too can be considered under the heading of income tax.

Then they dealt with determination of business income. That relates to corporation tax.

Then there is a matter I have not seen previous reference to, but it is dealt with under the simple heading of "international".

The next heading relates to sales and excise taxes and duties; and the last heading is general tax administration.

These matters are so inextricably linked together that I find it rather difficult to see why the government should have adopted the procedure it has. I think we are entitled to know whether it is the government's intention to continue to proceed with tax reform, shall I say, slice by slice.

The report of the royal commission was, basically, a package deal; its recommendations are closely interlinked. Changes in income tax are to be compensated for by changes in estate and gift taxes. Changes in the corporate tax structure are to be compensated for by changes in the taxation of individuals. Certainly on the allocation of tax revenues as between the federal government

and the provincial governments questions arise as to how you handle, for example, sales tax. Do you abolish it, or do you collect it at the provincial level and refund part to the federal government? Such matters involve the question of tax reform. I hope we will be given a much clearer indication of what the government proposes to do in regard to the whole subject of tax reform.

One further point I should like to make before I resume my seat relates to the degree of consultation—and I mean active consultation, not merely information that is given to the provinces—that should be undertaken in regard to the question of income tax and corporation tax. The province of Ontario commissioned a study which culminated in an excellent report being presented, entitled the Smith report. Similarly the province of Quebec commissioned a very excellent study of its taxation system, the Belanger report if my memory serves me aright.

As a result of our federal constitution and the separate jurisdictions that exist in Canada today, we are overtaxed. Our taxation system is complex. It has some grave inequities and inconsistencies created by the intermeshing of our provincial and federal taxation systems. If the government of Canada, having considered our taxation system, has not taken into account the legitimate interests of the provinces as expressed in these two leading tax studies—I am sure that most of the other provinces will follow closely the general principles outlined in these two tax studies—then we are merely going to be asked to exchange one form of irritant for another. As we all know, there is an old Biblical story about the woman who swept her house clean of devils, only to find that other devils ten times worse came in to take possession.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that without appropriate study of the three reports dealing with income and corporation taxes we will lead ourselves into an unholy mess. According to the 1967-68 figures, in excess of 34 per cent of the gross national product is taken up by the public sector. A great proportion of the gross national product is going to be affected by an unwieldly, an uncoordinated, and frankly a wasteful tax system.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I am quite pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we are to have the committee that has been constituted. On it will be 20 members from the house, and undoubtedly they will include representative members from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and ten members from the other place who, I am sure, will be fully qualified to deal with the subject. After all, Mr. Speaker, the other place is as much part of the parliament of Canada as this place is, and we welcome its joint participation.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party I take the strongest exception to the establishment of this joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate. I see no reason at all to include members of the other place on this committee, and there are some very compelling reasons for not including them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: The committee is to deal with tax reform, something that will affect all citizens of this country. I submit that any committee dealing with such a sensitive matter ought to be above suspicion and ought not to have on it members whose interests may conflict with that of the people. In short, there should be no conflicts of interest. I fail to see how conflicts of interest can be avoided if some of the members proposed for this committee from the other place are appointed to it.

The subheading of the July 12 article by Robert McKeown in *Weekend Magazine* is, "Senators Should Be Above Suspicion—But They're Not". In part Mr. McKeown said this in the editorial:

> A reporter put this question to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau:
>
> 'Is this a matter of concern to you—that many senators become directors of companies after they enter the Senate?'
>
> Trudeau: 'Do they? Is that a fact?'
>
> A fact? The Senate collectively holds hundreds of directorships and other business retainers. Once they become senators, men not previously noted for their business acumen find themselves being ushered into the top board rooms of the nation.

Before this measure had even been introduced to the Commons and before this house had deliberated the matter, the other place had appointed ten men to study tax reform. Even from the very incomplete list of senators with corporate appointments that I have been able to obtain, it is very obvious that most senators to be appointed to that committee will be faced with conflicts of interest. I am not imputing motives or intentions to the people of the other place; I do not say that they have become deliberately involved in this situation. I am merely saying that it is

too much to ask human beings to be completely impartial in situations like these. Considering their responsibilities in other areas, some of these senators will have difficult choices to make.

May I list some of the corporate appointments of some of the senators, Mr. Speaker. Senator Beaubien holds appointments to Canadair Limited, Empire Life Insurance Company—and we in the other place legislate with respect to life insurance companies—Holt Renfrew & Company Limited, Marshall Steel Company Limited, Beaubien Corporation, Belding-Corticelli Limited, Canada and Dominion Sugar Company Limited, Dominion Structural Steel, London & Yorkshire Canada Limited, and M.G.F. Management Limited.

Senator Cook holds directorships or appointments in the following companies: Cook, Bartlett, Chalker, Marshall & Thons, United Towns Electric; Dominion Buck Company; William Nosworthy Limited; Maritime Life Assurance Company; Newfoundland Fluorspar Limited; Great Eastern Oil Company—and it is significant to note that the Carter report has launched a major attack against the oil industry's depletion allowances. And this senator is a director of one of the oil companies of Canada. His other directorships are with Bank of Montreal, Colonial Cordage, and and United North American Holdings Limited.

Senator Everett is the president of Royal Canadian Securities Limited, and his other appointment is with Dominion Motors. Senator Gelinas has appointments with The Mercantile Bank of Canada; Distillers Corporation (Canada) Limited; Canadian International Paper Company; Canadian Cement Company; John Labatt Limited; Canada Permanent Trust Company; Foster Wheeler Limited; Manicouagan Power Company; Sicard Incorporated; Global Life Insurance Company; National Drug & Chemical Company of Canada Limited; EMCO Limited; Hilton of Canada; Robert Mitchell Company Limited and North American Holdings Limited.

Senator Grosart is not shown, so far as I am aware, as holding any directorships. I think he ought to remain on the committee.

Senator Hayden holds appointments to the following enterprises: The Bank of Nova Scotia; Union Carbide Canada Limited; Rio Algom Mines Limited; Atlantic Sugar Refineries Company Limited; Acadia-Atlantic Sugar Company Limited; United Steel Corporation Limited; Parker Pen Company; Allied Towers Merchants; Scotts Restaurants; Capital Wire Cloth Limited, and Electric Furnace Products. He holds ten other appointments as well.

Senator Laird has directorships with Western Ontario Broadcasting Corporation Limited, International Wire and Cable Limited, and Liquid Glaze of Canada Limited.

Senator J. D'Arcy Leonard holds directorships with Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation; Toronto and London Investment Company Limited; Canadian Industries Limited; Canada Permanent Trust; Consumers Gas and Triarch Corporation Limited.

Senator Thorvaldson holds directorships with Western Gypsum Products Limited; Wesco Paints Limited; Weshoe Industries; International Savings and Mortgage Corporation; Marshall Wells of Canada; International Laboratories Limited; Anthes Imperial Company; C.A.E. Industries Limited; Canadian Premier Life Insurance Co.; Canada Security Trust Company.

I regret having to list these directorships and would have avoided doing so if the matter had been of less serious import. If the work of the committee is to meet with success it is important that the members of the committee in all ways be above suspicion. There is no room for divided loyalties. If the government persists with its intention to appoint members to the committee with divided loyalties it will be quite obvious that this government's child will come into the world stillborn. It will be clear that the government is not really interested in tax reform and that the setting up of this committee is merely another delaying tactic. It will be clear the government will do little about the recommendations made some years ago by the Carter Commission.

The concluding words of Robert McKeown's article are:

> Sorry, senators, but that's the way it must be if you are to avoid suspicion of conflict of interest. No directorships, no retainers, no legal fees. Nothing.

Unless the government can assure us, and unless the Senate can join in giving that assurance, that those appointed from the other place to the committee will be above suspicion, the birth of the committee will be shrouded in suspicion.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, we are for the setting up of a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the

House of Commons in order to consider the financial structure of the government.

However, I agree with the hon. member of the New Democratic party who believes that since many senators belong to such or such a company, that could have strong bearing on the matter because some decisions could favour high finance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are for tax reform, but it is the whole structure from top to bottom, as it were, that should be examined. There are in the field of taxation gross injustices which could be labelled as antisocial.

Basic exemptions are not high enough and in relation with the increased cost of living, low income groups pay too much in taxes.

In our economy, several companies are not taxed as they should be. There are many kinds of reserves that big institutions may keep. They withdraw from those reserves, and they are legally allowed to do so. The law guarantees those rights they enjoy. There are many kinds of reserves which should be taxable in part, because they are much too big.

Some citizens pay too much in taxes. As for those who enjoy extraordinary benefits that are granted to them by the house or joint committees such as the one whose establishment is now being considered—in order to give all possible opportunities to large institutions which already enjoy great privileges—they should pay more taxes.

If we have to pay interest on money for high finance by overtaxing, it should be done equitably and all taxpayers should be on the same footing. The same income tax return should apply to everybody. That would only be fair, Mr. Speaker.

If that committee intends to study the problem in that light, we are for its establishment. We do not object to sitting between sessions; we are ready to devote the necessary time to study that serious matter of taxation. Moreover, we should consider the other existing problems. It is well to tax citizens but they should be able to receive some income.

A great many people do not earn enough to live on. We must look into this problem in an attempt to find some solutions so that everybody may get an adequate income, because it would be pointless to set up further taxes only to pay interest to financiers. Let us bring down interest rates, let us cut taxes, so that the taxpayers may breath a little, may live.

Mr. Speaker, if the Carter report which cost $3.5 million is not to be studied by that

[Mr. Latulippe.]

committee, we will object to its being established.

However, if that committee is set up to study the report and implement all its recommendations, we are favourable, that is that we will not only promote the setting up of the committee but will also be prepared to sit on it.

We expect only one thing: some improvement in our tax system and a little more justice for the taxpayers.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Gray: A point of order was raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I thought it was a useful point and on moving the motion I undertook to check it with the officers at the table. I believe I should deal with this now because once Your Honour hears it stated, I think Your Honour will agree it should be disposed of now.

The hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out that while the motion would authorize the committee to sit during sittings and the adjournment of the house, it did not deal with the question as to what it could do in any hiatus between the prorogation of a session and the beginning of a new session, and also with respect to the effects of prorogation on the existence of the committee itself.

I am advised that it is correct that the Standing Orders of the house do provide that the membership of the standing committees and the joint committees mentioned therein would be continued from session to session in a parliament. I am referring to Standing Order 65(4)(a), but that in any case any order of reference to such committee will expire on prorogation. In so far as a motion to set up a special joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate contains within it an order of reference, which I think in effect is the case here, this aspect of the motion at least would of necessity expire on prorogation.

I wish to suggest to the house that at the very least we can deal with the matter of continuing the membership of the joint committee by adding to the motion the wording on this point which is found in Standing Order 65(4)(a). We could add the wording that the membership of this joint committee "shall continue from session to session within a parliament." This is exactly the same wording—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thank the hon. member for the argument he has submitted to the house. I suspect what he is now proposing to do to the motion is a nullity. My view of the matter is that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is interesting, but it is only theoretical at this moment.

The Chair does not rule by anticipation. It may be that the work of the committee will be terminated before the work of the current session. There is no indication how long the current session is going to last, either now or next year. Certainly the Chair cannot be asked to decide now what would happen if this committee did not terminate its work before the end of the current session, whenever that comes.

I think the suggestion made by the hon. member is not too helpful, although I do not think I should even rule on this. It is his motion and it is up to him to make the amendment if he wants the motion amended. If the hon. parliamentary secretary wishes to amend the motion in the way he suggests, it is up to him to do it, but I am rather suspicious he may not achieve the aim he thinks he will by making that motion.

Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, before one o'clock I had pointed out to the house the united stand of the opposition on this particular measure. I pointed out at that time that there must be a reason when an opposition unites. When people who have actual differences with each other decide to take a common stand against a certain measure, which I might point out is most unusual in this house, there has to be a very obvious reason. It is because we all believe it to be wrong.

We believe the government is being incredibly stubborn and arrogant. For a long time there was a minority government. We thought perhaps the leopard would change its spots somewhat, but it is still the same old leopard.

• (2:50 p.m.)

The Liberals have a majority now and are determined to have everything their own way. They are requesting powers they do not need. The main point I should like to make in my intervention today is that the government do not need 75c. In addition I believe that 75c will come to haunt the government. They will find that by using 75c, although they may think they are protecting themselves, in the long run it will spotlight their own inadequacies, and remove them from a dialogue with this house and with the people of this country. With a dictatorial rule of that type there may be no need for them to understand. I am suggesting that in the long run it will be the government which will be hurt more than the opposition itself by 75c. Parliament will survive but the government will not.

There can be no question that we in the opposition have given a great deal. The opposition has given the government almost everything it has wanted. For a long time now our party has been asking for reform of parliament. We have made our position fairly clear. In many cases we have prodded the government into action. We are glad to see the rules which have been adopted. I know that many members of the Official Opposition have overcome their reluctance to grant the government certain powers. Private members with some reluctance have given up the power they had to push the government in order to get some of the necessary things for their ridings. They gave this up in the interest of making parliament more effective.

We have pointed out that we are prepared to accept 75A and 75B. Why then is 75c necessary? Surely it must be obvious that if we have 75c, 75A and 75B are a mockery. Who will negotiate and what kind of meaningful negotiations can take place when there is a gun held to one's head? This is all 75c is.

I would not think, particularly with the type of attitude displayed by the present

house leader, any meaningful negotiations would ever take place, and instead of 75c would be used all along. I remember occasions in this house when governments have taken a very strong position saying that the opposition was not letting legislation go through. Then suddenly the opposition said, "You know, we would not want to be put in this position; let the legislation go through". Then what happened? The government did not have any legislation prepared to bring before the house. The opposition has often been placed in the position of having to call upon the government to bring in legislation.

There have been many instances when legislation has not been ready to be brought before the house, legislation with which the opposition wanted to deal. We in the opposition have said that there are certain problems in this country which must be dealt with, but where is the legislation? It is not here. Instead the government has decided to inflict its stubbornness upon the house.

There would seem to be a special psychology to this parliament which has been sensed by most members who have been here for some time. That psychology depends upon members' reactions to government legislation. When a government brings in a good piece of legislation, or the kind of legislation people want, and which can command the respect of the country, the opposition does not oppose it because the opposition is responsible to the electorate.

Hon. members of the opposition know which legislation must go through, which legislation is important and which legislation should not be opposed. They oppose it in those areas which need to be examined. But the opposition is not foolish. The opposition knows something about what the people of this country need and want, and would not hold up legislation that has significant meaning to the people of the country.

Then there is the matter of the filibustering about which the government speaks so much. One would think the house is continuously occupied in a filibuster and that all we are doing here is filibustering. When we look at the record we find that we have passed an enormous amount of legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: Even when we had a minority government legislation was passed. When the government sat for years without a majority it was able to get its significant legislation through the house. It went through because it was good legislation which the people wanted. I can recall a minister of the government virtually asking the opposition to defeat the government. The opposition did not do so because it knew the legislation that was being brought in was good and desirable legislation. The government knew that no responsible opposition would defeat the government when it was bringing in good legislation. The only time a government has to fear an opposition is when its legislation is bad.

I suggest that by the introduction of 75c the government is attempting to protect itself when it brings in bad legislation from having to bear the consequences of that legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: There is a thing called feedback. On this side of the house we are as responsive as hon. members over on that side to feedback. I remember an occasion when former Prime Minister Pearson came back mopping his brow because the government had been defeated. He appeared on television and said a number of things to the Canadian people. Within a few days it was obvious to most of us in this house that the Canadian people did not want that government defeated at that time, on that particular issue. The government survived, not because it had the numbers necessary to survive but because the Canadian people wanted it to survive.

There are ways to find out how well a government is doing. All we need do is take a look at the situation in Manitoba to see how the Liberals are doing in Canada as a whole. When by-elections produce members other than of the government party this is a reflection of what goes on in this house. One might think at times that Mr. Speaker does not have control over the events in the house and does not call members to order on questions of irrelevancy. It is interesting, however, to note that as the debates unfold and the longer they progress the more the Chair becomes insistent on relevance. It may be my imagination but it seems to me that very considerable discretion exists with the Chair in this house, and that that discretion is used wisely and well.

A great thing is being made about the fact that the Creditistes put up a long fight on the amendments to the Criminal Code. I might point out that I was in total disagreement with the position taken by the Ralliement des Creditistes at that time. But I want to say one thing; they represented a sizeable block of opinion in this country and whether I agreed

with them or not they had a right to be heard in this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: It would seem from the arrogance exhibited on the other side of the house that members over there would like to see the world created in their own image and that they would like to see this whole house peopled with people of their kind. That is not the way it is going to be. When you look at the membership of the House of Commons you see the people of Canada. Some Canadians are arrogant, and this attitude is reflected in those on the other side of the house. Whether or not one likes the members in this house, they are here because the electorate of the country decided they were to be their representatives. The government has never had any difficulty finding support for even the harshest measures when the House of Commons thought those measures should be passed. I again refer to the flag debate of 1964-65. It was not the government that had the courage to call for closure. This was done by a member of the Conservative party who said: We are killing ourselves. This debate has to end. That sentiment was expressed by other parties.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Hon. members opposite have very short memories if they forget this institution has a way of correcting things that go wrong. Many of us love this institution; we care for it and do not want to see it dragged down. I hope that respect exists in hon. members opposite. Under our system of responsible government the electorate gives the government party all the legal powers of a dictatorship. Let us not be squeamish about that. Under responsible government the party in power has the powers of a dictatorship, albeit temporarily. Some of these powers are necessary. However, they are modified and the people of this country do not become too concerned about the strength of the powers because they know there is in the House of Commons the tradition of not abusing them. Nobody uses all the power he has. The people of Canada also know there is an opposition which has countervailing powers.

We are being asked to enlarge the already dictatorial power of government and diminish the power of the opposition. We are, in effect, being asked to upset a balance that is necessary and which in the long run will not work in the best interests of this institution. Government already controls information in this country. It floods the press gallery with press releases. The government has access to advertising. It brings in a labour code and Canada Pension Plan and claims credit for them, even though the opposition fought hard for these measures. The government takes all the credit for measures such as these and advertisements concerning them carry the pictures of the responsible ministers.

How much more power does the government really need? How much more should it have? Has it made out a case for additional power? I do not think it has. The government claims there have been substantial changes in our committees system. I do not understand how committees can overcome the already enlarged areas of authority the government possesses. As important as rules are, no set of rules can be devised to guarantee co-operation in the house if consent is absent or there is no desire to make things work. I say this with the greatest frankness, Mr. Speaker: Even if the government gets 75c, what will it have? If the opposition decides to take four days to deal with every measure introduced by the government, almost nothing will be done in the house. The government may be successful in having a specific piece of legislation passed, but how much of its program will go through?

In the final analysis it is the mood of parliament that determines how much legislation goes through. Proposed rule 75c creates an unco-operative mood in the house, and in the long run the government will jeopardize its hopes for a successful program. This is a truism; it is true of the home, as well as the factory, and it is true of the relationship between business and labour. There has to be consent, agreement and understanding of each other's role. The government is going back to an autocratic age. I would have thought that with all the talk about participatory democracy the government understood what democracy was, but it does not understand anything about it. Democracy survives, and institutions like this survive, because there is consent and willingness on the part of people to make it work.

It is true that there is a great deal more efficiency when you have an absolute dictatorship. All dictators love that; they do not have to answer to anyone for what they are doing. Democracy may be considered to be an inefficient system; let us face it. But is this a factory? Is it General Motors? Is this the type of institution we have here, or is it the forum of the Canadian people? Do we pretend there

are not in the country serious differences of opinion which must be resolved? Do we not recognize that the fights that take place in this chamber are brought about because we reflect the intensity of the feeling that exists in a nation like Canada.

Hon. members on the other side of the chamber say that Great Britain has adopted rules similar to those we are discussing. How ignorant of history can they be? Great Britain is not Canada, and Canada is not Great Britain. We are a country only 100 years old. We are just learning to live together. It is here that the warfare is conducted, because parliament in a way is war. We are concerned with very serious business; this is not a gentlemen's club. We come here with fire in us and fight to resolve the grievances of the people. It is to the glory of English speaking people that they have devised an institution for resolving difficulties without people going around cutting each other's throats. Parliament is a substitution for war and rebellion, and we must recognize it as such.

We must have freedom in this institution to express differences and resolve them. When a government brings in measures such as 75c it is an indication of their impatience and lack of understanding of what goes on in this nation. The government is not interested in resolving problems; it is interested in suppressing the opposition and not bringing controversial issues to the surface. This is a short-sighted approach, because if these issues are not brought to the surface here they will surface somewhere else.

If we consider the British House of Commons, we can more clearly understand the nature of this institution. I sometimes think we should have, as they have in Westminster, two lines running down the chamber the distance of two swords apart. This is to indicate the true nature of the Commons and how we have learned to live with serious differences and resolve them.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I said earlier that there is a psychology to this house and that this house knows when the government measures are good and when they are bad. On occasions when the government is strong, the opposition knows it. When the government is weak and is falling apart, the opposition also knows it. It has been said during the course of Canadian history that it is not the opposition that defeats governments, it is governments that defeat themselves; the opposition merely puts them out of their misery.

I suspect that what the government is trying to do is to head off the inevitable. I ask myself, as has every member who has spoken, why do they want rule 75c? What real difference is 75c going to make to them? After all, they have not used closure at any time because they know what happens when closure is applied. One measure is passed, but what happens to the rest of the legislative program? Why do they really want rule 75c? Obviously they have not needed it all year. They are not even pretending to make a case that they need rule 75c because of what has happened in parliament this year. If you press them hard enough, they say, "we might need it in the future, and therefore we had better be prepared for that future". I suspect that there is fear in their bones, like the fear of an ageing lover afraid of losing the favours of his mistress, the public. This year the government has had a honeymoon because the country wanted their Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to be given a chance. I suspect they know now that the honeymoon is over; the glamour is gone and the government must live by achievements instead of words or fancy gestures. They can survive only on the basis of a legislative program. So what they are trying to do is to bring in rules that will prevent their demise, and rule 75c is that kind of rule.

This rule is a foolish Maginot line the government is building because it can be outflanked and skirted, as only members of parliament know how to do. Or is the great Liberal party trying to be what it has been in the past, all things to all people? Is it trying to avoid a polarization of opinion in this country, by having members make great Liberal speeches about what we should do about poverty, about this, that and the other, and then having members vote the other way?

Mr. Pepin: I thought you were that kind of people.

Mr. Saltsman: We hear an intervention from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). No, it is the Liberal party which is that way and which likes that pattern of Liberalism while they pursue reactionary policies. With measures like rule 75c, under which a debate can be closed, they can put more of their own restless backbenchers into the debate. It will give their backbenchers an opportunity to make flaming, progressive speeches and then, when the vote is taken those members will quietly vote with

the government as though they had not heard or read their own words.

This is what the government wants. They want to continue confusing the country as they have in the past. Again, I do not think this will work for them. I do not think anyone is going to be fooled by the kind of measures that they are introducing. In my opinion, we have given a great deal. The opposition has made tremendous concessions to the government because it recognized there had to be changes in procedure. I sincerely ask the government to consider whether or not they need rule 75c because I do not think they need it. In the long run it will prove to be their downfall, just as closure proved their downfall in 1956. They will pretend they are getting things done when, in fact, they will have their eyes closed to public opinion about certain issues.

In some ways we are really helping you. The Opposition is going to survive regardless of what you do, and so will parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to remind the hon. member that he should address the Chair at all times, although he may not do so now because his time has expired.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the motion before the house I should like, first of all, to associate myself with other hon. members on this side of the house who have stressed the obvious need for reform, indeed, our party's willingness to support the adoption of many of the measures that would achieve that end. Since the present government took office, they have introduced a new principle into the rules of parliament, that is one of arrogance. They are obviously acting contrary to the age old tradition which has been the foundation of our freedom, namely that parliament must control its own procedure.

The government is asking the opposition to limit its power to oppose. It is asking members of parliament to gag parliament, and I contend that if this motion is allowed to pass, members of this parliament and indeed other parliaments, will be like driven cattle. Parliament will be the tomb and not the defender of Canadian freedom. Hon. members opposite, especially the new members, must know in their own hearts that it is not parliament that is ruining the reputation of this government and of the Liberal party. They must know perfectly well what has happened to their so-called just society and how it is held in contempt by so many Canadians. What is happening to the government and to the Liberal party has nothing to do with the length of debate in parliament or with the imagined abuses which rule 75c is supposed to correct.

The troubles in which the government finds itself all began just after the election. Canadians were affected beyond words by the indescribable mass slaughter and starvation of women and children in Biafra. They were disturbed when they saw almost daily on television pictures of children who were actually starving. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada, with his usual elegance, grace and wit, asked, "Where is Biafra?" Many weeks later, with the same sense of history and perspective, balance and justice, which are so much admired, the Prime Minister compared the situation of those women and children to that of the Nazis at Stalingrad. I would strongly suggest to the house leader, to the Prime Minister and to the government that before they try to ram through rule 75c which would have the effect of shutting up parliament, he should consider the advisability of putting a rein on his own tongue. Is there any wonder that a great many people in this country are disillusioned with the so-called just society?

• (3:20 p.m.)

Some time ago the Prime Minister made a cruel statement which related to a large part of our population. He said, "Why should I sell your wheat?" He said this to those people on the prairies who are gravely concerned about the tight financial squeeze in which they find themselves. This statement by the Prime Minister was not very consoling. I contend that rule 75c is not going to stop that sort of statement in this house. Apparently that statement was a calculated insult. There has been no statement about the problems faced by the oil industry in Canada. The Prime Minister also made a statement to the effect that certain civil servants who are not bilingual will be demoted to running elevators. These are examples of the thoughtless and callous statements the Prime Minister has made in recent weeks.

As a result of such statements the Liberal party and this government have reached a low ebb in popularity. It is obvious they want to ram through rule 75c to enable them to gag the opposition, then they will bring forth legislation which is deserving of debate. I contend this is why they are bringing in 75c. The Prime Minister's statements in recent

months have been attacked by the press. Following an invitation to the press some time ago to attend the Prime Ministers' Conference here, our Prime Minister told them to go home and take a bath. These suggestions would hardly endear him to members of parliament or the Canadian people. Such statements should not be made, and they do not become the Prime Minister of this country. Members are aware that these thoughtless, arrogant statements have dealt a serious blow to the reputation of this government. One cannot blame parliament for these statements and I do not think rule 75c will prevent the Prime Minister from making them. I am sure that if hon. members knew that 75c would have this result they would certainly give unanimous approval.

Members opposite know very well that the ramming of 75c down the throats of the opposition will not improve the reputation of the government or the Liberal party. I suggest to backbenchers on the government side that this is not an improvement to our rules. It will not affect them because very few of them speak. They should not forget, however, that in the near future they will be sitting on this side of the house, and that will be a different matter. They will then be objecting to this sort of rule. They will want a chance to say their little bit in opposition to legislation introduced by a new government.

I ask hon. members opposite to give serious consideration to the suggestion that 75c may be important to them, particularly when they sit on this side. Hon. members opposite who are in touch with their constituents know perfectly well that this rule is an unpopular one. It has been condemned by the press and I understand condemned recently by university students. They have circulated a petition throughout universities across Canada concerning this very obnoxious rule.

An hon. Member: Have you checked with your parish priest?

Mr. Carter: The hon. member has made his usual contribution from his seat. I should like to ask him to stand up and make a speech.

Mr. McBride: Would the hon. member permit a question? I should be interested to know how much the opposition had to pay the organizers of the university students to get the campaign going to which he has referred?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

[Mr. Carter.]

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, such a statement is a reflection upon the university communities in Canada and is unworthy of a member of this house. I do not think university students have to be bought or bribed.

An hon. Member: Especially by a so-called Christian.

Mr. Carter: They do not have to be bribed or bought in respect of what they feel is right. The hon. member may be that type of person, but I do not think those who belong to the university community are of the same type. They don't have to be paid to express their opinions in respect of what they believe. I cannot say the same thing about certain members on the other side of the house.

This government and the Prime Minister are obsessed with constitutional theories. Perhaps it is not known in Canada that these constitutional issues have been brought in as red herring, but that is the case. Canadians expected to be given the right to participate in the business of this nation. This promise was made. They desire to take part in finding the solutions to the serious problems which face this country. They were led to believe that they would get action from the government to solve problems of pollution, housing and poverty. So far there has been very little action.

Members on this side of the house in recent weeks have been trying to extract answers from the minister in charge of housing, but it has been like pulling teeth. We have tried to find out when we may expect a statement from this minister regarding the so-called guidelines on urban renewal. This statement was promised some months ago.

Constitutional issues have their place in parliament. There are many more important things in Canada at this time with which we should be concerned. We should not be wasting our time debating rule 75c. There are many more important things we should be discussing, including the wheat situation, the problems in respect of our fisheries, housing, poverty and pollution. Last fall we wasted weeks discussing a similar proposal. We are now wasting time discussing rule 75c when we should be devoting our time and energies to finding solutions to these other serious problems. These problems have been treated with nothing but indifference and contempt by the Prime Minister and his government.

Members on the other side must be aware of our role in NATO and the defence of North America. They must know that we are not

going to get a clear statement in respect of our policy as a result of debating rule 75c. Those hon. members opposite who are associated with war veterans and their associations must recognize the sense of frustration these people have as a result of the failure of this government to take concrete and firm action to improve their lot. Members must know how difficult it is to explain the actions of this government. I should not want to be placed in the position of a member opposite in trying to explain the inaction of this government and its indifference toward the serious problems facing this country. I admire some of the members opposite for their gall. I do not know how they manage to sit silent. When they shave in the morning it must be difficult for them to look at themselves when they think of some of the actions and statements, both callous and stupid, of the Prime Minister and other members of his government which they are told to support.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The chair is finding it difficult to link NATO, wheat and housing to the proposed Standing Order 75c. I would ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to the subject before the house.

Mr. Carter: With great respect to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the matters I have referred to are relevant in that they are subjects we could be discussing now instead of wasting our time discussing rule 75c. The point I am trying to make is that it is not the opposition that has hindered the government from bringing in its legislation. We have been very co-operative, and if legislation is good we approve it. But as opposition members there are certain things we cannot accept.

If the government is not ready with legislation to deal with housing and urban renewal, with additional benefits for veterans, and to deal with other crucial questions, then the government should not blame us for filibustering this debate. We do not delay the government on legislation which, in our opinion, is good legislation.

All hon. members realize the serious economic problems facing Canada today. I could cite the increased bank interest rates and the increased interest rates on mortgages. These are matters to which we should turn our attention, instead of wasting our time and energy discussing this proposed measure. As I have said, the opposition is anxious to co-operate with the government in adopting legislation that it feels is important and good for Canada. We are begging the government to bring in such legislation.

Questions have been asked daily in the house for the last two or three weeks about so-called guidelines in relation to urban renewal, but we have been unable to obtain satisfactory answers. We are only too ready to co-operate with the government on such legislation. Yet we have to discuss this obnoxious rule which will have the effect of gagging parliament.

Let me tell hon. members opposite that it is not the opposition that is ruining their image in Canada. The government came to the house about a year ago with a mandate from the Canadian people. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite are frustrated by the knowledge that their image has slipped badly since that time. They must not blame us for that; let them blame their own Prime Minister and some of his statements.

Mr. McBride: What about the orders that have come down?

Mr. Carter: The hon. member is quite familiar with the orders that have been passed around.

Mr. Crouse: He certainly knows all about that.

Mr. Forrestall: I can think of no one more qualified to talk about that than the hon. member.

Mr. Carter: The hon. member is rapidly learning the smart alec attitude taken by his leader. Why does the hon. member not rise in his place and make a speech? We would be delighted to hear from him, instead of listening to his smart alec remarks. This sort of thing will not get the government, the Prime Minister, or for that matter the people of Canada anywhere. This matter is too serious for that sort of thing.

As the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) suggested this morning, the government house leader is acting like a bull in a china shop. He lacks the tact to reach agreement with the other house leaders. As a result, we are wasting our time discussing this proposal. I would ask hon. members opposite to bear in mind the fact that it will not be long before they are over on this side of the house—two or three years.

An hon. Member: A Tory dream.

Mr. Carter: This is not a dream. Hon. members opposite may like to think it is but

it is not. Hon. members opposite will then realize how unfair they were to bring in Standing Order 75c. I ask them to vote the way they feel they should, instead of acting like trained seals who do what they are told.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I ask all hon. members of the house to co-operate with the Chair, and I would ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to the amendment before the house.

Mr. Carter: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members opposite how they can let this sort of thing happen. They get up in the mornings and shave the same as I, so let them act like men. Let them vote the way they feel they should, in which case I am sure they will vote against this unjust proposal. Let these great orators across the aisle, who sit in their seats making snide remarks, stand up and express their views. And when the time comes to cast their vote, let them vote against this unpopular measure.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great deal of jealousy among members on the other side of the house. Earlier today one of them asked for the institution of a rotation system for government members so they could have their holidays. These poor unfortunate souls do not like to be here now the heat is on. Let me tell my hon. friends on the other side of the house that when the snows are coming down they will still be here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: The type of comment made by the house leader yesterday guarantees that they will not even get a Christmas vacation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't be too hard on them. It is at least nice to see them here on a Friday afternoon.

Mr. Coates: As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says, it is nice to see them here. It is nice to see them participating in the democratic process, which is what parliament and this debate is all about. We are here to defend democracy.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Coates: I enjoy debate, and I hope to enjoy many more days like this because, unless this autocratic government bends, it will break. It will founder on the shoals of rule 75c. The people of this country know that the opposition is protecting its rights and their rights; that it is protecting its freedoms and their freedoms, and that it will not permit an autocratic government to take away any of our rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: The rules of the House of Commons have been distilled over 900 years. They have been formed in all parliaments as a result of agreements between political parties. Rules have never been imposed on parliaments by governments. They are not government rules. They are rules affecting all members of Parliament, and they apply to all hon. members. That cannot be said of rule 75c. This rule has been introduced for the convenience of the executive. Under the parliamentary system of parliament it is not an acceptable rule. It is a tool of the executive. We have been told over and over again that parliament is not efficient enough. Many people are led to believe that parliament and not the executive runs the nation. The executive may be given responsibility for running the nation, but it has no right to push parliament around and to limit reasonable debate on matters coming before parliament. The government now is saying, "We do not like the rules as they are and want to change them. We want the power to say that in three days a bill is to become law and the House of Commons shall pass that law in that time. Debate is to be limited." Well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition does not go along with that proposition. It will never agree to it.

A great deal of harmony between the parties has been evident during the present session. At Christmas we accepted a new set of rules which were agreed to by members on all sides. In the resulting atmosphere of harmony legislation went through the house with a minimum of debate in most cases. We considered that our opposition was responsible and felt that the government was most fortunate in having its programs considered in an atmosphere of harmony. Then, what happened? We were all told parliament would rise on June 27 and come back in October. People in the country were saying, "Parliament is adopting a businesslike attitude and it is evident the new rules are working." Then, the government house leader and some of his colleagues made the serious mistake of assuming that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) could be pushed around. They thought after a couple of days debate on any

measure his resistance would buckle. Well, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Liberal Party and the government house leader have discovered that the Leader of the Opposition is not made of stuff that will buckle when principles are at stake. He will not buckle and permit freedom of speech in this institution to be impaired.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: Because it seemed to the government that not all members of this party held similar views on all pieces of legislation coming before the house, it assumed that our ranks would be divided on this question. They are not. We stand firm behind our leader and members of other opposition parties stand firm behind their leaders. We will fight this legislation to the end, no matter when that end may come.

Although the government is anxious to streamline the rules and to introduce the guillotine, it has not told us why it wants this guillotine.

An hon. Member: The Prime Minister wants it.

Mr. Coates: Let the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the house leader and others on the government side tell us why they want these new rules. During the present session there has been no indication that we need new rules, or that we need any but the ones we are now using. Nevertheless, just before we were to rise for the summer the government house leader brought forward for adoption new rules that would give the government virtually unlimited power to do anything it wished within a short time.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Coates: The government is anxious to secure this power because it wishes to introduce legislation about which it will not tell the country or this house. That legislation must be most damaging to the public interest. It seems that only after rule 75c has been adopted, and that will only come about if the government forces closure, will we learn what is to happen. Only then will the public learn that all Canadians applying for old age security, a cornerstone in the social justice system of this country, will have to undergo a means test. The people of this country will be told, "If you want to collect the old age security pension, which was yours as of right, you will now have to submit to a means test." Mothers who every month receive in the mail family allowance cheques will be told that henceforth they will have to undergo a means test if they are to continue receiving family allowances. And why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? I say it because the government, as a result of irresponsible spending programs, has backed itself into a corner. It lacks financial flexibility and finds it impossible to undertake those programs it ought to undertake. These programs are necessary if we are to have the just society the leader of the Liberal Party talked so much about during the election campaign and which is further away than ever.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Who in the country today would say the society in which we live is more just than that of June 25, 1968? No one can say that, Mr. Speaker. Any man who on June 25, 1968 felt it was going to be easier to own his own home if the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his party were elected is today in a position where it is twice as difficult, if not impossible to own a home.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Coates: The Prime Minister is finding out from the wheat farmers in the prairies how just they think this society is after he has been one year in office. The fishermen on the east coast are finding out how just this society is after this government has been in office one year. The shipbuilding industry and the shipbuilding workers in this country are finding out how just this society is under the Prime Minister. The veteran, old age pensioner, the blind and disabled, they are all finding out how just this society is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: This has happened after only one year, Mr. Speaker. Heaven help this poor country if we have to put up with this government for four years, and heaven help us if they have 75c to work with as well. There have been other Liberal governments in other eras that have moved in this chamber for awesome powers, powers that Adolph Hitler did not even expect from the Reichstag in Germany. These are powers which are common in communist countries. If rule 75c passes there really will not be much difference between a country that has only one government for which everybody votes because there is no alternative, and a country with a government that has power to say to the opposition any time it wishes, "You have

three days to pass this bill; have a good time because it will be law before the public knows about it, even with the instant communications of today". That is not the kind of parliament the opposition is thinking about and that is not the kind of parliament we are going to have if we can do anything about it. This would not be parliament, Mr. Speaker, it would be an oligarchy taking unto itself every day in every way new powers.

The government told us that with this new efficiency that would come with the new rules and that the new committee system they had set up there would be much more participatory democracy in this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have committees. We have a proliferation of committees. We have so many committees we don't know whether we are coming or going. What a wonderful reception those committee reports receive when they are submitted to this chamber! The government does not even wait until these reports get into the house before they introduce their own policies, having no regard for the recommendations contained in those reports. The government manipulates other committees so that they do not even report what transpired in the committee. In other committees, such as in the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, the government endeavours to usurp completely the role of the chairman and the members of the committee.

This is the committee system we have today. It is as democratic as 75c, and that is all that can be said about it. There must be some steps taken to see that when there is unanimous agreement in a committee the government is forced to take action on the recommendations of the committee. These steps will never be taken by this government because it operates by saying one thing to the public and doing another thing in parliament. It will not be able to perform in that way much longer because the Prime Minister's abortive visit to western Canada I am sure has proven to him that you cannot fool the people by telling them one thing and then doing something else in parliament.

The days of Mackenzie King are gone. He is dead. This is not the same as saying God is dead. Mackenzie King is dead, as well as the philosophy he preached. The same rules must be applied in all parts of this nation. The same kind of social justice must be available in all parts of this nation. There has to be the same kind of approach to democracy. We are not getting that today. If this government ever secured the powers available under 75c, there would never be any hope that the people of Canada would get social justice because then we would have government by Trudeau, and Trudeau alone.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. It being four o'clock, the house will now proceed to the consideration of private business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills, notices of motion, public bills.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): There has been some discussion in the house, Mr. Speaker. I think there might be general agreement to suspend the private members' hour for today, and adjourn the sittings today at four o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) moved that the house do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. MacLean: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government house leader the business the government proposes to place before parliament next week?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the business for Monday will be a continuation of the present debate. As the hon. member knows, all house leaders expect to meet on Monday morning for the purpose of discussing further the business for the balance of the week.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. Once the motion is agreed to, this house stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at two o'clock.

Motion (Mr. Macdonald) agreed to and the house adjourned at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 21, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

MAN ON THE MOON

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the rules of this chamber properly restrict statements to matters or events which the government deems it necessary to make known to the house. The events which occurred during the past 24 hours are known by all hon. members and will gain little from repetition now. They are, nonetheless, of such an incredible nature, and illustrate so vividly the accomplishments of man in the fields of science and technology, that it is fitting for us to pause with all humanity to reflect on the magnificent accomplishment of this "giant leap".

[*Translation*]

Since the dawn of history men have turned their eyes heavenward to gaze at the mysterious moon. Through the courage of three men and the talents of many thousands of others, that heavenly body has suddenly given up its mysteries and has come within the grasp of earth. The adventure which we observed last night is surely one of the greatest achievements of all time.

[*English*]

On behalf of the government and the people of Canada, may I in this place congratulate the three astronauts and the people of the United States for this deed. We all wish the astronauts Godspeed and a safe return to earth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like personally and on behalf of my colleagues to associate ourselves with the congratulations extended by the Prime Minister to the astronauts, their families, and the United States of America. We join him in wishing the astronauts a safe return. It was a tremendous achievement. The science, engineering and technology behind the achievement are almost beyond the comprehension of a person such as myself, as is the degree of precision achieved and, of course, the courage of the men involved.

It was a great day for mankind, but it did provoke some sober thoughts in those of us who watched the achievement. It reminded us that the same man who is capable of reaching the moon in this way daily involves himself in practising inhumanity on other men. I hope, as I am sure everybody does, that the sublime achievement of the men responsible for the landing on the moon will remind us that while we are frequently as men rather petty, thoughtless and selfish and sometimes rather vicious, mankind is capable of this kind of achievement. We hope this example will serve not only to mark a great step forward scientifically but to remind mankind generally of what man is really capable of achieving.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party would like to associate themselves with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to the astronauts who yesterday accomplished a feat which staggers the imagination. This may well open a new chapter in the history of man's long development as he reaches out beyond his own planet to other planets and the stars. Even while we speak the two astronauts who landed on the moon are involved in one of the most dangerous manoeuvres of the exercise. I am sure all of us are hopeful that they will be successful and will shortly be returning to earth to receive the plaudits of an admiring world.

While we are praising the astronauts, I am sure all of us will keep in mind the thousands of men and women whose research and tireless work made this flawless performance possible. It now only remains for those of us who are still chained to earth to do everything we can to see that man's social and moral development keeps pace with his technological advancement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, we wish to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in congratulating the

people of the United States for such a great achievement.

I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Prime Minister for sending to the moon a message from Canada, both in French and English. We are sure that the voice of French Canadians has been heard the world over.

We also express the hope, as the Prime Minister did, that if we are capable of such a feat in 1969, all men of good will should co-operate in the future to feed mankind.

[*English*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SALARY INCREASE FOR MEMBERS OF STAFF

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table of the house an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy held Friday, July 18, 1969, concerning revision of the salaries of employees of the House of Commons.

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

CONCURRENCE IN TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau) moved that the twenty-fifth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented to the house on Friday, June 27, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

SYNTHETIC DETERGENTS MARKETING

PROVISION TO MAKE PRODUCTS BIO-DEGRADABLE

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-213, respecting the marketing of synthetic detergents.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make sure that all detergents marketed in Canada are bio-degradable. At present most are, but some products are imported and marketed here which are not. The bio-degradable constituent assists in preventing pollution after a detergent has been used.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[Mr. Dumont.]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAUSEWAY STUDIES

Question No. 1,832—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has the Stanford Research Institute report on the cost benefit evaluation of a Prince Edward Island causeway been reviewed by an independent economic authority and, if so, by whom and with what conclusion?

2. (a) Have any studies been carried out to indicate what subventions would be required if a corporation were formed to build, finance and operate the crossing (b) on what assumptions were these studies made and what did they indicate (c) what are the economic advantages or disadvantages of an immediate start on a crossing?

3. Have comparisons been made of the annual costs of a fixed crossing and of a ferry system projected over 50 years and, if so, with what results and conclusions?

4. What effect on the economic improvement plan recently agreed to between the governments of Canada and Prince Edward Island is anticipated if construction of a fixed crossing is begun (a) at once or (b) if delayed indefinitely?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. Yes, by C. B. Haver of Montreal for Northumberland Consultants Limited. The report however was prepared for internal use and as such the contents are confidential.

2. No.

3. Yes, an internal government study showed the discounted cost of a fixed crossing to be substantially more than the discounted cost of a ferry system over this period.

4. (a) The plan would require major revision; (b) No effect.

CARRAGEEN—EXTRACTION FROM IRISH MOSS

Question No. 2,188—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What consideration is being given to the suggestion of the honourable Member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid, *Hansard* 1968, p. 3616) that a plant for the extraction of carrageen from Irish moss be built in the Maritimes?

2. If the matter is under consideration, what departments of government are involved in studying the feasibility of such a suggestion?

3. What amount of Irish moss was exported to (a) Denmark (b) the United States in the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968?

4. What was the cash value of part (3) above?

5. What is the value of the carrageen imported into Canada from the countries mentioned in part (3) above?

6 What is the estimated cost of constructing a carrageen extracting plant in the Maritimes?

7. Have representations been received from the Government of Prince Edward Island or any other groups or organizations advocating the establishment of such a plant or plants?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry has been following developments and it is its understanding that private interests are studying the feasibility of locating extraction plant facilities in the Maritimes region.

2. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry is involved in this matter however other departments are involved in other aspects of this industry.

3 and 4. The quantity and value of exports of Irish moss to (a) Denmark (b) the United States in the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 are as follows:

	Denmark		United States	
Year	Quantity cwt.	Value $'000	Quantity cwt.	Value $'000
1965	30,633	289	62,445	681
1966	69,032	634	72,515	793
1967	45,603	602	90,665	1,270
1968	69,074	979	113,838	1,619

5. Imports of carrageen are recorded in DBS commodity class 219-99—"crude vegetable materials inedible n.e.s. (not elsewhere specified)" and no separate statistics are available on this commodity.

6. One million and upwards.

7. Yes.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—CONSIDERATION OF GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Question No. 2,399—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the federal government intend to meet with the provinces to consider the respective governmental responsibility for Indian Affairs in the fields of (a) education (b) employment (c) use of lands as farming, mineral resources and power resources?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes.

BILINGUALISM PROGRAM—INDIANS AND ESKIMOS

Question No. 2,408—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the federal government intend to embark on a program of bilingualism with the native populations of Indians and Eskimos in Canada and, if so, will both French and/or English be offered?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Indian and Eskimo children across Canada whether enrolled in a provincial or federal school follow the provincial or territorial curriculum of the province or territory in which they attend school. Therefore, programs of bilingualism developed in provincial/territorial departments of education will be made available to Indian and Eskimo children. The federal government does not intend to embark upon a separate or distinct bilingual program for the Indian and Eskimo population of Canada.

SALES TAX ON PHARMACEUTICALS AND DRUGS—EFFECT OF REMOVAL

Question No. 2,494—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What was the sales tax on pharmaceuticals and drugs before its removal by the federal government?

2. When was the sales tax on pharmaceuticals and drugs removed?

3. At the time of removal of the sales tax, what was the prescription index of the consumer price index for Canada and the major cities of Canada according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics?

4. Three months after the removal of the sales tax, what was the prescription index of the consumer price index for Canada and the major cities of Canada, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics?

5. What specific machinery was established to ensure that the removal of the sales tax on pharmaceuticals and drugs was passed on to the consumer as stated by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in *Hansard* of June 5, 1969?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am

informed by the Department of National Revenue, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as follows:

1. 12 per cent on the manufacturer's sale price.

2. September 1, 1967.

3. and 4.

Pharmaceuticals Component of the Consumer Price Indexes for Canada and Cities

	Aug.	1967 Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Percentage Changes Aug. to Nov. 1967
		Index 1957 = 100			
CANADA	103.1	99.6	97.8	97.7	— 5.24
St. John's, Nfld.	108.2	105.2	104.4	104.0	— 3.88
Halifax	100.8	96.6	96.4	96.0	— 4.76
Saint John	100.7	95.8	95.5	95.1	— 5.56
Montreal	100.5	96.1	95.0	94.9	— 5.57
Ottawa	101.8	94.9	94.7	94.0	— 7.66
Toronto	104.2	102.0	99.1	99.5	— 4.51
Winnipeg	102.2	98.4	98.0	98.8	— 3.33
Saskatoon	121.7	114.6	115.0	114.9	— 5.59
Regina	116.7	113.5	110.8	110.6	— 5.23
Calgary	105.6	104.1	101.5	101.3	— 4.07
Edmonton	116.8	113.5	112.6	111.8	— 4.28
Vancouver	101.5	99.3	96.5	98.3	— 3.15

5. Following the removal of the sales tax on drugs, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs examined the price structure of the drug manufacturers to ascertain their price reaction to the removal of the sales tax. Notwithstanding that this study involved a single industry which uses published price lists and was confined to the manufacturing level only, it took several months to complete.

For this purpose, the department obtained from virtually all the manufacturers supplying a significant quantity of drugs to the Canadian market, copies of their price lists in effect before the removal of the sales tax and of those issued after the removal of the sales tax.

Arrangements were also made for the Department to be supplied with copies of price lists or notifications of price changes subsequently issued.

SOUTH REGINA—ESTABLISHMENT OF SUB-POSTAL STATION

Question No. 2,505—**Mr. Benjamin:**

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Communications to establish a sub-postal station in South Regina?

[Mr. Forest.]

2. If so, is it the intention of the Department to construct or to purchase property for a sub-postal station in South Regina?

3. If so, what is the planned location and when will the facility go into operation?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Post Office Department and the Department of Public Works as follows:

1. Yes.

2. This is still undecided.

3. The proposed location is in the vicinity of Parliament Avenue and Gordon Road. It is planned that the postal station will be placed in operation in the fiscal year 1970-1971.

PUBLIC RELATIONS, CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,571—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs have a public relations staff and, if so how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1 and 2. See reply to Question No. 2,578.

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS—INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,578—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Yes, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has a general information service administered by the Information and Public Relations Branch, and a specialized consumer information service administered by the Consumer Service and Information Branch. Cost: 1960 to 1966, N/A; 1967 to 1968, $8,448; 1968 to 1969, $148,409. Staff: The information and Public Relations Branch is composed of seven persons including one Director, one Press Relations Officer, one Editor, one secretary and three clerks. The information Division of the Consumer Service and Information Branch is composed of four persons: an information officer, a program administrator, and two secretaries.

2. 1967-1968: One pamphlet informing the public about the Department, at a cost of $4,300; five information sheets explaining the various functions of the Department, at a cost of $200 each; seven press releases at a cost of $385 each.

1968-1969: Issued by the Consumer Service and Information Branch: Two Consumer Communiques ("Box 99—A Consumer Listening Post" and "Carpet with Care") at a cost of $1,095 and $1,500 respectively; two information bulletins (releases on reports of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission) at a cost of $496 and $416 respectively; two press releases at a cost of $20 and $60 respectively.

1968-1969: Issued by the Information and Public Relations Branch of the Department: Six information sheets at a cost of $315 each; 25 press releases at a cost of approximately $465 each. The press releases consist of speeches by the minister and officials of the Department and announcements of appointments and conferences, etc.

3. Numbers of copies of each publication: pamphlets, approximately 50,000; consumer communiqués, approximately 21,000; information bulletins, approximately 10,000; information sheets, approximately 1,200; press releases, approximately 2,350.

Copies of publications issued by the Consumer Service and Information Branch of the Department are distributed by mail or hand to Members of Parliament, Senators, the news media and the general public according to branch subscription list.

Copies of publications issued by the Information and Public Relations Branch of the Department are distributed in the same manner to Members of Parliament, Senators, news media, companies, trade unions, universities and the general public, including those who write for information.

MACKENZIE RIVER—CONSIDERATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE AT FORT PROVIDENCE

Question No. 2,580—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to the construction of a bridge across the Mackenzie River at Fort Providence to ease the reported problem of transporting freight by ferry and the increased costs entailed in food prices?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION—INDIAN RESERVES

Question No. 2,594—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. How many houses have been built under the new five-year housing program for Indians initiated in 1966 for each year since the inauguration of the program?

2. What has been the rate of family formations among Indians each year during this same period?

3 What programs are available or contemplated to take care of the urgent backlog need for houses?

4. How many houses have been built under these other programs each year since 1966 (a) on reserves (b) in cities (c) in rural areas off the reserves?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. 1965-66, 1,302; 1966-67, 1,769; 1967-68, 2,005; 1968-69, 1,794.

2. 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69: approximately 1,250 per year.

3. Indian housing program, on reserves; Indian housing program, off reserves.

Questions

4. (a) 1965-66, 1,302; 1966-67, 1,769; 1967-68, 2,005; 1968-69, 1,794. Includes houses built on Indian reserves and established Indian communities. *(b) and (c) 1965-66, Nil; 1966-67, Nil; 1967-68, 96**; 1968-69, 129**.

* No separate record kept of houses built or purchased in cities or rural areas off the reserve.

** Figures include construction of new houses and purchase of existing houses.

CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE—DEBT OUTSTANDING

Question No. 2,597—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. How much of the original debt on the Champlain Bridge is still outstanding?

2. What is the cost of servicing the debt?

3. What is the annual amortization?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. The original debt on Champlain Bridge as at December 31, 1968, was $52,176,876.

2. Provision for interest on loans and advances in 1968 was $2,804,640.

3. Annual amortization, nil.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD HEMOPHILIA RESEARCH

Question No. 2,602—**Mr. McCleave:**

Does the Department of National Health and Welfare make any contributions or grants toward hemophilia research and, if so, in what amount and to whom?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Department of National Health and Welfare does not make contributions or grants toward hemophilia research. However in response to applications in 1968-69, the Medical Research Council made grants totalling $59,700 in relation to research into the cause and cure of hemophilia.

CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SERVICE—REQUEST TO UNDERTAKE REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Question No. 2,604—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Has Dr. Bruno Cormier of the Forensic Psychiatry Clinic, McGill University requested the Commissioner of the Canadian Penitentiary Service to permit him to undertake a rehabilitation program in one of the federal prisons across Canada?

[Mr. Chrétien.]

2. Was his request refused and, if so, for what reasons?

3. Is his request still under consideration?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Informal discussions have been held between Dr. Cormier and officials of the Department of the Solicitor General on the subject of Dr. Cormier undertaking a rehabilitation program in one of the federal prisons. These discussions are continuing.

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD UNIVERSITY

Question No. 2,607—**Mr. Thompson:**

1. Have steps been taken by the government toward undertaking a feasibility study of the idea of establishing a world university?

2. Have there been any proposals made to the Canadian Government for the establishment of such a world university in Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: 1. No. It has been, and remains the view that proposals for the establishment of a world university in Canada, or proposals for a feasibility study of such a project, should be at the initiative of the provincial and municipal authorities concerned rather than with the Federal Government.

2. Yes. These have come from private persons and organizations such as the Canadian World University Committee and the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation.

LEONARD BORG—ELIGIBILITY FOR PAROLE

Question No. 2,642—**Mr. Schumacher:**

Were any instructions given to the National Parole Board concerning the eligibility for parole of Leonard Borg when his death sentence was commuted?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No.

SEAT BELTS IN COMMERCIAL VEHICLES

Question No. 2,644—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to promoting federal-provincial action to require the equipping of trucks, truck-tractors and inter-city buses with seat belt assemblies and to make mandatory the use of such equipment?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. In so far as new vehicles made in Canada or imported into Canada are concerned, consideration is being given to including all vehicles mentioned in the proposed Legislation regarding motor vehicle safety standards. Vehicles already in use come under provincial jurisdiction as does the mandatory use of safety equipment.

EARL ALEXANDER—FLAG TRIBUTE

Question No. 2,645—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Did the Secretary of State issue instructions that the usual tribute of flags at half-staff should be paid Earl Alexander as a former Governor General and member of the Privy Council and, if so, on what date were the instructions issued?

3. Was this order cancelled and, if so (a) on what date (b) for what reason?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Yes, on June 16th, in accordance with the "General Rules for Flying and Displaying the Canadian Flag and Other Flags in Canada," which provide that "the Flag on the Peace Tower of the Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, is flown at half-mast on the death of the Sovereign or a member of the Royal Family related in the first degree to the Sovereign (that is to say, husband or wife, son or daughter, father, mother or brother or sister), the Governor General, a former Governor General, a Lieutenant Governor, a Canadian Privy Councillor, a Senator, or a Member of the House of Commons."

The flag on the Peace Tower was half-masted following news of the death of Lord Alexander on June 16, 1969, and on June 17, 18, 19 and 20, the remaining working days of that week. Although not provided for in the General Rules, there was mounted in addition a special display of half-masted flags at the National War Memorial in recognition of Lord Alexander's wartime role as a commander of Canadian forces. These flags flew at half-mast from June 17 through June 20.

Flags at Canadian government establishments in England were flown at half-mast from June 16 and including June 24, the day of Lord Alexander's funeral.

Other tributes and marks of respect paid to the late Lord Alexander by the Canadian government on his death included: (a) Telegrams of condolence sent to Lord Alexander's family by His Excellency the Governor General and by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister; (b) A statement of tribute by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on June 16, the first sitting day after news was received of Lord Alexander's death, followed at his request by a minute of silence on the part of the House of Commons; (c) The opening of a memorial book at Rideau Hall; (d) Presentation of a special memorial carillon recital in the Peace Tower on Wednesday, June 18; (e) Attendance at Lord Alexander's funeral of the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson as personal representative of the Prime Minister, the Canadian High Comissioner to the United Kingdom, Mr. Charles Ritchie, and the Chief of the Defence Staff, General J. V. Allard, representing the Canadian government and Canadian veterans who served under Lord Alexander; (f) Participation in the funeral cortege of a special R.C.M.P. guard of honour.

2. The initial instruction that the flag be flown at half-mast "on other federal government buildings, airports and military bases and establishments" throughout Canada on the day of the funeral, as permitted but not required by the aforesaid General Rules in the event of the death of a former Governor General not related in the first degree to the Sovereign and not resident in Canada was cancelled on June 19 when it became known that Lord Alexander's funeral would not be held until June 24, eight days following his death and on the day recognized by Parliament as a holiday in the Parliament of Canada and by statute in the Province of Quebec. It is the practice, as the General Flag Rules state, that, during periods of half-masting, the flag is raised to full mast on statutory holidays. It was considered inappropriate that, in showing this mark of respect for one so highly regarded by all Canadians, divergent practices should be observed in various parts of the country.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

PUBLIC SERVICE—APPLICATION OF BILINGUAL BONUS

Question No. 2,176—**Mr. Corbin:**

Of the 1,951 employees of the Public Service of Canada who are presently entitled to the special bonus made available to bilingual employees, as mentioned in the answer to Question No. 1,309, how many have, as their first language or mother tongue (a) English (b) French (c) another language?

Return tabled.

Wheat Export Prices

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, before we pass on to the next item of business I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would inquire about question 2247, asked on May 8, and 2349, asked on May 23. It should not require much research to obtain the information to answer question 2247. It would also be most helpful if we could have the answer to question 2349 before the house rises for the summer.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will endeavour to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

TRADE

WHEAT—REDUCTION IN U.S. EXPORT PRICES—THREAT TO CANADIAN ECONOMY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the new threat to the Canadian wheat economy arising from the announcement by the United States government that it has lowered its export price of wheat by 12 cents a bushel, which will further erode the financial position of the Canadian wheat farmer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has given the Chair notice of his motion, as required by Standing Order 26. As hon. members know, a number of similar motions have been proposed during the last week or ten days. On each occasion it has meant that the Chair has had to make a difficult decision. I ruled before that there had been a debate which in some ways was related closely to the subject matter of the motions then presented by other hon. members. I have had the same doubts about the motion the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has just proposed. At the same time, the motion refers to a very important new factor and I feel that perhaps it would be the desire of the house that we set aside a few hours of debating time for the purpose of considering the very important matter referred to in the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

[Mr. Corbin.]

Having taken all factors into consideration, I feel it is my duty to allow the hon. member's motion so that a debate can take place after eight o'clock this evening provided, of course, that the hon. member has leave of the house to propose his motion. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: If 20 hon. members rise, the motion is opposed and will not be put. If 20 or more hon. members rise in opposition to the proposed motion, that is the right of hon. members.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): What do you boys over there say to that?

Mr. Speaker: If hon. members will look at Standing Order 26(8) they will see, I believe, that 20 or more members may rise to indicate that a debate shall not take place. I have to leave it to hon. members to decide whether 20 or more wish to rise in opposition.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, is it not the other way round?

Mr. Speaker: I was going to read the Standing Order. It is 20 members supporting the motion who have to rise. This would be the condition determining if there is opposition. Are 20 members rising on this point?

And more than 20 members having risen:

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could make a suggestion? It would be quite agreeable on this side, if hon. members would like to start earlier, to start perhaps at four o'clock rather than at eight, o'clock this evening.

Mr. Speaker: If there is agreement. Hon. members know what the terms of the Standing Order are. Under Standing Order 26(9) leave would be deemed to be granted and the motion would be proposed for consideration at eight o'clock this evening. If there is unanimous agreement the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands could be allowed to proceed immediately.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of hon. members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): So far as this party is concerned, we would be prepared to start at four o'clock, as suggested by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), or as soon as orders of the day are called.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Perhaps it would be most workman-like to start as soon ar orders of the day are called.

Mr. Speaker: Is that the wish of hon. members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed unanimously that we will proceed with the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands under Standing Order 26 immediately after orders of the day are called? Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TRADE

WHEAT—EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN U.S. EXPORT PRICES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to welcome the Prime Minister back to the friendly atmosphere of the House of Commons. While I do not wish to trespass upon the subject matter of the debate, I wonder whether it would be in order to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce if he has had an opportunity to consult with the Wheat Board and whether he can state briefly to the house what effects the price cuts by the United States may have upon the outlook for this country?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubts as to the question now being asked by the Leader of the Opposition. We have just agreed there will be a debate in 40 minutes' time. It seems to me that perhaps that would be the time to get answers to questions which normally might be asked during the question period.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought it might help the debate somewhat if the minister were to make a brief statement.

GRAIN

INQUIRY AS TO INCOME PROTECTION PROGRAM FOR CEREAL PRODUCERS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In a speech which the right hon. gentleman made in the city of Winnipeg last year on June 2, he said:

> —the government will immediately involve all interested parties in the development of a self-sustaining program of income protection for western cereal producers.

Later in his statement he said this would be done early in 1969. Has the government yet evolved this program for income protection, and is the Prime Minister prepared to announce what it is either now or in the course of the debate which will be held later today?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as will be apparent in the debate later, there are certain forms of income protection which have already been implemented by the government. I think it would be well if we waited until the debate began to go into this question.

UNECONOMIC FARM UNITS—POSSIBILITY OF PURCHASE

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact the Prime Minister has apparently been reported as having stated that some uneconomic farm units might be purchased, will the Prime Minister say whether this would apply to western Canada inasmuch as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has apparently said it would only apply to eastern Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With respect, I must suggest to hon. members that perhaps they should not have their cake and eat it too. Hon. members agreed a moment ago that there should be a debate on this subject. Therefore they will have the whole day in which to make suggestions and ask the questions they are seeking to ask now. I think it would be appropriate to wait until we reach the debate later on to ask these questions. It is a basic rule applicable to the question period that questions should not be asked about matters which are to be discussed immediately. Such questions normally have been ruled out of order. I realize that questions must be asked about certain matters and I do not wish to appear to be unduly restrictive. However, not much would be gained by making an exception to the rule and then proceeding to the debate immediately thereafter.

Hon. members know that on occasions when there has been protracted questioning

on a particular subject during the question period I felt there was no need to have an adjournment debate on the same subject later under Standing Order 26. I would think it should be one thing or the other. I believe it would be the part of wisdom not to insist on these questions unduly at this time.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I then ask whether it is the intention of the Prime Minister to remain in the house during the debate to answer questions on this matter which is of such great importance to the country?

Mr. Baldwin: I too rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Accepting the basic principle of your ruling, of course, as I would in any event, I ask whether Your Honour would not agree that there might be a selective application of the rule so that questions might be asked which are genuinely for the purpose of obtaining information that would be useful during the course of the debate? This might in fact save considerable time in the debate and might permit a more useful contribution by members who have very legitimately raised this issue. I ask Your Honour to give consideration to that proposition.

Mr. Speaker: I have, of course, given this point consideration and I recognize it is in many ways a valid point. It is just that in the past we have followed the practice that when a debate is set down for the evening or the next day we have waited until that order is reached to make suggestions and seek information. It is only the application of this rule that I have taken the liberty of bringing to the attention of hon. members. I would hope we might try to follow this rule.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, following my point of order, through you I would respectfully seek an answer from the Prime Minister concerning whether or not he intends to remain in the house today, take part in the debate and answer these questions at that time?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Hees: Does he or does he not?

Mr. Trudeau: No.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, obviously the Prime Minister did not mean a thing he said in the west last week and does not give a damn about this whole problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

[Mr. Speaker.]

LABOUR RELATIONS

QUEBEC-LABRADOR IRON ORE INDUSTRY—APPOINTMENT OF MEDIATOR

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I go to labour—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: I really cannot conceive what hon. members are laughing about. Has the Minister of Labour received a telegram from the union negotiators, who have recently been negotiating with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway in an effort to settle the strike which has been in effect for quite a number of weeks and in respect of which negotiations have broken down, requesting the appointment of a mediator to help settle the dispute? If so, what was his reply?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, shortly before noon I did receive a telegram signed jointly by representatives of the United Steel Workers and the Machinists asking if we would provide joint mediation with Quebec. Subsequently we have contacted the Department of Labour of the province of Quebec to see whether they would agree to joint mediation. I shall be in a position to report more fully on Wednesday.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, have the union negotiators and the companies been informed of the minister's decision to pursue the course he has just indicated?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, instructions to the labour department have already gone out to inform both parties of this decision, and I presume that by now—or certainly later this afternoon—management and labour will be informed that the province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada have jointly provided a mediation team in order to bring this very prolonged strike to an end.

OIL

INQUIRY AS TO SECRET AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister on a different subject, and may I say that we were rather sorry he did not visit the city of Calgary. In view of the economic anxieties in western Canada on the part of the agricultural and other industries, can the Prime Minister advise the house whether

there is a secret agreement now between Canada and the United States in respect of petroleum, and is the government prepared to make a definite statement in respect of any agreement now in existence between the two governments?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this question has been asked a few times and that the answer has been given by other ministers. There is no secret agreement. The present agreement between the United States and Canada has been in existence for some years. There is no secret agreement which has been added to that.

Mr. Woolliams: I take it the Prime Minister means the agreement that was secret in 1967 is the one that is still in existence. Did he have a discussion with the Premier of Alberta in relation to the petroleum industry and exports, and did he have discussions with any officials of the petroleum industry?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I did meet with the Premier of Alberta and his officials. I travelled with those officials and with people associated with the petroleum industry. Of course we discussed various aspects of this industry.

Mr. Woolliams: When the Prime Minister had discussions with the Premier of Alberta on aspects of the petroleum industry, did he have any discussion and were facts divulged which would indicate there will be an increase in exports in view of the development taking place in the north and elsewhere in western Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there were discussions regarding the question of increasing exports. This did not involve the matter of reaching an agreement between the premier and myself. It did involve knowing what agreement we might reach on exports and imports with the United States, and under what conditions this would be advantageous to the oil or petroleum industry. This matter was discussed, but no agreement, secret or otherwise, was reached between the premier and myself.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED TESTING OF NERVE GASES BY UNITED STATES—CANADIAN POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he is concerned in any way about the alleged try-out of nerve gases by the United States on Okinawa or one of the Pacific islands, or does he regard this as purely a matter of concern to the United States?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all the people of the world are concerned about the use of these biological or chemical forms of warfare. Certainly it is the policy of the Canadian government to do everything possible to eliminate their use.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs engaged in any discussions or does he propose to engage in any discussions with United States authorities about this matter?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have been engaged in discussions with the United States and other countries during the disarmament talks in an attempt to reach an agreement to eliminate these forms of warfare. We have not been specifically in touch with the United States about the incident on Okinawa, but we are generally concerned about activities in this field by all countries, including the United States.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether or not the proposal for eliminating this kind of warfare which was placed before the disarmament conference in Geneva, I think by Great Britain, has come up for discussion there and what the position of our representative has been? If it has not yet come up for discussion, what will be the position of our representative, and is the government taking any initiative to push that proposal for early discussion and decision?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, this matter is of such importance I should like to be able to give a precise answer. I will take the question as notice.

MAINLAND CHINA—DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION —POSITION RESPECTING TWO CHINAS

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, in view of continuing, speculative press reports concerning the talks now taking place in Stockholm between representatives of the government of Canada and the government of Mainland China, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs clarify his statement made on July 16, and will he assure the house that as far as Canada is concerned there will be no breakdown of

these talks over the question of the so-called two Chinas?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this question because I am sure it is important that the matter be clarified. I have a brief but precise answer to the question which I should like to give.

We are not promoting either a two-China policy or a one-China, one Taiwan policy. Our policy is to recognize one government of China. We have not asked and do not ask the government of the People's Republic of China to endorse the position of the government of Canada on our territorial limits as a condition to agreement to establish diplomatic relations. To do so might cast doubts on the extent of our sovereignty. We do not think it would be appropriate, nor would it be in accordance with international usage, that Canada should be asked to endorse the position of the government of the Peoples' Republic of China on the extent of its territorial sovereignty. To challenge that position would, of course, also be inappropriate.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house whether, in the event of achieving diplomatic exchange with the government of Peking, it is the intention of the government of Canada to withdraw diplomatic relations with Taiwan?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, since the government of the People's Republic of China claims to be the government of China, obviously we cannot recognize two governments. The statement I made is quite precise on that point.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian government does succeed in being allowed to recognize the government of Communist China, is it the government's intention to recognize the government at Taiwan as a separate government?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is exactly for that reason I made my statement today. I hope the hon. gentleman will read it.

PENITENTIARIES

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL—STUDY RESPECTING SECURITY MEASURES

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether he is now prepared to answer a question posed several days ago as to action to be taken to make a study and, if necessary, improve security measures at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary following the escape of two murderers and another person?

[Mr. Anderson.]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to advise the hon. member that a commissioner has been appointed. Judge Bisson of the Quebec Superior Court has been appointed as a commissioner to investigate that incident.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

INQUIRY AS TO ENFORCEMENT

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that another officer of the law was shot and killed in the line of duty over the weekend in St. Boniface, is the Solicitor General giving consideration to enforcing the death penalty in such cases as stipulated by the law?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, since the courts have not yet passed on the charges that will arise out of that tragic occurrence I think any answer I might give today would only have the effect of prejudicing a fair trial of the accused. I believe I should not answer the question further.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I think this is what the hon. member was really asking. Is it now the policy of this government to commute all death penalties?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, I answered the same question when it was asked by the hon. member a few weeks ago. There is no question of a policy to be drawn from the decision of the Governor in Council in any single commutation case.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—RUDOLPH HOLOTA, ASSISTANCE IN TRIAL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister aware of the fact that a trial is taking place in Czechoslovakia of a man called Rudolph Holota considered to be a Canadian citizen, and is the Canadian government taking steps to see that a fair trial is accorded this man in respect of whom I understand certain charges have been made?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of this case. I have been following it, and we have offered our good offices to him if he is in need of them. As I recall it, he has been charged with some offences committed before he came to Canada.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—MEASURES OUTLINED BY PRIME MINISTER ON WESTERN TRIP

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. During his trip to the western provinces last week did he outline to the people of that region the steps that the government intends to take or is taking to control the rising inflation which is going up at present at the rate of 10 per cent a year? If so, would he take the first opportunity on motions to outline these steps to the house?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did have several occasions to indicate to them what measures the government was taking to combat inflation, and they sympathised with me when I said that one of our greatest difficulties was rejecting the irresponsible demands of the opposition to spend more money.

Mr. Hees: As the Canadian people and this house are very interested in the precise steps which the government intends to take and which have not yet been outlined to us, would the Prime Minister take the first opportunity on motions, as requested, to outline these steps to the house?

Mr. Trudeau: Surely the hon. member cannot be all that interested in combatting inflation if he has not taken note of the several steps that have been taken, including those that were mentioned in the budget speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Prime Minister not aware that the steps of which he speaks have been outlined to the Minister of Finance as absolutely unworkable and useless, and he did not deny—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

VANCOUVER—FAILURE TO REMIT CHEQUES FOR OVERTIME

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Can he say whether a complaint has been received from the post office workers in Vancouver over the reported failure of the central pay office in Ottawa to provide them with payment for their overtime work and if so, what action has been taken?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, my friends in the postal unions tipped me off that this question was likely to come from the Conservative party. I did not expect it from a member of the hon. member's party. I may say that I will be glad to take up this matter with my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to find out why there is a delay in making available overtime cheques for the month of June.

PRICE STABILITY, INCOMES AND EMPLOYMENT

REQUEST TO PROCEED WITH MOTION ESTABLISHING COMMITTEE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question related to that of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings to the government house leader. Would he give consideration to bringing forward government order No. 91 on the order paper, the measure to set up a joint committee of the house and the other place on price stability, incomes and employment, in order to meet the very serious rise in the cost of living?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Not at this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DESIGNATED REGIONS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): My question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Now that the industrial incentives bill has been passed by both houses, and in view of its rather unusual nature, how soon will the minister be in a position to announce the provisions that will be in operation, in particular the designation of the various regions where this legislation will apply?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will be within the next few weeks, two or three at the most, I would think.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

APPLE-FLAVOUR CRYSTALS—REPRESENTATIONS BY MANUFACTURER CONCERNING PRODUCT

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that thousands of consumers across Canada are being deceived into buying a product which they think contains fruit when in fact it does not, can the minister indicate to the house whether his department is investigating the representations of Sun-Rype Limited of British Columbia in regard to the packaging and advertising of Nabob Sungold apple-flavour crystals?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this question can be put on the order paper or more properly debated at the time of adjournment.

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON STATUS OF PROGRAMMING FUNCTION

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, as a result of a question asked by me ten days ago which Your Honour suggested might be answered by the Secretary of State in a statement on motions, may I ask the minister whether he will make a statement this week on the reasons and authority for reductions in the program department of the Company of Young Canadians, which changes appear to be against the expressed position of the provisional council that there be no major changes in the company before the permanent council is elected later this month?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I will be happy to get more information on this situation, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—ACTION TO TERMINATE

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. What does the minister think of the increasingly harried and agonizing tones of the male voices that currently respond at the telephone exchanges in British Columbia, and have he and the officers of his department been able yet to take any useful steps to bring about a termination of the strike and thus put an end to the misery of these poor, unfortunate men?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, those poor unfortunate men can put an end to their misery any time they want to give up manning the switchboards. As I have said on many occasions before in the house, the Department of Labour will act at a time when we think that action would be opportune, but we do not think the time has arrived yet and it may be another week or two before both parties are in the right frame of mind.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ARMED FORCES BASE CONSOLIDATION—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can the minister indicate whether, in light of recent announcements by the Minister of National Defence that a number of military establishments may be either substantially reduced or closed, there has been not only consultation with officials of his department but whether there is machinery now available for consultation with provincial and, in a number of cases, municipal officials before any major decisions are taken?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of National Defence is in touch with my department and we are now considering the problems relating to the military bases under discussion.

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I have a supplementary question in relation to the latter part of my question. Is there or will there be machinery available for consultation with provincial and municipal officials?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as decisions are made at the federal level, consultations will take place with the provinces.

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which I ask for clarification. Did the minister suggest that consultations would take place only after decisions have been arrived at by his

department or by the Department of National Defence?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I merely assume that on the subject of military bases, one refers only to matters under federal jurisdiction. Therefore, the decision is up to the federal government. However, in those cases, we believe there will be consultations, but the central government keeps the authority or the power to make decisions.

[*English*]

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Has he consulted his colleague, the Minister of National Defence, with a view to bringing pressure to bear to have a defence establishment set up in the province of Newfoundland in accordance with the request to the minister by the Royal Canadian Legion?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): No, Mr. Speaker, it is not my duty, professionally, as Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, to make representations to the Minister of National Defence.

[*English*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister who was absent last week when the matter came up. Would he not give consideration to prior consultation with the provinces, particularly those provinces where the removal of armed forces bases would cause severe economic hardship?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the minister covered this subject very well.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder whether you even know what is going on.

Mr. Trudeau: Put your earphones on.

Mr. Forrestall: Go back out west.

TAX REFORM

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—SUGGESTED DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the importance of the work of the Special Joint Committee on Tax Reform and in view of the Prime Minister's clear and well stated concern about the question of conflict of interest, would the right hon. gentleman consider seeking an agreement between this house and the other place under which all the members of that special committee might be invited to declare their directorships and other financial interests which could come into conflict with any proposed changes in Canada's tax legislation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should not like to determine what the other house may wish to do in putting members on this committee. I am sure the suggestion put forward by the hon. member will be conveyed to them in one way or another. After all, they all have interests as taxpayers in what happens in connection with tax reform; it might be difficult to eliminate all people with an interest in taxation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Prime Minister would look more closely at what I said, either now or when he gets *Hansard*. I referred to members from both houses on that committee. My suggestion is that there might be some guidelines in accordance with which members of the committee would be encouraged to declare their interests in advance. I recognize the point that the Prime Minister cannot compel members to do this, but I wonder whether a lead could not be given?

Mr. Trudeau: I believe the whole question of the Senate and House of Commons Act is to be brought before a committee, and this aspect could then be dealt with generally. I realize, and I have said this earlier, that the whole question of conflict of interest as tackled by the present statute is not adequately dealt with in the light of modern practices, and I agree that the whole subject might be looked into. I hesitate to say it ought to be done specifically for the purpose of this committee; it seems to me we are thinking in terms of a general question relating to many committees.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT AND PARTICIPATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask

the Secretary of State a question about the International Development Centre proposed in the Speech from the Throne in relation to aid programs. Can the minister tell us whether such a centre has been established? If it has not, can he tell us whether the conception is that there shall be participation in this centre by other countries?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have some doubt whether this matter is so urgent that it may be considered at this time.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might be allowed to finish. I was attempting to say that in my view this is not a matter of very urgent importance and that it could easily be put on the order paper. If hon. members think the decision is wrong, the question can be considered at the time of adjournment.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Some days ago I asked the minister whether he would make a statement on motions concerning plans with respect to employment for students during the summer months in view of the widespread unemployment in this field. The minister indicated he would do so. Can he tell us when he may be in a position to make such a statement and, if so, can he advise the house whether additional student loans may be available to students this fall in consequence of their present financial difficulties?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to report to the house either by making an oral statement or by tabling a report early this week. As the hon. member knows, the administration of student loans is not the responsibility of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Nesbitt: I realize that the minister has no direct responsibility for the administration of student loans but perhaps, with his manpower portfolio in mind, he would consult the Minister of Finance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have reservations about questions which suggest that ministers should consult with their cabinet colleagues, or questions which inquire whether a minister has consulted with another minister. I would think that such questions are not in order.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE—INQUIRY AS TO RESULT OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Alexander Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the President of the Privy Council.

Can he report to the house on the meetings held during the weekend with representatives of the various parties, so that the third report of the standing committee on procedure and organization might be concurred in this week?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we had discussions with representatives of all parties and I hope we will again meet this evening at 7 to carry them on.

[English]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. As a bachelor who has not had an experience like this before, have his abrasive meetings in the west last week now convinced him that the honeymoon is over?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR PUBLISHING OF DIRECTIVES IN FORCE AT BORDER POINTS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Mr. Speaker. In light of the continuing unease about departmental directives, particular those relating to immigration, and the controversy over the past weekend at border points near Montreal, has the minister considered or raised with his cabinet colleagues the question of either making these directives public, so that there would be public knowledge of the directives issued by the department with regard to immigration, or referring them in the first instance to an in camera meeting of either the Committee on Manpower and Immigration or the Committee on Statutory Instruments, so that full consideration could be given to the immigration policy of this country?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure the question as asked is in order. I shall allow it, while reminding hon. members of what I said a few moments ago—that it is not in order, it seems to me, to ask whether a minister has consulted cabinet colleagues. The hon. member can ask directly what decision has been taken, and to this extent the question is in order.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): May I ask, then, whether the minister has given this matter his consideration and whether the government has come to some conclusion with regard to it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Whatever unease the hon. member refers to was likely related to guidelines which had been in force with respect to the treatment of military deserters. The policy has been changed and the guidelines formerly in existence have been withdrawn.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): During the past weekend there seems to have been uncertainty with regard to an ambivalent situation in connection with immigration procedures at border points near Montreal involving some changes which might have resulted from a departmental directive. Would the minister not agree to these directives being considered by a committee in camera, or consent to their publication?

Mr. MacEachen: I would hesitate to suggest referring to a committee any matter which is stated so vaguely as the hon. member has stated it.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

VANCOUVER—TREATMENT OF PRISONER AT AIRPORT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): On Friday last, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra asked me whether I was aware that the R.C.M.P. had brought a shackled and manacled prisoner through the concourse at Vancouver Airport and, if so, what I was doing to check this kind of barbarity.

The hon. member for Vancouver East asked a supplementary question:

> Will the Solicitor General look into the fact, proven by photographs, that this man was taken through the Vancouver airport in a strait-jacket as well as being manacled?

I replied that I would look into the matter immediately. I have now done this, and I find that the man was being brought from Prince George to Vancouver. He was in custody on a charge arising out of holding a robbery victim as a hostage at gunpoint for two days, and he was being taken to another place where it was expected that a further and considerably more serious charge would be laid.

By reason of the nature of the charges and because of certain conduct since his arrest, I am perfectly satisfied that strong security measures were required in this case. As a result of certain direct action which he himself had taken, affecting his wrists, the man could not be handcuffed. A strait-jacket was used instead of handcuffs. The plane was a C.P.A. jet from which passengers exit only by way of a passage leading to the terminal; the manner of unloading normally used by the police could not be employed in this case. This is why the prisoner was taken through the passageway. Photographers had apparently been alerted, and waited in the passageway to get pictures.

COMBINES

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he has yet received the report of the Economic Council of Canada on combines and competition? If he does not receive it before the adjournment, will he be publicizing it during the recess?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have not received it, Mr. Speaker. I think the usual procedure is for the report to be given to the Prime Minister and released by the Economic Council itself. The report is certainly not submitted to me and I am not in charge of making it public.

Mrs. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I have in mind the minister's statement of July 3, to be found at page 10789 of *Hansard:*

> All we can do is hope the council reports as quickly as possible. If the house is sitting when I receive the report, then naturally I will be making a statement as soon as I receive it.

If the house is not sitting, will the minister publicize the report when he does receive it?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am not in charge of publicity for the Economic Council of Canada. My statement that the hon. member quoted was to the effect that when I

receive a copy of the report, which will probably be at the same time the hon. member receives it, I expect to have something to say about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

TRADE

WHEAT—REDUCTION IN U.S. EXPORT PRICES—THREAT TO CANADIAN ECONOMY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) moved that the house do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my reason for moving this motion relates to the announcement, made last Friday by the government of the United States that that country was reducing some of its wheat prices by 12 cents per bushel. This statement has been reflected in the announcement just made in Winnipeg that the Canadian Wheat Board has reduced its prices for hard wheat by two cents to as much as seven cents per bushel, depending on grade, and for durum wheat by 11½ cents per bushel. These reductions, which bring the price well below the minimum price set by the International Grains Arrangement, further aggravate a situation that has been growing increasingly more serious over the past nine or ten months.

It should hardly be necessary to tell the house that western agriculture is in a deplorable state. Last week the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made a visit to the prairies, and I think if anyone is conscious of the fact that the wheat growers of western Canada find themselves in desperate straits it is the Prime Minister.

But it should not have been necessary for the Prime Minister personally to visit the prairie provinces in order to find out that the western farmers are in the financial doldrums. A standing committee of this house, the Agricultural Committee, visited western Canada and submitted a report to the house, a report that I assume the Prime Minister and his colleagues read. That report indicated that the wheat growers of western Canada faced virtual bankruptcy, and urged upon the government the need for an infusion of cash income into the pockets of the prairie farmers.

Apparently the Prime Minister either did not read the report or he did not believe what was said in it, for he undertook to visit the west himself. It is too bad, I think, that we had to have noisy demonstrations to convince the Prime Minister of Canada that the farmers are, to say the least, upset.

The prairie farmer is a very patient person. He has put up with a lot of hardships. He is the one person in our economy who buys in a protected market but has to depend upon the world market to determine the price that he will get for his produce. Over the years the prairie farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze, with the price of almost everything that he has to buy going up and the price of most of his produce going down. He now finds himself in a catastrophic situation that borders on disaster.

I am glad that after spending six days on the prairies the right hon. gentleman finally told the farmers: "What you need is dough". If "dough" is money, then he is right. If he means by "dough" flour and wheat, the farmers have plenty of that. The western farmers need money, and the reason they need money is very obvious.

In their brief to the government the Canadian Federation of Agriculture pointed out that in this crop year there has been a reduction in grain receipts of $430 million. There has been a $140 million reduction in deliveries and a drop of $290 million in Wheat Board spring payments, which in this crop year will amount to less than $70 million compared with $360 million in the previous crop year.

If this were a sudden crisis the farmers might weather the storm. But this situation has been continuing for some time. In the last crop year the farmers of western Canada received a final wheat payment of 17.8 cents per bushel less than they received in the previous year. Their final price for barley was down 9.4 cents per bushel, and for oats 1.5 cents per bushel.

Therefore, the western farmer has been facing essentially two problems. First of all he faces a reduced delivery, which means he is unable to sell all of the grain he has on hand. Secondly, he is getting a reduced price even for the grain which he is able to sell. Consequently, he finds himself in an impossible position.

When the Prime Minister was on the prairies he talked about the problem of helping out farmers, because there were rich farmers as well as poor farmers. The Prime Minister referred to the fact that some farmers, according to what he was told, had assets

amounting to $100,000. These assets are worth $100,000 only if they can be realized, and if they can produce a financial return. The $100,000 assets that a farmer might have are, first of all, assets of which he cannot dispose. No one would buy a $100,000 farm if he cannot sell the wheat produced by that farm, or if, when he does sell the wheat, it is sold at a price that is below the cost of production.

I want to make it perfectly clear that the prairie farmers are not asking the government for charity. They are not asking for handouts. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to talk about farmers who are on uneconomic farms, those farmers who cannot make a living. This is a separate problem, a problem that has to be dealt with, but we are talking here about those farmers who are efficient, those who have been productive. In fact they have been so productive that at the present time there are close to one billion bushels of grain in Canada, and by the time this year's crop is taken off the farms this amount will probably rise to 1.5 billion bushels.

• (3:10 p.m.)

These are not people who need charity. These are people who are facing bankruptcy and whose assets are useful only if they can obtain a price for their product that will enable them to meet their costs of production and give them a reasonable return on invested capital. They must sell the produce of their farms.

I think this parliament must be seized of the problems facing prairie farmers. Our aid should not be in handouts but in actions that will salvage the industry. After all, a short time ago hon. gentlemen opposite gave about $80 million to two automobile companies. Ford Motor Company of Canada was given $75 million, and the Chrysler people got $5 million. Neither of these concerns was bankrupt; neither could be described as poor. The government gave this money because it thought it necessary to keep these companies in business.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, that question was answered in committee to the satisfaction of the committee and it is unfair for the hon. member to repeat his accusations at this time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The matter may have been answered to the government's satisfaction and to the satisfaction of Liberal committee members, but it was not answered to the satisfaction of other committee members, as I know very well.

Mr. Broadbent: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to the minister's suggestion that members of the committee were satisfied with the answer. I was a member of the committee and I was not satisfied with the government's answer.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I do not wish to introduce an irrelevant issue into this debate. My point is that the Prime Minister and his colleagues did not wait until the automobile companies were bankrupt. They gave going concerns large government handouts. I am saying that while the wheat economy is still solvent, before farmers go bankrupt and before hundreds of them have to abandon their farms, the government must act.

I have had a steady stream of letters from farmers who are having their machinery repossessed. One Manitoba farmer wrote saying that he had $64,000 worth of machinery repossessed and that he had a 70 per cent equity in that machinery. How can he take a crop off if his machinery has been repossessed? I have had letters from representatives of implement companies, car and truck salesmen, and merchants across the prairies. All tell the same story of declining sales volume and declining business activity. This is not a matter of handing out charity to some poor farmers. We are now talking about salvaging the wheat economy as a viable part of the Canadian economy. That is what we are talking about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This great wheat surplus is not the farmers' fault, Mr. Speaker. Surely the farmers are not to be blamed or penalized for being so efficient and productive. In the last 20 years the productivity per farm worker has tripled, and no other industry in Canada can claim that record. By virtue of modern technology, ingenuity, and much hard work our farmers have been able to produce this tremendous quantity of high quality wheat. They were encouraged to do so, being told repeatedly by government spokesmen, "Grow the wheat and we will sell it."

Now it is a different story. Now the government is beginning to say, "We have too much wheat; we do not know what to do with the quantity we have; our farmers are just too

productive." That is not what the farmers heard in the past.

I wish to read briefly from a speech the Prime Minister made in Winnipeg on June 2, 1968, in the midst of an election campaign. It is in the form of a written text and I therefore assume that the Prime Minister seriously meant what he said, and that his words were not sheer campaign rhetoric to secure the votes of western farmers. I am assuming that the Prime Minister was announcing a carefully thought out program of which the farmers should take cognizance and upon which they should act. The part of the speech I shall refer to is headed, "Canada's Export Objective". The Prime Minister said this:

> The Canadian government is confident of Canada's capacity to grow and sell the wheat that the world demands. Both the government and the Canadian Wheat Board are determined to maintain and improve Canada's share of the world wheat market. The objective is to secure 25 per cent or better of world wheat trade or, in quantitative terms, 1.3 billion bushels of wheat exports in the next three years.

I pause there, Mr. Speaker. That was a pretty direct promise to the farmers of western Canada. The government was prepared to improve Canada's share of the market and to secure 25 per cent or better of the world's wheat trade. The Prime Minister said the government was prepared to dispose of 1.3 billion bushels in the next three years. That is about 433 million bushels a year.

When our farmers heard the Prime Minister say that, they were encouraged because our share of the world's wheat market had been declining steadily. From 1948 to 1952 Canada managed to retain 21.3 per cent of the total world wheat market. In the last crop year, however—in the 1967-68 crop year—our share of the world's wheat trade dropped to 11.6 per cent, about half the previous figure. When export figures for this year become available I suspect we will find that our share of the market has declined even more.

Mr. Pepin: For what year did the hon. member quote the figure of 11.6 per cent?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That was for the 1967-68 crop year. I continue reading from the Prime Minister's speech:

> To attain this level of wheat exports, the government is prepared to give all necessary support to the selling operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. In furtherance of these objectives, the government will:
>
> (a) Continue to subscribe to and fully suport the International Grains Arrangement.
>
> [Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]
>
> (b) Review and amend credit facilities available to improve the competitive position of Canadian wheat on world markets.
>
> (c) Continue a high level of wheat and flour in Canada's Food Aid Program. The government has announced a goal for total aid of one per cent of the gross national product. Wheat and flour will continue to represent an important share of this increasing expenditure.

I draw attention to subparagraph (b), which says that the government will "...review...the competitive position of Canadian wheat on world markets". I hope the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) will tell us, when he speaks, what the government has done to improve our competitive position.

Mr. Pepin: I will.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister says he will. I hope he will tell us what the results of government actions have been.

Mr. Pepin: The hon. member should know that.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I will know if the minister tells us what he has done, and if he will show us the results. I say to the minister that on the basis of the results his tenure of office has been a total failure.

I draw attention to subparagraph (c), which says that the government will "continue a high level of wheat and flour in Canada's food aid program". Our goal for total foreign aid is 1 per cent of our gross national product. My deskmate, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), on Friday, I think it was, put some figures on the record which had just been published by O.E.C.D. and the last year for which figures were available showed Canada's contribution to foreign aid was .49 of one per cent, less than one-half of one per cent of our gross national product.

For years the government have been telling us they were going to reach this goal of one per cent. They are not halfway there yet. I wonder what the minister is doing about including more wheat, cereal grains and flour in the foreign aid program. It certainly does not show up in the figures published by the O.E.C.D. As a matter of fact in recent years the government have not even been spending the full appropriation voted by parliament for foreign aid. That is how little has been done about trying to get our surplus food and other supplies into our foreign aid program.

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member to remind him and the house that the hon. member's time has expired. He may continue only if he has the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that 40 minutes was the maximum for debate under Standing Order 26. Am I wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I am subject to correction. My understanding is that the rule has been cleared up. Standing Order 26(14) states:

No member shall speak longer than twenty minutes during debate on any such motion.

I gather the hon. member qualifies under 26(14).

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Trudeau: Make your suggestion. You can do it in 30 seconds.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) wants my suggestion.

Mr. Trudeau: In 30 seconds.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Let me start with the Prime Minister's suggestion. He is the one in charge of the show. He is the boss. He sits in the seat of power. Let me read what the Prime Minister said to the people of western Canada in the same speech of June 2, 1968. He said:

Variations in world cereal supply-demand give rise to year to year fluctuations in Canadian grain sales and farm income. These fluctuations create difficulties for grain farmers in making forward operational plans. To meet this problem the government will immediately involve all interested parties in the development of a self-sustaining program of income protection for western cereal producers.

He went on to say:

Resolution of this problem will be sought in sufficient time to bring in legislation to permit implementation of a program early in 1969 should it be required.

There can be no doubt about it being required. When I asked the Prime Minister on orders of the day about this promise of an income protection program he implied that he was talking about cash advances on farm stored grain. I want to point out that the very next paragraph in his speech dealt with that. When he talked about an income protection plan, he did not include the cash advances as being part of the income protection plan. He went on to say:

To meet farmers' needs for operating funds at harvest time, advance payments will be increased, as soon as possible, to provide for the doubling, to $6,000, of the amount available to individual farmers as interest-free loans on farm stored grain. At the same time the burden of repayment will be eased by reducing the rate of repayment.

The Prime Minister indicated over a year ago that early in 1969 the government would be introducing an income protection program for the western farmer. We have been trying for at least eight months to find out what that program is.

The government wants suggestions. Ministers have received suggestions from this side of the house again and again. Even more important, they have had them from the farm organizations and from the wheat pools. It has been suggested that in order to meet the immediate situation the government might pay an acreage bonus of $2 an acre up to a maximum of 1,000 acres. We in this party have suggested that the government consider a more speedy way of getting money out to the farmers by making a deficiency payment of 20 cents a bushel on the wheat which was delivered in the 1967-68 crop year, up to a maximum of 5,000 bushels. That would just about make up to the farmers the drop in the price which took place in that crop year.

The other suggestion, which I am sure has been made to the Prime Minister and his colleagues again and again, is that the government has a responsibility to see that the floor price of $1.95½ a bushel, basis Fort William, which was set under the International Grains Arrangement, be the guaranteed price to the wheat producer. If the Canadian Wheat Board finds it necessary to embark upon a price war in the sale of wheat, then surely the price of waging that war ought not to be borne exclusively by the people who produce the wheat.

If the government and the Wheat Board decide on a price war in order to stay in a competitive position with those exporting countries that have violated the I.G.A., then surely this battle ought to be waged by the Canadian people as a whole and not just by the farmers of western Canada. Nothing could be more logical and fair than to ask the government to say that as far as the farmers are concerned the Wheat Board will pay them on the basis of $1.95½ a bushel for their wheat, basis Fort William, and any difference in price which they must accept below that

figure in order to sell wheat will be borne by the treasury of Canada.

I suggest the government must do a great deal more to implement the Prime Minister's commitments of June 2 than it has done today. The Prime Minister said he was confident of Canada's capacity to grow and sell wheat. If it is really going to do what the Prime Minister said, then the government must be prepared to embark upon an aggressive sales policy.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce has been very coy in telling us what has happened to the agreement with the Soviet Union, which expires at the end of this month, and under which roughly 165 million bushels have not yet been accepted by Russia. What have the minister and his department done about getting the Soviet Union to accept the balance of this contract?

I am told by those who visited the trade fair at Budapest that the Canadian government was not even represented. But the province of Ontario was represented. The British government was represented and the United States government was represented. Canada was not represented at all. I am told that Ontario had a pavilion there. That may be news to the minister. Perhaps the minister does not know what goes on in world affairs.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: We cannot take part in everything.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): No, but any man who is a minister of trade and commerce of a country which has such an agreement under which 165 million bushels of wheat are still to be sold, should have a representative at fairs held behind the Iron Curtain or in any country which is likely to be interested in securing Canadian wheat. The minister has not told us, for instance, whether there is any possibility of renewing that agreement or extending it so that we would still have some hope of selling these 165 million bushels. The minister has not indicated whether he is carrying on any discussions with wheat importing countries regarding bilateral trade agreements.

I notice, for instance, that Great Britain made very large sales to Roumania of equipment for irrigating land and is receiving wheat and other foodstuffs in exchange. I notice that France has been taking payments in the form of goods from other countries,

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

and that the United States has been taking partial payment either in soft currency or in goods. To what extent are the full resources of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce being put behind the Wheat Board in order to enable that body to sell wheat in competition with other countries?

If Canada is to sit back and say "Cash on the barrelhead", while everybody else is working out agreements for long term credit, or partial payment in goods and partial payment in soft currency, we will continue to sit here with one billion bushels of unsold wheat. The responsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of the government to see that we sell more wheat and to realize that in order to do so we must use the techniques of our competitors. We cannot continue to use the methods that were adequate when there was a shortage of wheat in the world and we were in the fortunate position of having a surplus.

I hope the minister, when he reports to the house, will tell us just how much wheat and flour have gone into our foreign aid program, and how much it has increased each year. Also I would hope he would tell us what is being done to extend this program for the disposal of western wheat and Canadian flour.

May I conclude by saying I regret that the attitude of the Prime Minister and of the government generally seems to be that we have a surplus of wheat in the world, that this is a tragic situation, that there is nothing we can do about it except make some cash advances which will not solve the problem for the farmer who still has wheat which he cannot sell after he has filled his quota, but which has cost him a great deal of money to produce. Is the government taking the position that we are in a hopeless situation and the only answer lies in allowing the farmers to go broke and be pushed off the farms, or in reducing the number of farmers and consequently reducing the amount of wheat produced? This is not the answer.

If the government want diversification, they should say so. They should bring down a diversification program, as the Federation of Agriculture suggested and provide $160 million this year, which would be reduced each year by $40 million, which would be used to help farmers transfer from grain to beef. If they do that they will have to stabilize the market and give the farmers some assurance that if they produce beef they will be able to sell it, and will not be told that there is no market for beef and that they should go back to producing grain.

Surpluses of wheat are not new phenomena. I remember standing in my place in this house in the 1940's and saying, amidst laughter from some members, that the day would come when we would be scraping the bottom of every bin in Canada trying to get enough wheat to meet world demand. That was considered to be very funny but in a few years it turned out to be true. Wheat production and wheat consumption have gone in cycles. Ever since the days of Joseph in Egypt, in biblical times, there have been periods of surplus followed by periods of scarcity, and periods of abundance followed by periods of drought. A day will come when again there will be a demand for Canadian wheat.

The important thing for the government and this House of Commons to do at the present time is to take the necessary steps to keep the efficient farmers in operation against the day when Canadian wheat, which is still the best wheat in the world, will be in demand all around the globe. I therefore hope we will have some statement from the Prime Minister, or from his associates, outlining specifically what they propose to do.

I do not think we should be told once more that a policy is forthcoming and will be announced in due course. Ever since last fall it has been perfectly apparent we were headed for this crisis. Now the crisis is here. In that period the government ought to have evolved a policy, and should now be able to tell us what that policy is. It should be able in the next few days to announce a policy that will give the farmers of western Canada some assurance of two things: first, that there will be a massive infusion of cash income to see them over the present crisis and, second, that there will be some stability of prices in the future to enable them to stay in operation as efficient producers.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that at this stage perhaps the minister or the government would state the position of the government, particularly in view of the rapidly developing situation. I am grateful, however, for an opportunity to participate in a debate on this subject. Apparently it took a new body blow delivered to the wheat producers of Canada for this house to be able to debate this subject, one which we have been anxious to debate following the temporary suspension—which I believe are the minister's words—of the minimum price under the I.G.A. This matter obviously involves an emergency of great importance to the grain farmers who are directly involved, to the whole of western Canada, and indeed to the whole of Canada. There is no question about the fall in Canada's share of the world market during the past year. Although the minister may mention this, I am not now talking about the longer term events over ten year periods.

There is no question that during the last two or three years Canada has lost a substantial share of the world market and that western farmers are now faced with a record backlog of wheat for which they are seeking sales. I remember hearing the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) on television, during a certain event a year ago last May or June, speaking in Winnipeg and admit that Canada had not done a good job in selling wheat in recent years. I took for granted he was saying to the western farmers that his government would do better, and that he recognized there was a lot of room for improvement in the way things had been handled.

We had a world wheat agreement for a year. Now we have an agreement in respect of which the minister seems to be helpless in either enforcing it or getting anything done about violations of it. I do not want to be unfair to the minister but I think it is correct to say that for the last two or three years Canada has been trailing along behind developments, has been following the market downwards, and has fallen behind others who have made wheat sales. Canada has reduced its price, but so far as we can judge we have derived very little benefit from that process.

• (3:40 p.m.)

It is important to understand the true nature and the dimensions of the present crisis, much of which had its origin in 1966. The federal government has had its responsibility since then for developing policies to meet the coming crisis but it certainly has not discharged that responsibility despite the assurances of the Prime Minister a year ago that such would be done.

In 1966, for example, the United States made a number of changes in wheat policy which adversely affected Canadian growers. These were obvious at the time but our government did not act. The United States wheat acreage allotment was increased by about 30 percent, and it adopted a modified two price policy in order to grasp commercial markets.

It is correct that in 1967 and 1968 the United States was a major exporter of wheat while total world exports declined by about

15 per cent. As a result of Canada's indecisive response to these new changes our wheat exports declined by almost 40 per cent. I hope the minister will correct me if I am wrong in any of these assertions which I believe to be correct.

As I say, recently the minister and the government seem to have been following the market downwards. I should have hoped that long ago Canada might have been able to convince the United States that there was to be nothing gained by cutting prices. One does not extend the market to any extent by reducing prices, because the demand for wheat is inelastic. Canada and the United States have basically the same interests in maintaining a solid basic price for wheat, yet Canada seems to have failed completely to convince the government of the United States that it is in the interest of the two governments and the two countries to act in concert.

The price reductions announced toward the end of last week by the United States represent further confirmation of our failure in this regard. I wonder whether part of our difficulty can be related to the fact that the Canadian government may not have a very good odor so far as the government of the United States is concerned. Whatever the reason we seem to have failed.

As a consequence our farmers have what appears to be a record backlog of wheat on hand. However, there is another side to this matter in terms of the proportion of total wheat sales. Wheat in storage is not as large in percentage terms as it was ten years ago. In the past a succession of good growing years was frequently followed by poorer crops in a number of countries which were normally big suppliers. We know that in the past any surplus or storage of wheat was usually used for a good purpose in the end. I do not think we should be too pessimistic. We should not assume that just because we are in these present difficulties the market will continue to deteriorate over the long run, or that the market for wheat will be weak in the long run.

The Prime Minister seems to have accepted the point of view that over future long terms of adjustment there must be less wheat grown in the west. If that is the case I think he certainly owes it to the wheat farmers of the country to tell them what the plan is, and indicate what methods should be used to reduce wheat production. Certainly we have to recognize that all the farmers who are growing wheat cannot turn to producing something else. A lot of their farms are not adaptable to other crops, and certainly not adaptable to the production of beef.

It is not good enough for the government of Canada to talk about a decrease in the market and a need for adjustment and change, and just leave it at that. It is not good enough just to tell the wheat farmer that there is a glut of wheat in the world and that he has to turn his hand to something else. If the government of Canada is convinced that the outlook in the long term is bad, then let it produce a program which will provide for some orderly adjustment.

Surely part of any such program must take the form of some assistance in the short term, because there is a back-up on the farms. Farmers are strapped for cash, and this is having a backing up effect in their communities and throughout the whole region. Surely there is an urgent requirement for the immediate infusion of assistance into this great industry.

I heard the Acting Prime Minister last week—the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp)—say on television that it would be contrary to the government's anti-inflationary program to provide any cash assistance to the western wheat grower. I think that is rubbing it into the farmer pretty badly. Surely there is nobody in the country who has suffered more from the squeeze created by inflation than the western farmer, or the farmer generally. For the official spokesman of the government to tell the western wheat grower that much needed assistance cannot be granted because it would be contrary to the government's anti-inflationary program is really rubbing it in where it hurts.

Does anybody seriously contend that it would add to the inflationary forces in western Canada for such assistance to be granted? Does anybody seriously contend that the situation in the wheat growing areas contributes to the inflationary pressures in Canada today? What has happened to the selective policy of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson)? I refer to those anti-inflationary measures to be applied where there are inflationary pressures. Has this policy been abandoned or does the Minister of Finance and the government envisage that the budgetary surplus will be of such a size that the government cannot grant some assistance where it is badly needed, not just to shore up the farmers but to prevent a serious breakdown in the economy of this whole region?

• (3:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister spoke a good deal about the difficulty of working out a policy that does not involve farmers who have lots of assets but are strapped for cash. These farmers are in their present situation because they did what they were urged to do. They improved their method of production, they bought equipment, and perhaps they bought some land. Are we going to sit back in this parliament and see some of the best farmers in the west destroyed while the Prime Minister figures out some way of making certain that farmers who have substantial assets, but are badly strapped for cash, do not get any assistance from the government?

What we are talking about is the saving of an industry from facing grave difficulties. I suggest that what the Prime Minister said is quite irrelevant to the issue, and that these farmers may be in dire need of assistance. If they do not receive it agriculture in this country may receive a very heavy blow.

A variety of programs might have been adopted as an emergency measure. It might have been possible to work out a program with regard to payment for storage on the farm. This would have had the merit of paying for service rendered by the farmers in preserving an asset expected to be of value. I think the time has come when there is very little choice available to the government except to resort to some form of acreage payment, which has the merit of getting cash into the hands of the farmers quickly.

The Prime Minister spoke about a program of income support for farmers. When he was chided a few minutes ago for not having carried this program out, he said, "We did". I think he would have a very difficult time convincing members of this house that his pledge was carried out, and a much more difficult time convincing farmers in the western part of the country that he carried out his commitment, or even that he commenced to carry it out. The best example of this is the fact that the submission to the government, made by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture as long ago as May 28 has so far received no answer.

I think it is very clear that the government of Canada is taking the attitude that the present difficulties are entirely due to international developments beyond its control. I do not accept that. I think the Prime Minister was right when he said a year ago that Canada has not done an adequate job in selling wheat. I think that that statement which was true a year ago is even more true today.

The Prime Minister is back from his lecture tour in the west. He talked tough to the prairie farmers for the benefit of the eastern audiences. The western farmers certainly do not need to be told about the hard realities in the long term or in the short run. But they need to be told about the plans that this government has to be of assistance to them.

At a time of very serious uncertainty regarding agriculture, the government in the last months has simply added to the uncertainty. The Prime Minister spoke about cutbacks in wheat production, but no one has indicated what policy the government has to encourage alternatives to grain production if there is to be a cut-back in it. The Prime Minister proposed, apparently offhandedly, to pay farmers a salary for life under the condition that they surrender their land to the state. The Prime Minister continues to suggest that the farmers do not understand the national problems, but he does so without giving any indication that he understands the farmers' problems.

Parliament wants to know what emergency program the government plans to adopt to meet the short term crisis when the government will begin to implement this program, and when it will tell parliament what it proposes to do. We and the country generally have been asking for this for months, and we received only evasions.

Inflation is no answer. The government's anti-inflationary program is no excuse. The fact that some of these farmers have substantial assets but no cash is no excuse. This is no excuse for allowing the industry to get into deeper and deeper difficulties, and allowing many of our best farmers to go under economically. The fact that the international difficulties have increased in depth is no excuse for sitting back and refusing to deal with an emergency which exists in this country today.

I say to the Prime Minister and the responsible minister in this government: Act, and you will receive the support of members of this house. Act to meet a serious situation. The time is long past when it is sufficient simply for a Prime Minister of this country to ask questions, either in this house or on the farms of this country. What we need is action, and we expect it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Wheat Export Prices

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care to the two previous speeches, and in particular to the last words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) about action. They brought to my mind something that was said about his predecessor, namely, that he mistook acting for action. I point out again that I listened with great care. When he spoke about what kind of action is needed, the only thing he could come up with was the solution offered by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he was prime minister, namely, acreage payments. This is a remedy of some kind, but it is my hope that if we were to adopt this solution we will try to do it with somewhat more refinement than the way in which it was done in 1958, 1960 and 1962. Obviously it did not solve the problem at that time. If it had, we would not have to deal with it today.

An hon. Member: Who is acting now?

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: Again may I say that I listened with great care to the Leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas). For example, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Canadian government has been "trailing behind developments" regarding wheat, and he said "We derive very little benefit from this process".

We tried desperately hard and are still trying to save the International Grains Arrangement. In the process we may have lost a number of sales, but it was worth the effort. The other day in Washington when the Australians made a great to-do about getting out of the road temporarily in order to accommodate other exporter members of the I.G.A., I had no hesitation in saying we had made our effort previously. It was six months ago that Canada contributed greatly to the maintenance of this agreement. In my view the sacrifices we made at that time were worth while.

The Leader of the Opposition points to the fact that by "trailing behind" we may have done wrong—that may be too strong a word—to the Canadian wheat economy, and he points to the United States as an example of a country that has moved ahead. I do not see it this way. Last year the United States sold 750 million bushels; this year they are down to 525 million bushels. This should help me make the point that I thought I had made previously, namely, that this is not exclusively a Canadian problem; it is an international problem. For this reason I believe we have to find the right combination in trying to influence events and also in adapting to those events.

I was in Washington just a week ago. I have spent five days there in the last month. I was in Washington with representatives of the other exporter members of the I.G.A. Canada tried as hard as possible to prevent a collapse of wheat prices in the world. We tried to restore co-operation among exporters under the I.G.A., without this co-operation nothing can be done.

I have been asked in the house on a number of occasions to say what kind of success or failure we had. I said on a number of occasions that I did not know. I think the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic party should give me credit for not having tried to take them down the golden path in any way. I was very sincere in my answers, because I did not know. Nobody else knew—neither the Leader of the Opposition nor the leader of the New Democratic party—exactly what would happen, because wheat marketing depends upon a number of circumstances that are not within the exclusive control of the Caandian government. Two things the Canadian government does not control are the weather and the policies of other countries.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? He is dealing with this matter on an international basis, as if it were an international crisis. For six weeks 29 ships were waiting in Vancouver harbour. Was that an international problem or a problem of this government?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have answered the hon. member's question on a number of occasions. Weather had a great deal to do with that situation, but I cannot convince those who do not want to be convinced to accept my views.

We tried very hard at Washington. On Friday afternoon the Americans announced the "corrective measures" they were taking. As is known by now, they were reducing the price of ordinary, hard, red, winter wheat at Gulf and Atlantic ports by 12 cents a bushel.

A number of other specific cuts have been made by the United States for other types of wheat. I have since been asked by the press whether I was surprised by these announcements. I have been asked whether they were

in the spirit of the Washington meetings. Frankly, I prefer not to comment on that subject at this time because it would not be wise so to do; it would not be in the best interests of Canadian farmers and of the Wheat Board. We have not yet heard from Australia and the European Economic Community on that subject.

This morning the Canadian Wheat Board announced its own adjustments to cope with the new situation created by the United States move and moves made previously by other exporters. As hon. members know, price reductions announced this morning range from 1⅛th cents a bushel to eight cents a bushel for spring wheat, depending on grade and export position. These are the corrective measures we have had to take.

I have been asked whether this is the final move or only the first round. It is not possible for me to predict this, because I do not know what will be the reaction of other countries to the Canadian announcement. The Canadian government hopes that a new plateau has been reached and exporting countries will rally at that level. It is not possible to know what the future has in store.

The two hon. members who spoke before me seemed to find this an extraordinary situation and said it was catastrophic that in the last year Canada exported only about 310 million bushels. I shall try to put the record straight. I am not trying to make anything out of these figures but simply to put forward the right assessment of the situation. The golden years to which the two hon. members referred, in comparison with this year's picture were extraordinary in Canadian wheat history. In order to assess more precisely what present exports are, I think one should refer to figures for a number of previous years. I quote the following figures for the record: 1958-59, 294.5 million bushels; 1959-60, 277.3 million bushels; 1960-61, 353.2 million bushels; 1961-62, 358 million bushels; 1962-63, 331.3 million bushels:

One has to bear these figures in mind. When one comes to more recent years, the figures rise tremendously: 1963-64, 594.1 million bushels; 1964-65, 399.6 million bushels; 1965-66, 584.9 million bushels; 1966-67, 516.3 million bushels; 1967-68, 335.6 million bushels; and this year about 305 million or 310 million bushels. But 1963-64 and 1965-66 were extraordinary years. However, when one tries to assess the present situation in regard to Canadian exports one has to consider a longer period of years, and 310 million bushels is not such a catastrophic export figure.

All kinds of figures have been quoted about the percentage of Canadian exports compared with those of other exporters. The figure 10 per cent was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition. I should like to know where he got that figure. The figure I have here in respect of Canadian exports for 1968 is 19.20 per cent. For the previous year the figure was 17 per cent, for the previous year 26 per cent, and for 1965 27 per cent. The figure for 1959 was 20 per cent, for 1958 22 per cent, for 1956 21 per cent, and so on. Therefore, there is no tremendous difference which could create the impression that is being created here today.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it matters very much, but the minister was not referring to what I said; he was referring to the figures quoted by the leader of the New Democratic party.

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I apologize if I gave the wrong impression.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the figures I quoted the minister will find in table No. 1, copied from figures released by the F.A.O. and submitted to the minister and his colleagues in a brief presented by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture on May 28, 1969. These figures are given taken from the F.A.O. and deal with Canada's share of the world's grain trade.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: There are all kinds of ways of assessing these things. You have commercial, non-commercial, concessional sales and so on. I would have to go into detail in order to make a proper assessment. Mr. Speaker, we now have a situation in wheat production that is, I do not know whether I should say abnormal, but certainly strange.

Mr. Woolliams: I have never seen it so strange.

Mr. Pepin: Stay with us and you will see other things that are strange. The last three years have seen exceptional harvests. As a matter of fact, all over the world in each of the last three years a record has been broken. As a result it is obvious that the grain trade in the world has gone down substantially.

In the year 1965-66 the world trade totalled 2.3 billion bushels. In the most recent crop year, shipment of wheat was less than 1.7

billion bushels, a reduction of more than 25 per cent. This represents a reduction in world trade of 600 million bushels of wheat.

It would be somewhat unusual if this tremendous decline that has taken place had not been reflected in the Canadian trading picture. I think if one wanted to be fair in one's assessment of the situation—which I am not sure some members of the opposition wish to be—one would have to bear this in mind.

Reference has been made to the fact that the Soviet Union has not taken up its commitments for Canadian wheat. If the Soviet Union had taken the 135 million bushels still due under the last contract, then Canadian sales would have been about 305 million or 310 million bushels, plus the 135 million bushels to the Soviet Union, for a total of 440 million bushels, quite a good trading year.

Mr. Stanfield: You cannot live on ifs.

Mr. Pepin: No. But the Leader of the Opposition could not have predicted either that this would happen, and had the Soviet Union fulfilled its commitment the market situation would have been different, and we would not have had today's debate.

The same situation obtains in relation to stocks held throughout the world. The drop in world trade in wheat has been matched by the increment in stocks held by the five major exporting countries. On June 30, 1969 stocks reached a record level of 2.4 billion bushels. At the conclusion of the Kennedy round negotiations in the spring of 1967, stocks amounted to only 1.4 billion bushels.

I am trying to indicate that the conditions when the I.G.A. was signed were quite different from present day circumstances. One of the purposes of the I.G.A. was to provide for necessary adjustments to newly arising circumstances, but unfortunately we did not have the kind of co-operation between I.G.A. exporters and importers needed to meet this objective. It is very difficult for countries to co-operate when there is a surplus of production.

The Leader of the Opposition seemed to accuse the Prime Minister of having promised that this government would sell 1.3 billion bushels of wheat in three years. As I said, we have sold 305 million bushels this year, so I do not think we will meet our objective for this year at least. However, things may improve in the next two. In 1968-69 had we sold 135 million bushels to the Soviet Union, as contemplated we would have totalled 445 million bushels, which if multiplied by three would reach our objective quite easily.

May I now move to the next part of my remarks. It has been implied that the government has not been as co-operative as it should have been in regard to the western wheat economy. The leader of the New Democratic party questioned the claim of the government that it gives all the support it can to the Wheat Board. He asked what we had done to support the I.G.A., what kind of credit facilities we had made available and what kind of food aid in terms of wheat the government had given.

Since time is short I should like very quickly to review the situation. I am not trying to say that what the government has done is enough; I am just indicating that it would be well if members of the opposition knew what had been done and is being done by the present government. I also want the Canadian public to know what has been done to protect and to assist the Canadian wheat economy.

First of all, we have made initial payments. As is well known, the Canadian government makes some initial payments every year, currently on the basis of $1.70 per bushel for Manitoba Northern No. 1, other grades being adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Korchinski: This price is getting a little shaky.

Mr. Pepin: Yes, it is indeed. I think it is well for members of the opposition to realize what a floor price really means. Allowing 15 cents a bushel for storage and operating costs, on the basis of a $1.70 a bushel initial payment, the Canadian Wheat Board must sell No. 1 wheat at an average price of $1.85 per bushel in order not to call for government support. Should there be further declines in prices throughout the world, the Canadian government would find itself committed to very substantial amounts of money. The floor price acts as a guarantee for the western farmer, a very important protection in times like these.

Secondly, there are the provisions of the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act. I was told by people who accompanied the Prime Minister on his visit to western Canada that there are some who are still unsure of the effects of the measures the government has taken. As is well known, or should be well known to hon. members, in November 1968 this act was amended to provide for a doubling of the maximum amount of interest free

advance available to producers, namely, an increase from $3,000 to $6,000. We have also taken action to enable producers to obtain interest free emergency cash advances for the purpose of drying wheat amounting to $600 per producer.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, to help offset the effects of reduced delivery opportunities, the government has directed that prairie grain farmers will be eligible for full interest free cash advances in the new crop year even though outstanding advances have not been fully repaid as at the end of this crop year. Last year these advances amounted to something like $156 million. As at the end of this year between $60 million and $65 million remains unpaid. Added to this $60 million to $65 million there are next year's cash advance payments, so one can conservatively estimate that about $250 million will be put into circulation in this way on which the government will pay interest. This amount represents quite a substantial contribution by the government of Canada to the economy of western Canada.

The leader of the New Democratic party also asked me about credit facilities. The wheat sale a couple of weeks ago to Peru was based on the new credit facilities the government is now offering, namely $6 million this year and $6 million next year. This arrangement facilitates sales of wheat in a number of developing countries where the Canadian government feels it should assist the marketing efforts of the board. Again, this is an important contribution. Again, this is something for which the Wheat Board is grateful to the government.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Very often questions are heard here: "Is the minister doing everything he can for the Wheat Board?" I do not know what more I could do to help the Wheat Board. If you consult the commissioners I am sure that is the report you will get

I will not go into the provisions of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act but, Mr. Speaker, action taken under this legislation this year represents a further contribution of some $60 million from the Canadian government to the wheat economy. That is not peanuts. I am merely trying to put the record straight and demonstrate that something is being done. One would not believe it on listening today to the speeches of the leader of the New Democratic Party and the Leader of the Opposition.

I wish to draw attention to the increased foreign aid that has benefited western farmers. For instance, when the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) allowed acreage payments to western farmers, in 1958, 1960, and 1962, the total of those payments, represented $120 million. In that period, of four years running from 1958, to 1962, the amount of foreign aid given by the Canadian government represented $66 million. If you take the last four years you will see that the present government has provided wheat and flour aid worth $260 million to developing countries of the world. I repeat from 1964 to 1969 Canada has given $260 million in wheat aid. So I suggest that the leader of the N.D.P. was not well informed when he said that tremendous amounts of money could be put into these programs. A tremendous amount of money has gone into them, and that is why I was a bit sarcastic when I said he should know better than make the statements he was making.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Will the minister permit a question? Will he specify how much money was paid out in each of the crop years? Could he tell us how much has gone into foreign aid with respect to wheat and flour.

Mr. Pepin: I have the figures.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Has the minister the figures for the last three crop years? If so, do they include the figures for the present year?

Mr. Pepin: In part. Let us not be too political, Mr. Speaker, let us begin with the period 1963-64. The figure is $4.4 million. For 1964-65 it is $20 million; for 1965-66, $30 million; for 1966-67, $89 million; for 1967-68, $63 million and for 1968-69, $56 million. One of the main reasons our aid has been declining is that there is simply less need for us to give food to the world. It is well known that Pakistan and India are, at the moment, almost self-sufficient in wheat. Because of that our aid to that area has not been so necessary.

I listened to opposition spokesmen saying that this government is not doing well enough

in the publicizing and marketing of our grains. They left the impression that the Wheat Board is in a Fuller brush type of operation. That is not so. Very few individuals in today's world are actually buying wheat, and I am sure that they are properly visited and attended by the Wheat Board. The leader of the N.D.P. left the impression that the Canadian government had not done its homework and that the Wheat Board was not publicizing Canadian wheat properly. That is not so. The Wheat Board has numbers of missions coming in and going out. As a matter of fact I ought to be in my office at this moment receiving a delegation from Tanzania and Uganda.

The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has a number of missions, both ingoing and outgoing, that publicize Canadian goods, and wheat in particular. The department has offices in some 70 odd countries. We have trade commissioners who devote an extensive amount of time looking for sales and trying to help the Canadian Wheat Board. On numerous occasions the Wheat Board has said to me how grateful it is for the help these trade commissioners are providing.

As I look around the world I ask myself, where is there a better system for the marketing of wheat? I do not know of one. Yet the opposition inveighs against our system of wheat marketing. If our sales are not as great as we wish, that is because circumstances are not what they were. A number of countries that were importers in the past have now become self-sufficient; and a number of those that were self-sufficient have now become exporters, Roumania, Bulgaria, and Kenya are examples in question.

The wheat glut was mentioned. The leader of the N.D.P. hoped that the present world situation will not continue to exist for ever. I was about to say, "Amen", but that might not be very Christian. I might only mention that the cycles he referred to are very real and that sooner or later there should be a greater need for Canadian wheat. In those circumstances we will meet the objectives the Prime Minister set for Canadian exports.

That is about all I had to say, Mr. Speaker. I shall be glad to answer questions. Of course the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) will also take part in this debate.

Mr. Korchinski: Will the minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if the minister would indicate whether at the recent meeting in Washington the members of the European Economic Community, France in particular, agreed not to go to the Far East because of excessive freight rates and close competition? Did they not at the same time leave themselves this opening: that they could still compete at a lower level? Was that not why the United States dropped its price, and why Canada had to follow suit?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, at the Washington meeting the E.E.C. was represented by an official and not by a politician. Consequently the official made a report to the E.E.C. After receiving that report the E.E.C. made an offer to the United States, the terms of which in part are those to which my hon. friend has referred, but probably not for the reason he gave. What the E.E.C. will do in view of the United States action of Friday afternoon I do not know. We shall find out in the coming hours.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here today with what might be called the "deadly incoming tide of wheat". The problem is acute, as I have had the opportunity of noting on a visit out West with the committee on agriculture.

Indeed, the situation is serious, for the income of the farmer no longer suffices for him to pay for his equipment or enlarge his land, which, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, may be worth $100,000 or $125,000.

Last spring, I met farmers in Saskatchewan and Alberta who had to move their equipment outside in order to store the wheat they had produced in huge quantities in the last few years.

Now, if a farmer cannot sell all his wheat, even though his farm may be worth $100,000 or $125,000, he still needs his daily bread. Surely, under those circumstances, he should be guaranteed on honest sustenance.

A bill allowing farmers to get interest free loans would enable them to survive but it would not solve the problem, which is one of finding outlets and, in our present economic system, where can those outlets be found?

Half of mankind suffers from malnutrition. Farmers have to let wheat rot in the fields or in barns, as I said a while ago, leaving the economic system at the mercy of the chartered banks, with the co-operation of a government that will not base money upon production which if monetized, could be distributed to the underfed part of humanity.

Last Sunday, I heard a missionary back from Paraguay who said that in that country two million people suffer from malnutrition. Their average income is less than $200 per year and does not even enable them to eat once a day, while we in Canada live in the midst of plenty. I do not blame the government for that, but the system that the government promotes and maintains and on account of which such plenty which is left to rot and is not shared with those who would need it.

I explained that a while ago when congratulations were expresed for the Appollo journey. When, in a world of scientists, we can afford accomplishments of that kind, while living people cannot ship wheat where it should be sent, I say there is something wrong with the economic system and that we should most urgently change such a defective system so as to be able to distribute such abundance, for we insult God every day.

We of the Ralliement créditiste say let those millions represent the value of wheat. Let the Bank of Canada create money as quickly as wheat yields, namely 60 seeds out of one per year, and let that abundance be distributed according to the will of the superior being, who enabled us to see such magnificent things these last days, let wheat, a seed of which can yield 60 more per year, be shipped to everyone so that Canada may be considered tomorrow as the bread basket of the world.

Let us no longer allow the banks to withdraw the money, with the co-operation of the Bank of Canada, instead of letting them control the volume of money by making the farmers and the workers work and by charging them interest at 10 per cent. Rather than concentrating the wealth in the hands of a few people and impoverishing those who really do the work, like the western farmers for instance—and I know several who are very hard workers, who produce today just as they did in wartime, which made it possible for us to fight against these who wanted to impose dictature upon us, and to feed the armed forces—let us find today the necessary funds to ship this wheat to those who need it.

I say it now and I have said it before, that we would not object to some assistance being provided to less privileged countries if we were able once and for all to settle our problems which in fact are rather of an economic nature.

Means of transportation are not lacking. Farmers have reached the goal they had set for themselves and have increased their production as was required of them. In fact we did ask them, during a tour over there: What do you want? More than 1,000 people, who had come as far as 200 miles in order to meet the federal members in the hands of whom they had placed their hopes, asked us to settle those problems once and for all. They said: we want the West to be the granary of the world and we wish to feed all mankind.

Those people are so truly willing that I think that in addition to insulting God who has allowed such abundance, we are insulting those who have produced that wheat, who have toiled and laboured and who expected to be the providers of the human race. Let me remind them however—unless I need not do so—that they have heard that quite often, during the recent tour of the Prime Minister.

In 1962, I had the opportunity of talking of the problems of the Quebec farmers. I am very well acquainted with those problems since I have been myself a farmer, having inherited some land from one of my uncles.

We have also lost our family farm, in Quebec. If the government does not take the necessary steps, in the West, there will no longer be any family farm. The capitalists, who take advantage of the farmers, as they did in Quebec, are going to buy a lot of land and within the next 50 years, the government will say: we must impose socialism or communism; we must redistribute the land.

There appears to be many people of good will since, as we saw a while ago, all those who have asked for and requested this emergency debate will co-operate to solve this problem once for all.

It is perhaps necessary that people study especially a little further the story told us by the Bible of how they managed to preserve for seven years the wheat in the warehouses at the time of Joseph. They were able, with the backwards means at their disposal in those days, to foresee that there would perhaps be famines one day. Now there is famine today in some countries. As for us, we ask, as I said before, that production should exist at the same time as the making of money so as to convey this plenty to those who need it.

I know that the Prime Minister also explained that many farmers in the Maritimes are struggling with economic difficulties, like those in Quebec. We also talked of it, especially in relation to the dairy industry.

• (4:40 p.m.)

But those problems exist, in the Maritimes as well as in the West. People are always complaining. We have there an obvious proof that our economic system does not meet the needs and that it is high time in 1969, for intelligent men to work together and find an economic system which will enable a distribution of that wealth and which should be a blessing to the extent where people will cooperate. Let it not be said, as is too often heard, that it is a curse. Such a statement is made each time the problem is brought to the attention of the house.

As for us, who are taking part in the drafting of legislation, we must act so that those people will have from now on three meals daily. Legislators should be able to find an economic system which would allow a distribution of this wealth, because at the moment, we do not know where we are going.

As I said, if the right hon. Prime Minister asserts that farmers in the Maritime provinces and in Quebec are poorer, it means that there are problems to be solved. In fact, it means that Canada is going bankrupt and that agriculture which is a basic industry in any country—and which we should protect to feed the Canadian people—is in jeopardy. We should provide for a fair distribution of this affluence—money, wheat—to feed this portion of mankind which survives on one meal a day.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that we approve of this urgency debate. At the same time, I ask the people from the West to have consideration for the farmers in eastern Canada who also find themselves in great financial difficulties. We shall endeavor by working hand in hand to find not simply a band-aid solution but a means whereby work will be paid for and each farmer will get a sufficient income to meet reasonably the needs of his family.

When we visited western Canada, the farmers told us outright that if they were not to receive any additional grants, they would have to put up with what they called the depreciation of their farm implements, of their buildings and of their lands. However, I must remind them that in eastern Canada, in the Maritimes, farmers have been living with that for more than ten years—and this is why they gave up their lands—and that is the reason why the policy now in force in the West amounts to a fiasco. As far as I am concerned, I put the blame on our economic system. Let us work together so that we may change it very quickly.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with delight to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) as I always do. He has this fatalistic approach which is summed up in the old song "Que Sera Sera"—"Whatever will be, will be". I think that is the approach the minister has taken in respect of this particular problem. I see nothing in what he has said today to change my opinion. I believe he made only one statement with which I was in wholesale agreement. He admitted that he really does not know what the answers are. I think he should have sat down at that point. That is a good statement. It sets out the government's position; they do not know.

Mr. Pepin: That is not what I said.

Mr. Baldwin: That was the impression I received and I heard it repeated twice. The minister went on to say that this is not exclusively a Canadian problem. Of course it is not. But to my knowledge no other government have with such great skill and ingenuity exaggerated the problem as have the Canadian government. In plain fact they have been inept in their handling of this particular problem.

Let us look at the situation. A year and a half ago one could see this problem, and variations and refinements of it, developing. The party opposite which now forms the government was very engrossed in the fascinating job of choosing a leader, and then in setting the groundwork for an election. I suggest that this government has lost for this country a year, or a year and a half in which it could well have been dedicating its attention to the problem which was apparent to so many of us. During the election campaign I and a number of my colleagues on this side of the house could see what was developing, and discussed the matter during the course of the election campaign.

I agree with the minister when he says that there also is less of a need now than there was in the past in certain areas of the world in which grain was purchased and used by the emerging countries. I feel, however, that although there is less of a need in certain countries there is still a need in the world as a whole, and will be for a great many years, for Canada to make available a greater portion of the agricultural production which it has been so skillful in developing.

I suggest that the government and its agencies have had hardening of the arteries in their approach to this problem, that there is a capacity in the world to absorb a greater degree of our surplus agricultural production, and that the government cannot excuse itself by saying in certain areas there is less need.

We have all known for some time that the development of new strains of wheat in other parts of the world, particularly Mexico, and the capability of some of the newly emerging countries to make use of fertilizer have eased the agricultural problems in those areas. But there are millions of people to which this situation does not apply. I believe this government stands indicted for its failure to recognize that fact, and it is useless for the minister to quote very selective statistics, as he did today, in an attempt to get rid of this impression. The government stands indicted for its failure to look after its traditional markets. The abilities of the agencies of government and of the government itself have not been adequate to do this.

Other members have said this in better words than I can use. My leader, and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), have indicated in very eloquent terms that this is the fact. I am sure other speakers will follow me.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. The hon. member says the government is guilty of not marketing aggressively enough. Marketing is the function of the Canadian Wheat Board. Is the accusation one against the Canadian Wheat Board? I think if that is what the hon. member has in mind he should say so.

Mr. Forrestall: As the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) would say, accept your own responsibility.

Mr. Baldwin: This government, led by a new leader, sought and secured election on its claimed ability to solve the problems with which we are faced. It is certainly not for me to indicate to the minister or his colleagues precisely whether or not their responsibility should be increased. But there is no doubt that a government such as this government which, as I said, sought and secured election on the basis of what it would undertake to do, has failed, and in doing so has failed to give leadership to all the agencies in this country which, together with the government, must initiate and carry out programs. What is being done is not adequate and it cannot find an escape in the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

I will go so far as to say that there should be more vigour and more persistence on the part of all the agencies which come directly under the government, and which are ultimately responsible through the government to the people of Canada, in dealing with this problem. I think there is a need for inspiration and leadership. I am convinced that over the course of the last year and a half we have lost some of our traditional markets which we will have great difficulty in renewing in the days which lie ahead.

Finally I should like to deal with one aspect of the question; that is, how to get some of the people engaged in the agricultural industry, who in the past have been involved specifically in wheat production, into other areas of agricultural production so that there may be available for the areas which are most competent to grow wheat the ability and the right to do so?

• (4:50 p.m.)

I should like to give the house a case history involving the Peace River area. This is not the first time I have brought this matter before the house. As a result of asking oral and written questions, by attempting to obtain the unanimous consent of the house for discussion on previous occasions, and through personal communications with the minister involved I have attempted to point out that in the great, fertile northern part of Alberta there have been specific problems. This is an area which for many years grew some of the world's best wheat.

The name Herman Trelle was known in association with championship wheat at all the wheat expositions throughout the world. For years Herman Trelle and those who followed him obtained the world wheat title for this north country. But because it has become apparent to some of the people up there that they have to diversify the agricultural industry, this is no longer the case.

These people have not entirely stopped growing wheat, but they have found other ways of expressing a capacity to produce, and they have been diligent about doing so.

Some weeks ago I drew to the attention of the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), the fact that a meeting was to be held in the town of Falher in the Peace River country to discuss a very special problem. I read into the record of this house a copy of a telegram I received from

the president of the chamber of commerce in which he invited the minister and his colleague to attend.

Mr. Stanfield: Where's the minister today?

Mr. Baldwin: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is here, but I look in vain for the Minister of Agriculture who is no doubt exhausted by his efforts to attempt to shepherd the Prime Minister through parts of western Canada.

This invitation was extended personally to the minister. I did not seek to make a political issue of this because the problems of thousands of people were involved, but I did genuinely hope and desire that the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, would attend. Falher is, generally speaking, the centre of a large French-speaking area in northern Alberta. Agriculturists from Quebec have come to this area and they are some of the best farmers we have in the Peace River country.

At the time of this particular meeting these people were deeply interested in a debate which was being carried on in this house on the official languages bill. They were particularly anxious that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce as a minister from Quebec, and the Minister of Agriculture from their own province, would attend the meeting. In any event this invitation was extended.

I went up there and learned about problems of which I was aware, at least to a certain extent. These people presented me with details of a solution to a problem about which the government had done nothing. In the agricultural industry there are general problems and specific problems, which exist in various areas. In this regard the government could have acted. It is of some interest to note that the northern part of Alberta, and what is known as the B.C. block of the Peace River area, have more farmers on a unit basis in their populations than exist in any other part of this country.

This meeting was attended by a number of farmers, representatives of agricultural industries, farm unions, co-operatives, municipal organizations and elevator companies—all the people who are dependent and concerned in respect of their livelihood upon this agricultural industry in northern Alberta.

I discovered that in this Peace River area there were between five million and six million bushels of feed grain. This grain does not have to be exported or carried in box cars to Vancouver or Fort William where it is piled up waiting to be unloaded in order that the cars can be sent back. This is grain which could be sold, and there was a market for it in British Columbia and in parts of eastern Canada. It included barley, oats, and a lot of lower grades of wheat available for sale as feed, and it was wanted by the feed mills for agricultural purposes in the two regions I have mentioned.

It is also a fact that a great many of these farmers did not have a one bushel quota. The majority of them had two bushel quotas, although a few had a three bushel quota. This information was confirmed by representatives of elevator companies. Many of these farmers could never achieve a five bushel quota which I understand has been underwritten by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the government.

These people were asking for the opportunity to have boxcars moved in, so that they could be filled with this grain and dispatched to those areas in Canada where they could be unloaded immediately and the grain utilized. Some of these farmers admitted to me that they had illegally hauled grain in their trucks, or by custom trucking, a distance of 100 to 125 miles to elevators at Dawson Creek in British Columbia. Some of them were turned back and one or two were prosecuted. Uultimately the police were alerted, and I understand this practice has now stopped. This was grain needed by buyers of feed grain in Dawson Creek, who had urged these people to bring it over.

I was told by certain farmers that they had gone to Edmonton in a desparate effort to find markets for their feed grain, and that this grain could be sold. When these potential buyers were told that the grain was in Peace River they in turn informed the farmers that when they obtained an undertaking for the supply of boxcars they would buy the grain.

As I have said, this whole problem involves some five million to six million bushels of grain, the sales of which would have brought in revenue to the extent of $4 million or $5 million. These people would not need some of the government's guarantee, about which the minister has told us. This is the sad story of these people in the northern part of Alberta. It represents the unwillingness of the government to acknowledge the problem, and the failure of the government at the appropriate time to appoint, as it could have done, people to expedite the marketing and transportation of this grain. Had this government asked this

house for the authority to do so, I am sure it would have obtained it. This is a sad story of the ineptitude and the failure of this government to recognize a problem which so seriously affects all the people of western Canada, and particularly those people of Peace River for whom I am trying to make this case.

• (5:00 p.m.)

This failure is recognized. I have in my hands a recent editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, a paper which usually supports the government but which is objective when it comes to the recognition of the problems of agricultural Canada. This editorial says in part:

> The federal task force on agriculture, in a report in March, was strongly critical of policies of both the government and the Canadian Wheat Board which had put undue emphasis on the production of wheat. It found that the temporary Wheat Reserves Act which provided assistance to farmers with farm stored wheat, "subsidizes producers' incomes after they have produced in excess of market demands, and encourages them to continue producing." It held that the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act was stacked in favour of the production of wheat: it pays a higher price per bushel on wheat than on oats and barley. It held that the Canadian Wheat Board had been traditionally prejudiced against feed grains and in favour of milling wheat—

Further, on, in dealing with probable solutions—I come back to the question which the minister slid over regarding one of the proposals which emanated from this party, and from other opposition parties, on the matter of acreage payments—it reads as follows:

> Acreage payments were three times used by the Diefenbaker government to cushion farmers over bad years, though the payments then were $1 an acre with a maximum of $200 per farmer. It is the quickest way of getting cash—which is the immediate need—into farmers' hands.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member but his time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous agreement of the house.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Baldwin: I have one more sentence, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I say that there are solutions, and that we are not prepared to forget the defects and the deficiencies of the government over the last year and a half. I suggest that they seek out the ways and means which can be utilized to bring the farmers of western Canada over the most difficult of periods, and if they do so I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that they will find ample support from this side of the house.

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should apologize for speaking on agriculture as in a way I am a city person whose only real experience with agriculture has been working on ranches in Alberta in my youth, which does not qualify me to speak on present day wheat problems because, first, I was not on a wheat farm, and second, my youth was long enough ago that the knowledge I gained then is almost irrelevant today.

Mr. Baldwin: Don't you worry, the Prime Minister speaks about them.

Mr. Pepin: And so do you.

Mr. Osler: But I wanted to speak in this debate, and I think I know a little about the problem. I felt therefore that I must get up and speak; especially when I find that the much-publicized western rump of the conservative party is so poorly represented in the debate this afternoon, and someone must give a western point of view.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Osler: I think that we have all had a very instructive speech from the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I just hope that there will be more hon. members who will express their thoughts because though they have been vocal at other times, this is the time for them to be constructively so.

Mr. Aiken: They will be. Just wait, they are here today.

Mr. Osler: I suppose they will speak when their roster system allows them to do so.

An hon. Member: Don't be jealous just because you cannot work one out.

Mr. Osler: However, speaking seriously, I do not think anybody, anywhere would try to say that there is not a large problem. Every man and his dog have an opinion about how they can help the farmer, but most of their solutions are so costly, and would be so ruinous to the country as a whole that not much of the country would be left if they were adopted.

However, there is a very bad world wide problem in agriculture and I suppose that no matter what government were in power the problem would exist. There are at least four

countries that share the problem with Canada. As the minister pointed out, it is not a uniquely Canadian problem. Price structures have been breaking down throughout the world, and Canadian farmers cannot earn a decent return on the capital that is involved. A little while ago a letter came to my hands which I find rather typical. It is from a man in Manitoba who runs a fairly good sized operation, and who wrote as follows:

> At the moment our current operating debt is in the neighbourhood of $19,000 acquired over the past year and a half. Our interest charges this year have been in excess of $5,000 and farming over the past years has not been able to generate that kind of money—

He is operating 820 acres. He has about a $90,000 investment, and he is considered a model farmer in his area. He has 12,000 bushels of wheat, plus a lot of other crops, but he has no cash and he cannot meet his commitments. This is like any other industry that is going through a long-term problem to which long-term solutions must be applied. The traditional export markets have evaporated. The types of wheat in demand in the world have changed. To a large extent we are growing types of wheat that are no longer needed because milling techniques have changed. Inflation has driven up operating costs. According to an article in *Maclean's* magazine, which states the obvious but in a rather dramatic way, farm costs have been rising consistently. It reads:

> By 1967, according to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, they were 68 per cent higher than in 1949, yet farm income was up only 9.7 per cent in the same period. On the basis of 1949 dollars, income was down by 33.1 per cent.

There is another thing which I do not think any government should try to sidestep, that is that governments in the immediate past encouraged farmers to grow everything that they could grow and told them that they could sell it. But if you look at the record, again broadly speaking, whether under the former Conservative régime or under this régime, large quantities of wheat have only been sold effectively when there has been trouble; and it is a poor type of practice in any business if you can only succeed when someone else comes a-cropper.

If you have a famine in Russia, in China or somewhere else, then the major wheat producers can unload their surpluses; otherwise they cannot. What I am trying to suggest is that we hear a lot about short-term solutions, but this government would be less than honest with people if it did not say the sort of thing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been saying, and it would be less than conscientious if it did not go for long-term solutions.

There is no use being sentimental at the expense of the poor guy who is out on the farm and saying that we have always produced all the wheat in the world and we can always sell it in the long term, and that sooner or later it will work out; let the boys sit on their wheat for a few years and let the people of Canada carry them for a few years because one of these days the wheat will be sold. I think that is being romantic at someone else's expense. It really is time that the fundamental problem was faced.

There are several solutions to which reference is made all the time. People want two-price wheat. I do not think you can ask the people in the rest of Canada to pay extra for their bread on a long-term basis so as to keep wheat producers producing all the wheat they want, especially at a time when the trend in tariffs is down in eastern Canada and in the central markets of the world.

• (5:10 p.m.)

We cannot have it both ways. If we encourage a tariff-protected industry in western Canada—which we have never had to this date—at the same time as we discourage tariffs in the east, we are being more schizophrenic than anybody would expect even a democratic government to be. I am all for democratic government, but we are sometimes accused of trying to buy people with their own money.

The same argument applies to acreage payments on a long-term basis. Perhaps a case can be made for acreage payments to enable people to live through an emergency, if they are tied in with a policy which encourages farmers to change from wheat to other types of production. However, I believe that long-term acreage payments for the sake of subsidizing a farmer are a dishonest approach to the solution that is required.

Rhetoric such as we have heard here all winter will not help much; neither will misquotes or partial misquotes of the Prime Minister's speeches when he goes west and makes famous statements such as, "I am not going to sell your wheat." I was there, know what he said and what he meant when he said it. If I had been a little less new at the game I would have gone right back and given the rest of his speech at every opportunity, so the message would have been conveyed loud

and clear, rather than its being sullied and misquoted for several weeks.

To illustrate that the present government is not completely ignorant of the situation and completely misunderstands it, I should like to quote from a lead editorial which appeared in the *Financial Times* this week, dealing with problems in the west. The editorial reads in part:

> To say that there is no chance of a general and unselective payment being made to wheat farmers is to face the facts of government economics in this day and age.

This is what we have heard so much talk about: general, unselective payments with no long-term objectives in mind. I believe this type of program would do a disservice to the Canadian farmer in particular and the country as a whole. I hope the government will continue to have enough guts not to advocate such programs, but will move forward with imaginative, long-term policies that do not involve unselective payments generally.

With regard to general subsidies, the New Democratic party seem to want people to be subsidized for this, that and the other thing when the mood of the country is to try to get away from subsidies. A short time ago the Winnipeg *Tribune*, commented editorially on the difficulties experienced in Europe, where in the 1967-68 season because of subsidies 30,000 tons of Italian oranges were destroyed. The article continues:

> This year grapes and apples have joined the waste in rivers and garbage dumps. In France and Belgium thousands of tons of potatoes, peaches, pears, cauliflowers and fish have been destroyed while the cost of living for city people has grown at an ever faster rate. The high cost of food is a major factor.

This situation developed because of the policy of subsidization that all the common market countries have been following; so let us not join our N.D.P. friends in following that Pied Piper very far. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on these matters, but I believe that short-term solutions to meet specific problems such as we have can be devised. In the long run these would not hurt the country as a whole. Short-term aid is already given for drying wheat, and there are advances on unsold and undelivered grain. Further advances will be made next year, as the Prime Minister has said, amounting to millions of dollars. It is all very well to say that these advances are purely loans. They are cash infusions which, if hon. members opposite are correct, should be enough in themselves to help the situation because their purpose is to tide people over to the time when we shall again be selling unlimited quantities of wheat to Russia.

But over and above these, there should perhaps be some form of cash subsidy for a stated length of time to help the farming industry to meet specific, long-term objectives. These objectives might be defined as diversification, rationalization of farm size and efficiency and replacement of some farm employment by industry, using government "seed" money through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, with the co-operation of provincial governments. Another solution would be the encouragement of food banks by the United Nations or other international agencies. These are long-term objectives, and any further short-term aid should be tied in with them.

I apologize again for not being an expert on these matters. We have heard a great deal in the last few months about the great government of Manitoba that was recently defeated at the polls, what a terrific job they were doing and what a lousy job everybody else was doing. We have been told how terribly difficult it was to get Ottawa to pay any attention to them. According to a brief presented to the Manitoba legislature by the Meat Packers Council of Canada last May, within the province of Manitoba itself lies the solution to at least part of its agricultural problem; yet the province did precisely nothing about it.

This is why it is very important to take a long-term view of these problems and to achieve co-operation between the federal and provincial governments in working out policies which are of lasting benefit, rather than shouting names at each other. Hog production in Manitoba has seriously declined, as has cattle production. They are not producing nearly as many cattle and hogs as they should be. The province has the capacity to improve their situation, with federal government help, presumably, if they ask for it and if they have plans that are worth considering and can be used as a basis for co-operation.

Iowa produces 22 million hogs a year. Manitoba, which has about the same population as Iowa and is about the same area, produces only 750,000. North America is a huge meat market and there is no reason for Manitoba producing so few hogs. The Manitoba meat industry is working to only about 65 per cent capacity, mainly for two reasons. The first is that Manitoba farmers are not producing enough cattle and hogs, and there

is not within their shipping area a market of sufficient size for the packing houses. Second, they are not producing cattle or hogs of the quality required.

Many farmers in Manitoba are primarily concerned with dairy products and sell "on the side" the cattle they do not need. There are exceptions, of course, but statistically this is true. Somebody will have to take steps to upgrade the industry in that province and obtain a sizeable proportion of the available market. Manitoba has less than one per cent of the North American hog market, and approximately one per cent of the cattle market. This is one reason for the decline in the industry. From the point of view of quality, 43 per cent of hogs produced in Canada are graded A; in Manitoba only 35 per cent are graded A. The same is true of meat: 56 per cent of cattle slaughtered in Canada are graded as red or blue beef; in Manitoba the figure is 47 per cent.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Manitoba's average is considerably below the national average, both in quality and quantity. Instead of bleating about wheat production and inability to sell, some federal action should be taken in co-operation with the provincial government to improve grades and achieve 100 per cent production capacity. If necessary, more plants should be built to reach a future 100 per cent capacity. The market potential is well-nigh unlimited, but quality must be improved and the product merchandised, the same as with other commodities. But as I say, there must be co-operation between the federal and provincial governments toward these ends.

If this immediate past history of the late provincial government of Manitoba means anything at all, it is indicative of a lot of time-wasting and wringing of hands instead of tackling problems that exist. I guess the late government has now received its just deserts.

I do not have any easy solutions. As I say, even the four major wheat producing countries of the world cannot seem to find solutions. However, I do think that short-term cash infusions are required, and I hope such infusions will be increased. We also need long-term, well thought out plans. Even if we have to listen to the opposition criticise our "inaction" for another six months we would do better to stick to sound principles and prepare some long-term plans to assist the west to return to what it should be, a farming community though not necessarily a predominantly wheat farming one. If we have to take another few million acres out of wheat production, this is not going to be a long-term tragedy. Let us not be romantic about the fact that because we have always grown millions of bushels of wheat we will have to continue to do so, even though the poor farmer has absolutely no way of making an economic living therefrom.

[Mr. Osler.]

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, this debate is but one of a number held this session on agriculture, particularly on agricultural problems in western Canada. Many of the arguments and statements that have been put forward today are a repetition of the arguments addressed since last September. A number of times Your Honour has been requested to grant an emergency debate, and in your wisdom on most occasions Your Honour has ruled it out because the matter had already been brought up repeatedly. I trust Your Honour will understand that we of the opposition have felt obligated, as one of our responsibilities, to keep raising the question, no matter how inconvenient it may be or how untimely or uncomfortable for people in some places. This is an issue that affects the entire nation. It is not narrowly confined to just one or two provinces; all of Canada is affected.

I was hoping that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) would have some announcement to make about new government initiatives to deal with Canada's agricultural problems, particularly in the area of immediate concern today, western Canadian cereal grains and world markets. The minister spoke of it being an international problem, and of course it is. He has told us nothing that we did not already know.

I submit that the minister is incapable of dealing with the problem or of taking new initiatives to find solutions. I say this because when the minister goes to Washington or to Winnipeg he is handcuffed by the government of Canada's lack of policy. In this way the Canadian Wheat Board as well as the minister have been continually handcuffed for the past year. Until the government of this country takes new initiatives and introduces new policies to enable the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Canadian Wheat Board to do the kind of job of which they are capable, there will be no quick solution or improvement to the present situation.

It is all very well for the minister and for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to talk

about an objective of 1,300 million bushels of wheat sales in three years, or whatever the figure is. It is, of course, good to have objectives, but unless the government has the policies to achieve such objectives, or to give some reasonable chance of achieving them, they are all to no avail.

The Prime Minister's recent trip to western Canada, uncomfortable although it may have been for him, is the most recent example of the kind of callous disregard there is for the wheat farmers, as well as an illustration of the government's complete failure to understand the size of the problem, let alone its immediacy. The remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) illustrated this in a first class manner. The hon. member does not comprehend the size of the problem, let alone its immediacy. Only when the government declares that agriculture is a primary industry that is basic to the health and wealth of the entire Canadian economy, and takes action accordingly, will some short-term and long-term policies be forthcoming.

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre on a question of privilege.

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, it did not seem to me that I had indicated that I had no realization that agriculture was a major industry. What I was trying to express, though it may have been difficult for some members to comprehend my remarks, perhaps because I spoke badly or perhaps because of a natural disadvantage, was that agriculture was a major industry, one that had to be given serious consideration. I said that perhaps the emphasis within the industry should be redirected. I was not advocating that agriculture be neglected.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is hardly raising a question of privilege. I think the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) should be allowed to continue his remarks.

Mr. Benjamin: This is a fresh illustration that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, like a lot of his colleagues, does not understand the totality of the problem. The hon. member talked about diversification and referred to hogs and cattle. The farmers have been hearing this kind of talk from Liberals for the last 25 years. One has only to go back to the 1950's when the plea was for diversification. The farmers diversified their operations, and what happened to hog and cattle prices? We were up to our eyes in hogs. We were told that too many hogs were being raised.

The hon. gentleman expects the farmers to diversify their operations and compete with corporate enterprises. I would ask the hon. member if he is prepared to support measures to prohibit corporate enterprise operating farms? If he is, then I will believe that he does understand the problems of the farming industry. We are not talking about a private corporation and its board of directors. We are talking about farmers who work on the land, about people, not corporations. This is what the government, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre still do not understand.

During his trip out west last week the Prime Minister made reference to income protection and mentioned a number of measures that are supposed to ensure income protection. First of all, the Prime Minister felt somewhat insulted by some of the signs and yelling at some of the meetings held in Saskatchewan. The Prime Minister may find things difficult when he arrives at a place where nobody loves him, but I suggest he will become increasingly aware of this sort of thing unless he quits shrugging his shoulders and starts rubbing his shoulders with the problems confronting Canada.

I may say that the kind of demonstration carried on last week by the farmers of western Canada is unusual and extremely rare. Demonstrating is not something that they are prone to do, unlike some people in large urban centres. The farmers are just not built that way. They never have been. If ever there was a sign of outrage, of their extreme disgust and despair, then this was it. The prairie farmers do not make a habit of that kind of demonstration. But for years they have been back and forth to Ottawa with resolutions, briefs and agricultural delegations. At times, when they have become desperate, they have elected a few Liberals, but to no effect. All the time they have received the run around. The government which has refused to face facts, has victimized them. This government has not taken into account the fact that the Canadian agricultural community is basic to the nation's welfare and that western problems cannot be treated as separate problems. The Prime Minister has talked about income protection, the Farm Improvement Loans Act and the Farm Credit Corporation. Well, farmers do not need more loans. They have debts

enough already. And what did the amendments to farm legislation that the Prime Minister spoke about accomplish? In the end, the result of those measures was to raise the interest rates that farmers have to pay from 5 to 7¾ per cent.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mention has been made of cash advances. It seems that all those on the government side have forgotten these must be paid back. The more you advance to a farmer, the more he must pay back. Opposition parties share the government's view that cash advances are necessary. The opposition spent years trying to persuade Liberals to implement those advances, and only after they were defeated in the late 1950's did they become converts to the idea. Although these advances are interest free, they must nevertheless be paid back. The farmer, in fact has not had income protection but he, in common with his fellow Canadians, has been victimized by parasitic, high interest rates. The farmer has been victimized also by the private grain trade, and I hope the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) will agree with me, I submit that this private trade in grain should be subject to controls. These traders have been parasites on the backs of the Canadian agricultural community for too many years.

The Prime Minister talks about income protection at a time when grain prices are low and about to go lower. Bearing these factors in mind, our party proposed a cash deficiency payment program of, say, 20 cents per bushel to be based on deliveries in the 1967-68 crop year, for a maximum of $2,000 in each case. What was the government's response to that? Nothing. It has made no response. If our suggestion is no good let the government explain why it thinks so. Over two dozen proposals have been made by opposition spokesmen, and we are still waiting for the government's reaction to them.

The Prime Minister asks how he can give "X" million dollars to the farmers when he must also consider fishermen and pensioners. He asks, how will he explain it to these other elements, in the population. We are not asking him to explain anything to the farmers, fishermen, pensioners or the unemployed. We want him to explain why he can do nothing for farmers, fishermen, pensioners or the unemployed at a time when his Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will be sitting on his fat surplus of $250 million for this fiscal year. The Prime Minister says nothing about bank profits or outrageously increased corporate profits. Why do the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and all the other mouthpieces on the government side, talk about fighting inflation and then hurt the people who are not causing inflation. Farmers who have no cash cannot contribute to inflation. Fishermen, pensioners and the unemployed are not guilty of contributing to inflation, on the other hand, all the so-called bastions of private enterprise that contribute to inflation are aided and abetted by this incompetent government.

May I make a few suggestions to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce? To implement them he will need the authority of the government, because neither he nor the Wheat Board can do very much unless the government changes its policies substantially. I hope the minister will go to the cabinet and say, "Let's give these suggestions a try." I hope he goes to caucus and says, "These are the measures you must adopt; if you do not go along with me, get yourself a new boy." If he does that, he will go down in our history as the minister who struck a blow for our farmers.

I suggest that the minister ought to go to the Prime Minister and his colleagues in cabinet and say that the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board must be tremendously extended, and that we must provide it with finances that will enable it to undertake the export of our wheat in competition with other countries. If necessary, let us wage an export war. Countries that break their agreements have victimized us. Canada did not break those agreements. If Australia wants to play games, we too can play. We can teach them a lesson or two. I say to the minister that it is unfair and immoral to leave Canadian farmers alone to compete with the treasuries of the United States and other countries. If the agricultural community of this country is left in that plight, it will be destroyed. That is quite right, and that is why I say that the Canadian Wheat Board needs financial resources to do the kind of job that must be done. If in order to sell wheat we have to cut our price to $1 a bushel, let us do so—but not at the expense of the farmer. Let us not call on our farmers to pay the whole shot. Is it not socially desirable that we maintain in Canada maximum number of economic farm units? I am sick and tired of hearing vague hints from the government side that we should have fewer farmers. Where are the farmers we take off the farm to go, Mr. Speaker?

Instead of supporting ex-farmers in metropolitan centres, is it not cheaper to help them maintain themselves on their farms?

Another suggestion is this. Could the government not enter into barter arrangements? Has the government considered seriously accepting as part payment for grain sold abroad, the currency of the country to which the grain has been sold? We could leave the currency in that country and invest it in whatever way would be best. For instance, has the minister considered the quantity of fertilizer that India needs? Would it not be a good idea to accept rupees—or the appropriate currency—in part payment for grains and use that money to build a fertilizer plant, a hospital, or whatever else is needed? Have Wheat Board officials considered these barter arrangements? Have these suggestions with respect to foreign currency been brought to their attention? Has the minister thought of authorizing the Wheat Board to wage a wheat war to meet foreign competition? If that is what our foreign competitors want, they will get it. But, surely, Mr. Speaker, this government does not expect our farmers to carry the burden of that war. Our farmers need to be backed up by the resources of the whole nation. The set back they received when the bottom dropped out of the I.G.A. was bad enough.

But it seems that the government and this country's transport industry are incapable of organizing the movement of grain to ensure even a five-bushel quota by the end of July. I may add that this five-bushel quota is the lowest in our history. May I draw to the attention of the house an instance when the minister, unknowingly misled the house? On July 3, in reply to a question raised in this house, the minister read a telegram from the Chief Commissioner of the Wheat Board, as reported at page 10784 of *Hansard*. I do not think I will be taking this statement out of context if I quote from the middle of the paragraph. It had to do with the grain movement. The telegram read in part:

• (5:40 p.m.)

Would further advise that both railways currently have a very substantial number of cars under load to lakehead and Pacific coast—

This is true.

—and are spotting cars for additional loads each week to the full unload capacity of the terminals.

On July 1, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool issued one of the strongest statements I have ever seen from a president of that organization. He reported 10 million bushels in their terminals at the lakehead. He reported that, in order to handle their expected export or unload shipments into ships, plus filling that space, their grain company would require 11,000 box cars of grain. They would require a minimum of 440 cars a day to unload. But at that time they were unloading exactly half that number, yet the Commissioner of the Wheat Board states in his telegram that the terminals were being supplied with cars to their maximum unload capacity. That was not true then, Mr. Speaker, and is not true now.

The minister knows what kind of railway equipment is required to have a grain movement that will complete the delivery of the five-bushel quota. We all know the number of cars required. What we want to know is, are they being supplied? A few days ago, in a telephone conversation with people in the grain trade and the transportation business, we were talking about the unload capacity of the terminals. At the lakehead, on July 9, there were 3,600 carloads of grain, give or take 50 or 100. I cannot vouch for the exact figure, but that is very close. There were 3,600 carloads of grain waiting to be unloaded. Of that number, only 414 were for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminals. The Saskatchewan Pool terminals, going full blast six days a week, three shifts a day, can unload over 600 cars a day. In order to fill up the space they have to handle their outgoing shipments, as well as to properly utilize a maximum staff, on overtime, going six days a week, they would require 1,200 cars.

The same situation occurred at Vancouver. One day this month they ran out of cars to unload. They worked half a day and sent the workers home. This kind of record for the grain movement indicates incompetence on the part of the government and the railroads, Mr. Speaker; there is no other way to describe it.

While half the shipping points in the three prairie provinces are all on three or four-bushel quotas, the minister is still too willing and ready to accept the assurances of the railroads that they are co-operating. Of course, they have a lot of cars for the grain movement. What else is new? I have some questions which I wish to address to the minister. I hope the minister will read a statement on motions tomorrow or Wednesday at the latest. As of now, what number of railway cars are in the grain movement? What number are required to complete the delivery of the five-bushel quota? I am sure that, as

of now, this figure is somewhere between 20,000 and 25,000 cars. The minister can get the exact figure.

What number of cars, additional to those now in the grain movement, are required from the railways between now and July 31 to complete delivery of the five-bushel quota? This could do wonders for the cash income position of the farmers. What additional number have already been supplied, compared to the number in the grain movement on July 1?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. Unless there is unanimous consent—

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: What action have the government and the Canadian Wheat Board taken to ensure that the terminal facilities of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool at both the lakehead and Vancouver are, in fact, being utilized to full unload capacity? Will the minister advise whether the grain companies have been authorized to buy grain after July 31? If not, will they be?

Will the minister advise if the crop year will be extended? Will the government authorize the Canadian Wheat Board to complete the purchase of a five bushel quota from farmers? They can deliver it any time in August, September, or whenever required. Will the minister discuss with the Canadian Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commissioners the possibility of allowing offsite and offtrack storage, including the piling of wheat on the ground? Will the minister assure the Canadian Wheat Board that if there are any losses incurred as a result of this kind of handling, the tab will be picked up by the government of Canada? In that way, the minister will get the five-bushel quota delivered.

Will the minister discuss with the railways the possibility of using different kinds of railway equipment? I made a trip to the United States, through North Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin, a few weeks ago. I stopped in a number of rural communities to inspect their country elevators. They are not only using box cars, they are using gondola cars. At one point they had even boarded up stock cars, filling them with grain or corn. At present there are several hundred gondola cars, which hold almost 2,000 bushels of grain each, and which are normally used for hauling of potash, sitting idle in gravel pits and side tracks. Will the minister ask the railways to use their imagination in order to turn this and other kinds of equipment into grain moving equipment?

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) mentioned the situation in Peace River. You can go anywhere in the prairie provinces and see the same thing. We have found a consistent pattern of lack of co-operation by the railways, lack of imagination by the government, refusal by the government to authorize the Wheat Board to take extraordinary measures, because they know how to do the job. What they need from the government is authority and money.

I wish to repeat to the minister one of my earlier sentences. Surely, the minister will agree it is socially desirable to have the maximum number of people possible on the land on economic units. We do not want to hear this nonsense about less farmers. We need a government which will put the resources of the entire nation behind an industry that is basic to our whole economy. The ramifications of dropping farm income will hit the constituency of every single member in this house. Any member who does not believe that is under a great disillusion.

The ramifications of the drop in farm income over the past year and succeeding year are being felt by the farm implement industry, automobile industry, steel industry, transportation industry, fertilizer industry, building industry and lumber industry. Even the fishing industry will suffer. This is not proper. This is not civilized. It is not even good business. That phrase should appeal to hon. members across the way.

A basic industry should not be in this kind of financial condition. All we are asking the government to do is to come up with proposals, both short and long-term. We may criticize some, but we will undoubtedly support some. We may make alternative suggestions. We in this party, as well as farm organizations, have pleaded with the minister. The minister has yet to mention the latest submission from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Surely, they must have some knowledge of the subject. Proposals have been made to the minister week after week and month after month by farmers' unions, but we have yet to have any definite response

from the government as to whether they will accept any of these proposals.

If the government is not going to accept the proposals what are they going to do on their own initiative? After the experience of the Prime Minister last week, I hope the government will now wake up and bring about some positive action, if not on what the opposition parties have mentioned then on the proposals of the people engaged in the farm industry, or their own, if they have any. We have waited, and we do not want to wait much longer.

Mr. Pepin: May I be allowed to say, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of the things the member mentioned are already being done. Potash cars are being used and cars are being rented from the United States. Also, with respect to the Wheat Board using money available for temporary wheat storage. I would not like to leave the impression that what the hon. member suggests is not already, in part at least, being done.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The minister has already taken part in the debate.

[*English*]

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): I should like to say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I notice the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) from this most important debate. There may be some slight excuse for the Prime Minister because he has been looking into this matter personally. The Minister of Agriculture cannot be excused. I have before me an extract from Throop's Scrapbook at page 112. The heading is Political Humour. Mr. R. B. Hanson having interrupted Mr. C. G. Power, Mr. Power is reported to have said:

> The honourable member had better not talk so much or they will make him a minister and keep him quieter.

That is what I think about the Minister of Agriculture. He should be here. This is an agricultural matter. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) should be complimented in one sense, and I shall have more to say about that later. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) dealt particularly with subsidies as a western member. What he said was new to me and I come from a little farther west than he does. I compliment the Prime Minister on his visit because he conceded there was a problem in western Canada relating directly to the wheat situation. This is what we are talking about.

Mr. Barnett: It took him a long time to find out.

Mr. Gundlock: Yes, as my hon. friend says, it took him a long time to find out. It certainly did, but at least he came to that opinion. He found out there was a problem. During his visit he said there would be no handouts. I take it that that means subsidies. That is what my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre said.

I should like to refer to the 1968-69 estimates in respect of subsidies paid by the Canadian government. Quoting the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) page 3474 of *Hansard,* the 1968-69 subsidies amount to $415 million. Running down the page one can see that the quality premium on high grade hogs and lamb carcasses amounted to $110 million. Freight assistance on western feed grain totalled $21 million. The payment under the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was $15 million. Payments in connection with the movement of coal were $35 million. The carrying cost of temporary wheat reserves totalled $29 million. Subventions in respect of eastern coal were $2 million. Payments to the railway companies under the Maritime Freight Rates Act were $14 million. Payments to the railways under the provisions of the National Transportation Act were $127 million. Steamship subventions for coastal services amounted to $12 million. The trading loss on the agricultural products account and the agricultural stabilization account were $113 million. Other subsidies amounted to $11 million. The only one I can see here which would appear to relate directly to what we are talking about, western wheat, is the freight subsidy on western feed grain. In reality, this subsidy helps other parts of the country as well.

My arithmetic, as well as my English, are not too good, but according to my arithmetic the goverment is paying $386 million in subsidies today. So I would ask the hon member, through you, Mr. Speaker, what is all the talk about helping the western grain farmers by way of subsidies. I have not even mentioned the $80 million given away to the automobile industry. I do not know whether it is permissible to mention that in this debate, but it might be. I complimented the Prime Minister for having found a problem in the west. Some people on his side of the house do not agree.

He says the problem arises because there is overproduction of wheat and the farmers should not grow so much. I have been here for some time and was here when the Liberal party was in opposition. At that time they were saying the same thing. They ridiculed a minister of that government who said, "Grow more; we will sell it". Today, they are saying, "Do not grow it; we cannot sell it". There is a point here. Wheat boards and brokers cannot sell to governments, but governments can sell to governments. I should like to say more about this later in my speech. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

[*English*]

At six o'clock, the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Gundlock: Just before I called it six o'clock I referred to the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). I see he is present now, so perhaps I should repeat what I said. Earlier I complimented the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on his visit to the west, as a result of which he found there was a problem there. I hope you will forgive me for the time I am taking at this moment in reference to the Minister of Agriculture Mr. Speaker, who is my neighbour. Perhaps I could call him my friend. He may want to hear what I had to say earlier, in order that he might reply.

I recall the time when the minister had a great deal to say about the government, and I recall the time when he joined that government. In looking through some scrapbooks today I was reminded a little bit of the Minister of Agriculture. I have in mind particularly Throop's scrapbook at page 112. Mr. R. B. Hanson having interrupted Mr. C. G. Power, Mr. Power is reported as having said:

> The hon. member had better not talk so much or they will make him a minister and keep him quieter.

I think that is what has happened to our Minister of Agriculture.

I note that the Prime Minister is not in is seat at this particular moment. How in the name of heaven can we resolve an important debate like this when the house is adjourned for a specific purpose and the ministers responsible are not here? This whole matter also involves the rule question, but perhaps we should go into that on another day.

When the Prime Minister was out west he expressed the conclusion that there would be no handouts to people with assets of $100,000. I think the press was very kind to the Prime Minister. At one time he said they were not, but I think on his recent visit both writers and broadcasters were reasonable. In spite of the Prime Minister's visit, and the moon trip, the press paid particular attention to a particular problem in Canada. Everyone admitted there was a problem. The Prime Minister said that he could see the problem. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, and the other ministers of the Cabinet, what they consider to be assets of $100,000 in today's economic situation and with today's interest rates.

The present government must accept the responsibility for the high interest rates which now prevail. The Minister of Agriculture is from the same part of the country in which I live and knows full well that interest rates average about 15 per cent, having regard to assets of $100,000. Farmers have to pay anywhere between 8 per cent and 10 per cent on bank loans, and higher rates on borrowings from other sources. Anyone who is operating a wheat ranch, if you would like to call it that, is paying an average of 15 per cent interest on financing.

I pointed out earlier in respect of subsidies that only $29 million of $415 million in Canadian subsidies is being paid to the Canadian wheat grower. This means that over $380 million is being paid in subsidies to people other than wheat growers. Let me bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the Prime Minister are listening to what is being said. It has been suggested that the government does not subsidize people with assets of $100,000 or more, but this government obviously has been subsidizing other industries, including the gold mining industry and the railway companies, to say nothing of the C.B.C. and other Crown corporations. These are virtually monopolies, not prime producers.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is now here and I should like to deal with another subject before I conclude. This minister who has direct responsibility for this subject was recently in Washington. Was the Minister of Agriculture with him at that time?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, he was.

Mr. Gundlock: Was the Prime Minister with him? The answer is no. I remember an occasion when I spoke in this house when the Prime Minister and the minister responsible for this problem were both in Washington. They conferred with the President of the United States. In the first instance they asked him, "are we friends and allies or are we enemies?" I hope both the ministers realized this. The President of the United States said, "Of course, we are friends. What do you have in mind?" But the matter of wheat was never brought up. It seems to me this is a question of management. They went on from there, reminding the United States that we are their best customer and their best supplier. In other words, they want our iron ore, our oil, our gas, our water, and even our air space as well as refuelling stations. Is that not a bargaining position? What did our government do when they were in that bargaining position? They never mentioned one of those points. Let the minister tell us, I would be glad to hear him.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spoke to Mr. Nixon on that subject.

Mr. Gundlock: You just said the Prime Minister was not at that meeting.

Mr. Pepin: I was in Washington three times last month and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) was there on a couple of occasions.

Mr. Gundlock: That is beside the point. I was talking about the last wheat agreement. The minister says he was there three times. He only needed to be there once.

Mr. Pepin: You asked a question, I answered it.

Mr. Gundlock: That was not the question. You said you were there three times. I asked if the Minister of Agriculture was there and if the Prime Minister was there. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) said no.

Mr. Pepin: I said yes.

Mr. Gundlock: You said you were there three times. Probably at one of the three meetings the three of you were there but, I ask, who were your advisers on the wheat agreement?

Mr. Pepin: In Washington? The Canadian Wheat Board, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Agriculture. They were all represented there.

Mr. Gundlock: That is exactly what I thought. The Wheat Board has no authority to deal with a government. Only the government can deal with another government. I say this loud and clear to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, that the heads of the wheat boards are very selfish people who are interested only in storage, not in handling and selling. I refer particularly to the Saskatchewan farm union, which almost disgraced this whole country at their meeting with the Prime Minister. I am very happy that, in my constituency, he was treated with courtesy and dignity as a Prime Minister should be. He understood that there was a problem out there, but his ministers and his advisers did not.

I should like to ask one more question. How much money has the government supplied to the grain council as of June 1?

Mr. Pepin: The Department of Agriculture is providing $50,000 and my department is providing $50,000 this year.

Mr. Gundlock: My information is that it is $2,500, not even enough to hire a secretary.

Mr. Olson: You need some better information.

Mr. Gundlock: I am not so sure. I will call Paul Martin. He has a good bureau of statistics. This is the information I have as of June 1. It is not even enough money to hire a secretary. How do they expect that council to work? Who are the members of that council? This reminds me of a remark a friend of mine, formerly a member of the house, once made, that you might just as well put a bunch of weasels in charge of a hen house. The reference was the way this government managed our business.

They tell us to sit here in the house while they go across the country telling the farmers not to raise wheat. This takes me back ten years. I remember when the Liberals were on our side and we were on their side of the house. At that time they said exactly the same thing. I remember when the minister of agriculture of that time said, "Don't listen to the opposition; grow wheat and we will sell it". What happened? We sold it, and they can do the same thing.

Mr. Olson: You mean Alvin Hamilton?

Mr. Asselin: He was a good minister.

Mr. Gundlock: It can be done. All it requires is good management. To say, in Canada or anywhere else in the world, "There is too much wheat; do not grow it" when there are millions starving and millions half starving just does not add up.

As I said a moment ago, if you deal with your allies and so-called friends properly, you will not have that problem.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I regret but there is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Forrestall: Chopped down by the minister.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): In case the last remark was recorded in *Hansard*, may I say that the Minister of Agriculture did not chop anybody down.

I welcome the opportunity this evening to talk about the problem which we have in the wheat economy in particular, and in the cereal economy in western Canada generally, because I have just spent a few days in western Canada talking to farmers from many parts of that area where wheat and related products are an important base to their agricultural enterprises. I do not believe that a good purpose can be served at this time by reviewing the international situation and trying to analyze what should be done in those areas where we, as the government of Canada, only have the power to persuade, to discuss, and to try to influence representatives of other governments. I believe that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) adequately covered that in the debate earlier today. However, I believe that an additional explanation should be given of several measures, and of one measure above all others, that this government has taken to alleviate the situation with respect to cash flow through the grain economy in western Canada because of the restricted markets or the contracted markets as compared with a couple of years ago.

It seems to me that the most useful thing that we could do at this stage is, first of all, to analyse the problem and see if we can agree on this before we try some of the so-called shotgun assistance programs that have been advocated by the opposition and by others as well. I think that all members in this house, even those who come from the grain growing areas in the prairies, will agree that the major problem today is the cash flow in the hands of those people who rely almost exclusively on the sale of wheat and other grains. It is not that they have no product to sell or that their assets have been reduced, bringing them down to the poverty line. The fact of the matter is rather that they have some desperate problems in some cases because the cash flow has been reduced substantially from what it was in 1964, 1965, 1966 and part of 1967. There is no argument about that so far as I am concerned.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Surely, the obvious answer to this problem is to substitute a program that will provide a significant flow of cash. I suggest the government has done this. There is one other kind of problem some farmers in western Canada are having, as well as those in other parts of the country. I refer to restricted net income, that is, income that is not at an acceptable level because of the so-called cost-price squeeze.

Let us get back to the other problem about which the opposition are complaining. I am not criticizing them for complaining, because it is a very real problem. I refer to the problem of the contraction and restriction of the cash flow necessary to meet commitments for operating, capital requirements and income on which to live. If this is the problem, we ought to institute a substitute program which would provide the cash flow required. I suggest we have done that. It seems to me—this was drawn to my attention rather forcibly during the last few days I spent in western Canada—that there is a misunderstanding, or at least a lack of understanding, of both the significance and the magnitude of the cash advances program that will become effective August 1, 1969.

Let me deal with acreage payments. There are 84 million acres on the permit books of western Canada. If we were to make an acreage payment of $1 an acre, or even $2 an acre, to most farmers in western Canada who are suffering severe problems in obtaining enough cash to meet their current operating requirements, it would not be enough. On the other hand, there are millions of acres of the 84 million involved in connection with which

the cash flow through the farmers' hands has not been reduced in 1969 but is, indeed, substantially higher than it has been in the past. This is mainly because a large part of the farmers' agricultural enterprise is based upon livestock, the prices of which have risen significantly in the last six or eight months. So if we are to be fair and honest in our analysis of the problem, making advances on the wheat farmers have in store is the way to provide them with an income. This refers to farmers who rely on wheat for their income.

Commencing August 1, as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) has already announced, there will be full reinstatement of the entitlement of every permit holder, producer if you like, to go to his elevator agent and obtain $1 a bushel, times the number of specified acres in his permit book, times six. This is regardless of whether or not he has been able to deliver sufficient wheat up to July 31 this year to retire the cash advance made during the 1968-69 crop year. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and perhaps farmers in western Canada, have the right to an explanation of what this means. It means that on August 1 and thereafter, the farmer will be able to go to his elevator agent and apply for a cash advance if he has grain on hand, which we assume he has. He will immediately get $6 per acre, times the acres on his permit book, up to a maximum of $6,000.

Mr. Korchinski: Provided he has not had a loan.

Mr. Olson: His having had an advance will not interfere with his entitlement for the new crop year. That is the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in June.

Mr. Korchinski: You had better explain that.

Mr. Olson: Hon. gentlemen opposite should have listened to that statement and understood it.

Mr. Korchinski: You had better explain it, because the press do not understand it.

Mr. Olson: We carried out some calculations in this regard. If you subtract the acres in excess of 1,000 that are in the permit books, you arrive at 472 million acres. If every farmer in western Canada had the necessary amount of wheat and applied for a payment of $1 a bushel on his wheat, there is the potential of injecting $472 million into the western economy. That program is already under way. Of course, every farmer will not have the necessary maximums of wheat; therefore, we have to scale the program down somewhat. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in Lethbridge last Saturday that the program would probably amount to something in the order of $250 million.

Mr. Bigg: In two years.

Mr. Olson: In one year. In fact, it could happen in 90 days. The program is already under way and will be effective in nine or ten days, I believe. Two hundred and fifty million dollars is a fairly substantial amount to inject into the economy during the next two or three months. Indeed, it will be available on August 1. However, I am realist enough to know that all the qualifications needed by a farmer to make application will not be present at that point in time. I suggest that after they harvest their 1969 crop and have wheat on hand, they will be able to qualify. That is a fairly realistic amount of money. As I say, it is somewhere between $250 million and $300 million. This amount will be injected into the western economy and will assist in the grain harvest this fall.

I ask members of the opposition to compare this with the references made to past glories when $1 an acre, up to 200 acres, was injected into the economy. This program gives five times as much. There is one other thing that should be made very clear.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the minister will permit a question if he has time at the end of his remarks. Let us be very clear on one point. Arguments have been put forward that farmers do not wish to go into debt in order to take advantage of the cash advance. There is no debt, in terms of money, which has to be repaid until a farmer has been given an opportunity to deliver his grain to the elevator, and is unable to do so. Then, of course, it becomes a debt and is repayable in cash; that is, if he is given an opportunity to deliver and does not do so. That is the only qualification. In the meantime, there is no interest on the advance; the carrying charges are paid by the government of Canada through the Canadian Wheat Board. Let there not be any confusion about its being the farmer's own money in this respect.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I remind the minister that any

charges due the wheat board are paid by the farmer and not by the government.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member do a little more homework. I remind him that the treasury of Canada pays the interest on cash advances.

Mr. Gundlock: Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister was not talking about storage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. That is not a point of order.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: The point I am trying to make is that the cash advances on wheat stored on farms are certainly the best possible substitute for actually being able to deliver grain to the elevators.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Mackenzie is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Korchinski: The Minister of Agriculture stated that the treasury of Canada picks up the interest rate. I think the minister himself should be aware that there is a reserve fund within the Wheat Board itself—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

Mr. Korchinski: —and a portion of this is transferred—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. That is not a point of order.

Mr. Boulanger: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Mercier on a point of order.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this. Although the debate in progress was initiated by the leader of the socialist party across the aisle, I should like the house to note that not a single member of that party is presently in the house.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion let me review in detail the exact procedure that a farmer must follow to obtain the benefits of the program. On August 1, or on any date thereafter during the crop year 1969-70, a farmer may go to his local elevator agent and apply for a cash advance on grain stored on the farm up to six bushels multiplied by the specified number of acres in his permit book. In line with the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, any carryover from the 1968-69 crop year as far as cash advances are concerned will not be held against his entitlement unless the farmer is in default; and the only way he can be in default is if he has had an opportunity to deliver grain but has not done so.

Let it also be clear that the farmer must sign a declaration that he does have that amount of grain on which he receives advance payment stored on the farm. The total acreage appearing in the permit books is in the region of 84 million. Multiplied by six, the total is something over 500 million bushels. There must be subtracted from this total that number of acres over 1,000 that appears in each permit book. This reduces the figure to 472 million acres, and it is these 472 million acres on which acreage payments may be made.

Mr. Woolliams: You have said that twice.

Mr. Olson: I will say it a dozen times more until people both here and in western Canada understand it. This is the entitlement as of August 1. I am certain that something in the neighbourhood of $250 million, perhaps $300 million, will be paid out during the next 90 days under this program, unless, of course, there is a significant increase in the volume of grain that passes through the elevator system.

Again, I suggest that an analysis of the situation will lead most people to conclude that the restricted market is the problem here. I contend there is no more fair, feasible or just way of dealing with this transitional problem, as we hope it will be, than by providing farmers with cash whether or not they are able to deliver their grain, and this is exactly what is happening under the program I have outlined.

I should like to answer one or two further questions that were raised. The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock) stated that a former minister of agriculture had told the farmers: "You grow the wheat and we'll sell it". The only minister I can recall saying that was the former member for Qu'Appelle, who at one time was Minister of Agriculture, and the house knows what happened to him. I should think that if a Minister of Agriculture told the farmers that they could indiscriminately grow large volumes of farm produce which he would undertake to sell, he would

be making an irresponsible statement. I think the former member's greatest claim to fame—I do not want to abuse him because the electors took care of him—was when he arrived in Hong Kong three days after a big wheat deal was signed in order to make the announcement.

Mr. Asselin: That was when the farmers were happy.

Mr. Olson: Another matter that was raised was this. It has been said a number of times that farms are being foreclosed, or sold at below current values, and so on. I should like to put on record some statistics produced by the Farm Credit Corporation, which is by far the largest lender of funds to farmers on the prairies, indeed to farmers all over the country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the minister but his time has expired.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, we would be happy to give unanimous consent and pay the minister that courtesy that he would not pay the hon. member for Lethbridge.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the house give unanimous consent for the minister to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Olson: I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. There is one matter I should mention that is of interest to members on both sides of the house. Experience has shown that even in the serious circumstances that are presently existing in western provinces there is a wide range between the amount and proportion of income lost and the financial circumstances of individual farmers. For example, this is borne out by the fact that in spite of current marketing problems at least 75 per cent of the prairie farmers—I am sorry I cannot be more precise than that—holding mortgages from the Farm Credit Corporation met their May 1 commitments within one month of the due date.

Another important factor is that of the 25 per cent who did not manage to meet their payments within this period, over half had arrears outstanding from previous years. Therefore, it must be pointed out that this particular problem is not quite as serious as some people have indicated.

In conclusion, may I say that other programs may have to be instituted in order to deal with farmers facing serious income problems that are not necessarily directly related to restricted opportunities for marketing grain. The Prime Minister did make mention of this particular aspect, and we are working on the problem. But let me be fair on this question of cash flow. It seems to me that the greatest amount of financial assistance that can be provided to those who need it the most will flow from the program that will come into effect on August 1. In my view this program is both large and significant.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Athabasca.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, before the next speaker commences his remarks may I ask the minister one question. When the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) introduced the cash advance legislation in 1957, did the minister speak about that legislation with the approval that he gave it tonight? The hon. member was at that time a Social Credit member of the opposition and I ask whether he voted for it.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember all the speeches I made on that occasion but I think as a matter of principle I supported that legislation.

Mr. Woolliams: I must tell the minister that our memories are better than that of the minister. I ask him to check on how he voted on that occasion.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I could check on that. I should also advise the hon. member that we have substantially improved the legislation since then.

Mr. Woolliams: I will not listen to any more.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is the hon. member for Mackenzie rising on a question?

Mr. Korchinski: No, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to have the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The Chair was about to recognize the hon. member for Pembina, but recognized the hon. member for Mackenzie temporarily, being under the impression that the hon. member was about to ask a question. The hon. member for Pembina has the floor.

Wheat Export Prices

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is here to hear my remarks. I have waited some time for this opportunity. The people in my part of the country think agriculture is of prime importance. Having been in office for one year, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has at last discovered western Canada, and we are very pleased.

An hon. Member: What is the question?

Mr. Bigg: I am not asking a question but making a speech and I would appreciate it if hon. members on the government side allow me to continue.

As I said, having been in office for one year, the Prime Minister has discovered western Canada, and we are pleased. Unfortunately, he speaks first and thinks later, as is his custom. His first reaction on discovering western Canada, and being told the government should consider western farmers, was to say that the government could do nothing. That is exactly what I expected him to say, and I am not disappointed. I did not expect this government to aid western farmers. The Speech from the Throne contains the warning that this government will do little, if anything, for the farmers of Canada. The speech of September 12, 1968, shows that the western farmer can expect little help.

Because the government established the Grains Council everybody hoped western Canada would benefit. I have been patient in my hope that western agriculture would be aided—notwithstanding this administration's record of not helping farmers. Of course, nothing happened. It has been most difficult to get questions answered in the house. When we have received answers they have been offhand answers or non-answers, so to speak. No sooner had we completed the throne speech debate than I drew to the minister's attention serious difficulties in western Canada involving damp grain. Western farmers suffered because their grain was damp. Any grain that had been harvested had not been dried, and any government action had come too late. There was too little of it, and what there was came too late. And what happened, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister went to western Canada and said, "The government can do nothing more." Well, the government could do much more; the Minister of Agriculture could do a tremendous amount of good, particularly on the prairies. As I say, I am not disappointed in what has happened. I am a westerner and for one year I waited patiently for the government to act. For one year I hoped that the government would answer my questions which touch intimately the bread and butter of thousands and thousands of people.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

Of course, nothing has been done because, since 1963, this government has pursued an entirely wrong course in Canadian agriculture from coast to coast. They wanted farms to grow bigger and bigger, and they wanted small farmers to get out of farming. The government boasts about the bigness of all sorts of farm loans. Not long ago the Minister of Agriculture spent half an hour telling us how many millions of dollars had been advanced to the farmers of Canada. I hope he is not serious when he says that he is injecting money into the farm economy, because how in the world can you inject money into the farm economy when farmers have to repay debts. In some cases it is impossible for farmers to pay back money they have borrowed. Farmers do not want to borrow; I know perfectly well they want to stand on their own feet.

This government, Mr. Speaker, wants to nationalize all land in Canada. That is its policy. That is why it wants proposed rule 75c, and I shall remain in Ottawa all summer to make sure that the rule is not adopted. The government wants to nationalize all the farms of western Canada, and I for one will not permit it to do so. I do not think the people of western Canada will be bamboozled by an itinerant prime minister. Let him use his charisma in the chain stores of the nation. He may use his charisma on 13 year old girls and in the shopping centres, he may wear different flowers in his buttonhole each day, but I say to him the people of western Canada are tired of this. They are tired of the flower show; now, they want the grain show to begin.

If the Prime Minister has charisma, let him use it in Washington on his United States friends. Let him stop quoting Mao and begin quoting Mr. Nixon. The United States will buy our products; that country is competing with us in world markets. It is Mr. Nixon who will help us to set up a food bank, do research, make better use of our resources and, in the end, help us to sell our grain. Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? I say it because in this world hundreds of millions of people go to bed every night hungry and Canada and the United States will help to feed them. The manner of our payment will have to be settled by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

In this government, ministers do not know what their colleagues are doing. Our Indian policy was introduced by our fine young Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), but it seems his colleagues did not know anything about it or they would have not have made their faux pas.

It is said there is too much wheat in the world. Is there, Mr. Speaker? Where? Are there not 700 million or 800 million people in the world who go to bed hungry every night? Are we to deny them food when we have it? Is that how the just society behaves? I say to the members of the cabinet that they are not world statesmen because they are not big enough to be Canadian statesmen. If they cannot put Canadian agriculture on its feet, how do they expect to participate in international affairs and become leaders there. Before venturing into the international field our politicians had better make sure that the hungry of Canada are fed and that the underprivileged of Canada have better living conditions.

If the Prime Minister says that we cannot have a two price system for grain because it will mean that a loaf of bread in this country will cost five cents more, I say that we should subsidize that bread. For goodness sake, do not take it out of the farmer's pocket. I was impressed when I heard the Minister of Agriculture tell us that in the next 90 days about $250 million is to be injected into western agriculture. What does he mean when he says "injected"?

• (8:50 p.m.)

The acreage payment was a subsidy needed by marginal farmers on small farms in Canada. It was the greatest boon to the small, marginal farmer that western Canada ever received. The name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) is still a byword in western Canada. Apart from anything else he may have done in his political career before or since that time, a great deal can be attributed to the statesman-like idea of giving money to the people who needed it most.

The policy of this government in the field of agriculture has been one and the same, to give more money to those who need it least. In this session of 1968-69, three promises were made with respect to agriculture. These were made back on September 12. There was the Farm Improvement Loans Act, which provided bigger loans to big farmers but no help to the little man, and the Farm Credit Act, which provided bigger loans to big farmers. Then, there was the crowning act of all, the Farm Machinery Act.

The farmers in my area have to sell their wheat now, if they have any, or their cattle now, if they have any, because the price of farm machinery is a crushing burden, particularly when they have to borrow money at 8, 9, 10 or 12 per cent. Only owners of large farms are able to borrow money for farm machinery or farmers who belong to a farm machinery syndicate. Even if you smell socialistic, you can get money. There will be bigger and better farms until the all-knowing, all-powerful Liberal government of Canada owns every acre of land. This is their style of socialism.

I have a Bible in my hand, not written by Moses, but by no less a man than Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I commend it to hon. members. The name of the book is "Federalism in Canada". In this book he says there is only one answer, deep socialism, and you will take it or we will ram it down your throat. Participatory government? By whom? For whom? By Liberals for Liberals. That is the new name of the socialistic government in Canada.

I am surprised because I believe there is a great deal of good in Liberalism, the Liberalism I was raised on and which is found in school books. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Gladstone of England are great names in Liberalism. It was this dream of Liberalism which swept across Canada on June 25, 1968 when people said, Laurier has come again. They did not know they were being sold a pig-in-the-poke. They did not know they were being sold a negative program.

If hon. members do not think this program is negative, let them pick up any article written by this man. They will find, statements to the effect, I am not going to say this; I am not going to say that, and I am not going to not know they were being sold a pig-in-a-book, he has never told us what he is going to say. Would you like to hear some of it

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Bigg: This is hate literature. I will read it.

An hon. Member: Read the book.

Mr. Bigg: My Liberal friends say, "Read the book". On page 164 of "Federalism and the French Canadians", this is the kind of Canadian Liberalism he states will unite

Canada. I quote from the second paragraph on this page:

> So the Anglo-Canadians built themselves an illusion of it by fencing off the French Canadians in their Quebec ghetto and then nibbling at its constitutional powers and carrying them off bit by bit to Ottawa.

Some hon. Members: Read on.

Mr. Bigg: I am going to read on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I might point out to the hon. member that the book he is reading from should have some relation to the actual debate on wheat.

Mr. Bigg: It has, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Basford: It is not solving the wheat problem.

Mr. Bigg: The wheat problem cannot be solved until we know what this government is going to do.

Mr. Basford: Go back to the book.

Mr. Bigg: The wheat problem cannot be solved because it is tied in with the economic problem. If government members have not read this book, their Bible, they are poor Liberals. This book was written and printed in the spring of 1968. It is not ancient history. You should know about it. If you have not read it, you should.

There is only man in the Liberal Party who admits having had no knowledge of what the book contains, and that is the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer). He had the courage to leave the cabinet.

The negativism in the whole approach to the wheat problem in Canada is sickening. The Prime Minister went out west. He thought all he had to do was smile, change his suit, smell his rose and all would be well. The people of western Canada are not that easily fooled. They want to pay their bills. They want to support their children. Many owners of small farms in western Canada are not satisfied to sell out to owners of larger farms, no matter what the deal is. A great many of them are not content to go deeper into debt, even though for 18 months they do not have to pay on the money that is going to be injected into their economy. They want to sell their grain for cash. They know their taxes will go up. Somebody has to borrow the money at 10 per cent to pay the carrying charges. This is only a stop-gap measure.

We were told acreage payments were only stop-gaps. The small marginal farmer in

Canada needs a little help when the government will not sell his products at reasonable prices so that he can stay on his own land. No matter what my socialistic friends on the left think of this socialistic government, we in this party are thoroughly fed up with it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: What is the answer? I think the acreage payment is worth while. The three acreage payments brought in by the Diefenbaker government amounted to a total of $120 million. This is less money than we wrote off to the city of Montreal to help pay for Expo. I do not begrudge paying the bills of Expo, but what is fair for Paul is fair for Peter. In this case it is not Pierre, but Peter out west who needs the help. He needs it badly. When you help the farmer out west, it is reflected here.

There are places in western Canada full of farm machinery, most of which was made in eastern Canada. The backlash has not hit the east yet. It is all very well to say, never mind them; they are a long piece away. Some day we will find the corporations in Ontario and Quebec will not be able to pay the fat dividends they have paid for the last two or three years.

The western farmer is the best spender in Canada when he has the money. He can only spend it once. If he has to borrow money, someone has to pay the interest. The minister is only fooling himself when he speaks of injecting $250 million into the economy. He knows perfectly well he is doing no such thing. He is lending money, at the expense of the people of Canada, to enable an economy which is sagging badly to continue. There is much that can be done. I would suggest some things if I had time, but I will just make one suggestion now.

More research should be done with regard to the uses of wheat. A day or two ago I heard of some research that had been carried out with regard to the use of fish. The fish are being dessicated, mixed with cereal products and sold or given away under our international give-away program to the hungry people of this world. This product is heavy in protein value. Wheat is the finest protein grain in the world.

• (9:00 p.m.)

It can be ground up with fish from the maritimes and in that way two problems can be solved. It can be ground and mixed up with codfish and if you do not like codfish,

then science can look after that. The taste of the fish can be taken away and it can be made to taste like wheat or pizza or anything you like. There are 40 Ph.D.'s in the Department of Agriculture. What are they doing except emulating the Prime Minister by saying, we cannot do anything about it. Such attitudes do not help one bit in this situation. If there is nothing the government can do about it, then may I say that I, myself, could do a great deal more than the whole tribe over there put together.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: We do not want a dictatorship in this country, but if we did I would volunteer for the job because I have more brains in my little finger than the people over there have in all their heads put together. I have given them more ideas in the last five minutes than they have had in the last year. I say, give us some reason to believe in you; give us some morale so we can tell our people the Parliament of Canada likes them and wants to do something for them. But let me say that when the government says it cannot do anything, the just society will never be built on that.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, it is not often I have the opportunity to agree with the editorial department of the Calgary *Herald,* but I should like to take my text for this evening from an editorial in that distinguished Conservative newspaper for Saturday, July 19. The editorial entitled "Don't Pretend" reads:

> It would be wonderful if oratory could sell Canada's wheat.
>
> Then something worth while might be expected to result from the special debate to be held next week in the House of Commons on the wheat crisis.
>
> But it's no use pretending that rousing words and rolling phrases are going to do the trick. That has been tried countless times before and didn't work. The pages of Hansard that have been filled through the years with words about Western Canada's wheat problems could well command a small fortune as scrap paper.

Unfortunately, the clairvoyance of that newspaper in discerning that a debate would be held here this week was not shared by members of the opposition. Because this party, through its co-operation and concern, permitted the debate to commence early, the opposition speakers were not prepared at all. They simply were not ready and as a result dusted off old speeches and were undeterred by facts relating to what is developing in the world. Furthermore, they have permitted this debate to proceed without the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), St. John the Baptist of the wheat farming people. The hon. member who spoke no less than eight times on the farm credit bill, no less than five times on the farm improvement loans bill, once on the farm machinery syndicates credit bill and four times on the prairie farm advance payments bill, has not been given an opportunity to participate in this debate. I think this is a gross unfairness to him.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) saw nothing wrong with assistance for farmers short of cash, regardless of their substantial assets. Again, if I may, I should like to refer to the editorial in the Calgary *Herald,* and I agree with it:

> It is hard for people to understand why an industry such as wheat farming cannot withstand the economic rigors of one or two bad years like other industries without demanding government hand-outs.
>
> Prime Minister Trudeau said it is hard for a fisherman earning only $2,000 a year to understand why a farmer with land and equipment worth $100,000 should consider himself eligible for government assistance. It is hard to understand because it simply cannot be justified.

The Leader of the Opposition sees nothing wrong with this. I think the perspicacity of the Leader of the Opposition is destined to assure him in his present position at least until he is replaced by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) or the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). The Leader of the Opposition does not accept that conditions in the grain industry are the result of international circumstances beyond the control of the Canadian government. With respect I would suggest that the following would summarize the facts of the case.

The last three years have seen excellent harvests throughout the world, mainly as a result of favourable climatic conditions. In each of these three years, world production was higher than in any preceding year in history. Much of this increased production occurred in importing countries whose requirements of wheat were thus increasingly met from domestic supplies. As a result, imports of wheat declined and world trade dropped in the last four years. In 1965-66 world trade totalled 2.3 billion bushels. In the most recent crop year, shipments of wheat were less than 1.7 billion bushels, a reduction of more than 25 per cent.

The drop in world trade in wheat has been matched by an increment in stocks held by the five major exporting countries. On June

30, 1969 these stocks had reached a record level of 2.4 billion bushels. At the conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations in the spring of 1967, stocks amounted to only 1.4 billion bushels. In the meantime Canada has maintained its share of the export market at about 20 per cent. Again, gentlemen, I should like to refer to the editorial with which I started:

> The best that can be hoped from next week's debate is that it might produce some ideas to assist the government. If so, surely it will be only too glad to accept them.
>
> Unfortunately, the debate may be short on ideas and long on politics.
>
> No amount of talking should be allowed to conceal some important facts. One is that the Canadian government did not create the wheat surplus; it is world-wide. Another is that farmers were warned repeatedly during the bumper-sale years of this decade that they could not depend on Communist countries as steady customers. The big sales to the Soviet Union and China came about because of droughts and wheat-crop failures in those countries. Some of the fat profits from those years should have been used by wheat farmers to branch out into other lines of production.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands was caught when the debate was sprung on him a little early. He did not have a single, solitary suggestion. However, this was not so in respect of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). His first suggestion was that we expand the power and authority of the Wheat Board by giving unlimited ability to enter into the price war, with no holds barred. Is that what Canada should do? Are we to take the leadership in this price war? He also wants to reverse the trend to urbanization. He wants to keep the people down on the farm and make sure that the taxpayers of Canada support those who want to stay on the farms. This is really a very progressive move and one, I suggest, we would hardly expect from a member of his party. The third suggestion was that we should accept foreign currency and invest in fertilizer plants. What would these foreign countries which would have these fertilizer plants do with the production they would have? Would they grow grain?

The Leader of the New Democratic party referred to the A.I.D. record and the Leader of the Opposition referred to the acreage payments. I think we might deal with both these at once. I should like to refer to the same O.E.C.D. figures referred to by the leader of the New Democratic party. They indicate that France is first with .95 per cent of its national income devoted to A.I.D., followed by Portugal with .77 per cent and Australia with .74 per cent. One might think it strange to inquire as to how much of France's foreign aid program is devoted to payments of notes due to its colonial empire, how much of that aid goes to north Africa? In the case of Portugal, one might question whether Mozambique or Angola have anything to do with this. In Australia we might think of the Polynesian empire and New Guinea colonies; possibly even the Vietnamese participation.

• (9:10 p.m.)

The other countries which have any significant amount of foreign aid over that of Canada, are the United Kingdom, Belgium and the Netherlands. This brings us down to 6/100ths of one per cent of the national income over the Canadian contribution. In each case we are dealing with ex-Imperial nations, and in each case I suspect strongly that the foreign aid programs are coloured very much by contributions to former colonies.

Le us look specifically at the aid program so far as Canadian grain is concerned. We could increase income by straight payments to farmers or we could increase it by moving wheat through food aid programs or through other subsidies. The opposition continues to refer to the three crop payments of $40 million each it paid to the farmers in 1958, 1960 and 1962, totalling $120 million. In those same years only $66 million worth of grain was moved out in foreign aid. I feel very strongly that farmers would be quite prepared and quite happy, indeed would prefer, to accept a government payment by way of foreign aid than receive subsidies. We also believe in moving wheat and we have done so with our foreign aid program on a scale almost four times as large as that of the previous government.

During the four crop years from 1958-59 through to 1961-62 the foreign aid expenditures in wheat by the Canadian government amounted to something over $66 million. In the most recently completed crop years these have amounted to $240 million, almost four times as much. The total amount of foreign aid, plus crop payment indulged in by the previous government, was about 25 per cent less than the total in foreign aid exports of grain by the present government.

The hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg) in the midst of a diatribe involving the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), which quite frankly assumed almost pathological overtones at some points, suggested that the

barter system would be a good idea. This is another sort of progressive recommendation from one who avowedly admired the liberalism of Laurier and Gladstone. I am sure that he might have found the conservatism of disraeli and Macdonald somewhat radical even for him.

In any case, the barter system just does not work in respect of commodities as great and as important as wheat to Canada. We cannot possibly get involved in a barter system in respect of our grain or we immediately are going to start facing demands from some of our larger potential customers, and our larger customers in the past including Red China and so on, who are themselves short of cash, who will insist on dealing with us on barter terms when it comes to buying our grain. We must maintain the integrity of our marketing system.

None of this denies the fact that there is a real cash problem which has been well identified by the opposition, for which they are to be congratulated. It would seem from the speeches of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of agriculture (Mr. Olson) that these problems had indeed previously been identified and that many worth while steps had been taken to meet them. However, the cash shortage is there, and certainly some farmers are suffering very seriously.

I do not share the feelings of the Leader of the Opposition that all deserve help regardless of their assets. I do not really believe that we should indulge in this area in another program of universal assistance when we have disavowed such programs for the future in any case. We must provide cash for farmers who find themselves in real need because of the failure of the grain market. We must be selective in this provision and we should, if necessary, resort to a form of means test. I do not think there is much point in trying to solve the cash problem unless we can also try at the same time to solve the market problem.

One thing that the government might consider is the possibility of seeing whether there are not markets for No. 5 or No. 4 grain, which we are not in a position to sell. We could then let our assistance program take the form of paying all or part of the spread between the price we can get for grain of those grades and the value or the price of the actual grades delivered. In this way we might solve both cash and market problems. The types of advances being recommended on acreage payments and so on will leave us next spring with the same problem we have today, intensified by whatever surplus we might enjoy from this year's crop, and it looks as though it is going to be a pretty good one.

The two price system has been advocated. Roughly speaking we consume for domestic purposes about 10 per cent of what we have grown in the last few years. The two price system involves fundamentally a tax on the consumer to support the producer in this area. Once this idea is introduced, it will be a simple matter to sit here regularly in this House of Commons listening to the extent of the grain farmers plight and determining just how much the city and town dwellers are going to be taxed by way of extra cost for their bread in order to make up this difference. I think the two price system is a very dangerous thing, and we should avoid it altogether if we can.

Certainly, the long range solution is diversification. This has been recognized by such eminent authorities as Premier Ross Thatcher and the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, a man who is at least regarded in some quarters as being an expert in this area. Certainly, a reduction of wheat acreage is absolutely essential.

I do not see that our economy can possibly support a U.S. type system under which we would be making continuous payments to maintain land out of production. I do not see why we cannot utilize the same sort of programs here that are utilized in the maritimes, and places where industry has fallen into distress, where relocation grants are given to people who are willing to change their vocation. It is questionable indeed that taxpayers should have to pay for something that farmers might well have done for themselves and which, in many cases, progressive farmers have in fact done. These are not miners or people employed in Cape Breton coal mines. These are basically self-employed businessmen, with wide discretion as to how they should handle their affairs. When they find themselves in some trouble we very definitely must give them assistance, but the programs that we advocate in this area must be selective; they ought not be universal.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): After listening to that last word of authority on this problem, I am somewhat taken aback. I felt that this was perhaps another Senator in the making. One of the suggestions he made was that there was a need for some sort of assistance to the western economy. Naturally, this would include the province of Alberta. The

hon. member suggested that we should be very selective. Does his reasoning also relate to old age security, which is paid to millionaires? Is that the type of reasoning he has in mind, and does this apply across the board? Is this Liberal policy that is being enunciated, because apparently the member has been selected as one of the spokesmen from the west.

• (9:20 p.m.)

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) suggested that only 25 per cent of the loan payments were not made as of the date they were due. If he would look up the previous record, he would find that about a year ago only 6 per cent of the loans had not been repaid. There has been a great increase in unpaid loans. Let me say further that the irresponsible statements have been made to the effect that the former minister of agriculture said "You grow wheat and we will sell it". There could be no more irresponsible statement than the one that came from the lips of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he said, "We intend to sell one billion, three hundred million bushels in three years". Nothing of the sort came about. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) tried to explain to us why this goal could not be achieved now. He said this was a kind of goal, but this is not an election year.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce attempted to chastise the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) for having made only one suggestion in his speech, that is for only advocating cash advances for the purpose of injecting money into the western economy in a hurry. Let me say that the only thing with which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) dealt in his speech was cash advances. If anyone can find anything else in his speech, apart from a lot of words, then let him stand up and say so. I think it is somewhat unfair of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to accuse the Leader of the Opposition of having dealt with only one subject in his speech.

Many suggestions were made from this side. I realize that I have only a limited amount of time at my disposal and therefore I should like to organize my comments somewhat. First, I wish to list some of the ways in which the government could inject money into the western economy, money which even the Prime Minister himself admits is needed there. After about three days of indoctrination, and after having seen for himself what the situation was like, he was ready to admit there was a problem. If the meetings which we had in Saskatchewan with the members of the touring agricultural committee were not sufficient evidence, and if the representations to the government by various farming organizations were not sufficient proof for the Prime Minister, then I don't know what proof he needs. He was going to use the charm he possesses, Trudeaumania—mania it is, but not the type of mania he thought. He believed all he had to say was, "follow". They socked him right there, and he said, "whoa, there" instead of "follow".

The first thing I would suggest, regardless of what anybody else may say here is acreage payments. The Prime Minister asked, "why should we subsidize a rich farmer who possesses $100,000 worth of property?" It is all right provided there is a ceiling, and it is up to the government to select that ceiling. The point is to inject some money into the economy in the west. What the government does not realize is that it is not only the farmers who are broke; it is everybody down the line. The businessmen in the west have gone broke and so have the municipalities which have had to hold back plans for new roadways. The hospitals have had to hold back their projects. The people are sitting and wondering what kind of government we have. I regret to have to say this, Mr. Speaker, but—

An hon. Member: Be careful, now.

Mr. Korchinski: I am very careful. I say this because I heard it. People are saying that this government turns only one way. They spend $200 million on the city of Hull, and people are asking why the government does not spend $30 million in western Canada. I will make a suggestion as to how this could be done. The International Grains Arrangement price for wheat is $1.95½. In recent days this price has gone down by ten cents to $1.85. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce indicated that he sold only 305 million bushels. Is $30 million too much to spend on the three prairie provinces? Is this too much to ask of this government? Do we have to drive a tractor over the Prime Minister before he realizes that assistance is needed? What the government must realize is that these people do not want to act the way they did when the Prime Minister visited them. In the past they have not acted that way because there was no need for it.

I will speak about the Farm Credit Corporation now. In the last four or five years

almost $1,100 million has been borrowed from the Farm Credit Corporation. I believe that at present the figure stands at $1,070 million. But the significant fact is that almost one third of that sum has been borrowed in Saskatchewan. The reason is that the people there are more desperate, as is obvious from the statistics. When the people of Saskatchewan did not give the Prime Minister the type of treatment he would have liked to have had, it was not because they are less kind than other Canadians but because they are more desperate. The Minister of Agriculture suggested that cash advances will help them. I say to him, let him come and make a few Liberal speeches in my constituency. I invite him to do so. Let him tell the farmers in my riding, who last year had dry crops and this year had frozen crops, how they can get a cash advance. What is he going to inject there? I know what he is going to inject.

We ask for the adoption of a two price system. It is too much to ask? What is all the talk about guaranteed income? Does it mean something or does it not? Is it or is it not part of the Liberal philosophy? Let the government adopt it if that is what they believe in. Let them go ahead and increase family allowances. It is the families with children that will eat the bread, so let us give them more. But do not deny assistance to those people who have been working hard. I do not think everyone realizes how much work farmers have to do. When you realize that they have borrowed to the hilt and worked their fingers to the bone, there is little enough reward. It was the Conservative government which increases the amount of available loans under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, but it was the Liberal government that increased the interest on the loans. There lies the difference. At one time the interest rate was 5 per cent. Now, when you go to a bank, you are told "I do not think I will renew your loan because you are a bad risk".

At one time the banker used to say to you, "you are a good risk. Any amount of loan you want is fine". This is not the case now. How can you sell your wheat? The credit is not there any longer. What should the government do? They should make arrangements with these banks, and this can be done, to make loans available at rates lower than they are at present. At one time the interest rate on a loan was 6 per cent, but later it went up to 12 per cent—even 15 per cent as my seatmate has suggested. That is why there is a shortage of money in the west. No one can tell me that farmers do not need the money, but the fact is that the banks have slowed down the granting of credit. These people will not add to the inflation any spiral. They are simply trying to regain credit facilities. They are trying to repay their notes at the bank so they may establish credit with which to carry on. As has been suggested, they will carry on because there is no more enterprising individual than the farmer.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Korchinski: The government makes no effort to solve the problem, despite the banks' earnings being at the highest level on record. I put those figures on record about six months ago and shall not repeat them now because my time is limited. The fact is that the banks have made a great deal of money from the farmer, because he is a continuing borrower. The government must realize that when the farmer goes to the bank, this kind of arrangement is made. What is regional development all about, if it is not to help those areas which are in need? If this is the kind of development we need, the government must institute a program to implement it.

I do not know what I have to do or say to convince the government of the seriousness of the problem. If it is necessary to get down on my hands and knees to do so, I will do it. Does the government realize how many farmers are broke? They are not able to buy groceries. The grocer who allowed them an advance for a month or two is no longer extending this privilege. The situation is extremely serious.

The government says that in three or four months time it will give the farmer a cash advance. I will arrange for the Minister of Agriculture to visit my constituency and explain the government's stand to my people, because an explanation is vitally necessary. I have tried to explain these things to my constituents. I ask the minister to persuade the government to do something to solve this problem and upgrade its image in the west.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) visited my area and knows the type of people I represent. They welcomed him. They spoke kindly of him and to him. Would he please appeal to the Prime Minister, on behalf of these people, to do something to solve the problem? We do not have surpluses. My area developed after the 1930's. There are in Canada depressed areas in provinces other than Quebec. My people cannot

understand assistance being concentrated in one area. It has been said that $125 million was written off in respect of Expo. This was great for Canada, but it did nothing for me or my constituents. It does not enable a family to go to the grocer and obtain a pound of coffee without paying for it. The farmers in my area cannot get their tractors out of the repair shops. Their business suddenly collapses, and some people wonder why. The banker says to him: If you cannot pay up, sell your tractor.

The government has tried to establish economic units. We thought we had economic units. If a farmer is not able to sell his grain, he does not have an economic unit. The Prime Minister has said that if the farmer does not have an economic unit the government will buy his land. Does this offer apply to a man who is unable to sell his grain?

There are on the other side of the house good Liberal backbenchers to whom constituents have opened their books and exposed their income tax returns. This is not an easy thing for people to do because their business dealings are private, but it has been done. I appeal to the government: Let us not be wishy-washy. Let us not be silly about cash advances. There has to be an injection of money into areas of the country which are worse off than others.

I have never opposed anything I believed was good for the country. If a program has been necessary for the maritimes, I have suppported it. Let us not ignore the plight of the western farmer. Let us not delay taking action for political reasons, because later may be too late. If action is not taken now, Canada will lose its best farmers. This is a question of simple mathematics: if you have 1,000 acres under cultivation—this is a much greater acreage than the average farm—and a five-bushel quota, you produce 5,000 bushels, which if sold at $1.70 a bushel amounts to $8,500. One pays about $2 an acre in taxes, and at least $1,000 for fertilizers. The average farmer pays from $1,500 to $2,000 for fuel. If one obtained a loan of $15,000 under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the interest at 5 per cent is $750, which for five years amounts to $3,750.

In addition, a farmer has to pay for repairs to machinery; he has to have enough money on which to live; he has to pay insurance premiums and many other things. The only way one can live on a farm at this time is to send your wife, if she is healthy enough, to work off the farm so she can make some money in order that the family may eat. This is the seriousness of the present situation with a five-bushel quota. A $290 million reduction in the final payment last year, compared with that of the previous year, and a reduction of $80 million in sales this year, amounts to $370 million. As I have said, the farmer's costs have increased.

I should now like to deal with the International Grains Arrangement. I believe I understand the situation in this regard. If under this arrangement we have not been able to produce a satisfactory deal for Canadian farmers, we had better scrap it. I asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce a question today about the International Grains Arrangement. According to the fine print of that arrangement, members of the European Economic Community are allowed to deduct from the price—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret very much that I have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may continue with the unanimous consent of the house. However, I think at this point I should remind hon. members that the Chair has been given a long list of applicants for participation in this debate; therefore, hon. members may wish not to abuse the privilege of speaking beyond their allotted time.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I thank the house for its indulgence. I shall finish my remarks very quickly. France is a member of the International Grains Arrangement. France is our big problem in this regard because she is a large producer and is a supporter of the price level. She has the right to subtract the cost of the freight from the gulf to the port of export and establish her price at that level. Then, France has to add the charge from Marseilles to, say, somewhere in Turkey. This is always lower than the price at the gulf. This is why France is in a preferred position, and her exports are 30 per cent higher this year. But Canada cannot benefit from the same kind of arrangement. I realize that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce does not want to reveal the fine print, but the government had better face up to the fact that Canada has had the wool pulled over its eyes once again. In fact, Australia is now doing what France is doing.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Another reason why France does not care about exporting to the far east is that the transportation would be so costly it would raise that country's export price to the level of the Canadian and the United States export price.

I like the $1.95 level, I can assure the house. I want it as security for our farmers. But if it works only to the advantage of France and Australia, then we had better take a second look and see whether we cannot find something more advantageous.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar.

Mr. Basford: We finally have an N.D.P. member in the house.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I hear some comments from across the way, Mr. Speaker, and it is nice to know that government members do have something to say. Except for the tractors that were purring up and down the roads of Saskatchewan last week, the silence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been deafening.

Mr. Basford: The Prime Minister was listening.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. George Bain of the *Globe and Mail* said that he had made some remarks about kicking a small boy in his posterior, though I do not know whether that is correct or not.

If hon. members across the way will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some remarks about the grain situation in Saskatchewan and particularly in my constituency. I listened to the bland remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) as he talked of cash advances. Certainly, he must have been in a different part of western Canada from the region I visited last week. Surely, as he watched the television and saw, as I did 7,500 farmers gathering in Regina, another 8,000 or 10,000 gathering in Saskatoon and the thousands of tractors driving up and down the roads, it must have been brought home to him that something was amiss on the prairies.

Today I was informed that the price of wheat has again declined. The members have repeatedly asked over the last several months for a policy statement from the government with regard to meeting the existing situation. Neither the members nor the farmers have received an answer. In view of the situation in Saskatchewan, I would say that the farmers of that province treated the Prime Minister very well.

I asked the Acting Prime Minister last week whether it was the intention of the Prime Minister of Canada, when he visited Saskatchewan, to meet with the National Farmers Union officials. I was told that no such arrangement had been made. If the farmers union had not put those tractors on the road and made a protest, I submit the Prime Minister would have gone to Saskatchewan, entering on the one side and leaving on the other, without sitting down and talking with the representatives of thousands of farmers in the province.

I like to hear talk of participatory democracy but I am not interested in gobbledy-gook. If the term "participatory democracy" is to be used, let it be used in its real sense. In order to have real participatory democracy the government must be prepared to sit down with the individuals in whom the farmers have confidence, those they have elected to head their organizations, organizations to which the farmers pay a certain amount every year as members.

Eventually the Prime Minister did meet these officials, and we heard talk of farmers with assets of $100,000. This was supposed to be an indication that these farmers were well off, rich. This is the application of the new economics. I did not have the advantage of going to a school of economics to learn about such things, but I have talked to a good many economists and I never thought that one judged a person's income by the amount of capital he was able to invest. But it seems that you do judge the financial position of farmers in Saskatchewan, in Ontario, or for that matter in the maritimes, on the basis of how many tractors they have, the size of the tractors that are standing in the yard, and the acreage that they have.

In all sincerity, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he use a different yardstick, because this one is going to lead him badly astray. The measure of a grain farmer's income is well known. It is measured by how much grain he sells and by the price at which he sells it. The same is true of a livestock farmer. One member on the other side of the house stated that the problem facing the farmers would still exist no matter which government was in power. I do not think the problem would be quite so bad as it is under this government. The difference would be that something would be done to solve the

problem, and this would be quite an important difference.

I should like to tell the government why this is not the first time that the farmers of Saskatchewan and western Canada have found it necessary to demonstrate when a Liberal government was in power. The same thing occurred in 1946. The farmers picketed the grain elevators and dairies in western Canada, and I was one of those who took part. Circumstances at that time had become so intolerable that the farmers just could not make a living. A few years following the action that we took in 1946 the government was bounced out of power, a very prominent minister of the day having tapped a Manitoban on the tummy and told him that he looked very well fed. Perhaps the farmers look well fed, but I am sure the government knows that the credit unions are strapped for resources to make loans in Saskatchewan at this very moment. Surely, the government's sources of information are as good as mine. Surely, the government knows that banks are being selective in granting loans. They must have this information if they are trying to assess what is the present financial situation of the farmers.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I hope the government will take an honest look at the situation and consider just what is at stake at the present time. What is at stake is the economy of the province of Saskatchewan in particular, that province being the main wheat producer, and that of its two sister provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. Some business people have asked prairie provincial governments to clamp a moratorium on interest rates. This is a business economy and when certain people ask for a moratorium to be clamped on interest rates it is time that the powers that be took notice, because something adverse obviously has happened. The government's real failure is in coming to grips with the existing situation. The Prime Minister has told us we must grow less wheat. He could have saved himself the trip to Saskatchewan if that is all he wanted to tell us. The farmers of the country have reduced the acreage of wheat under cultivation from 29 million acres to 24 million acres in one year, which is a pretty hefty reduction. What are they to grow if they do not grow wheat? That question must be answered by the government and farm organizations. Why has the government not consulted with farm organizations and worked out these matters?

[Mr. Gleave.]

Why has it come to the point that the National Farmers Union and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture are saying their voices are being ignored? Are these organizations not worth talking to?

If you want answers about the automobile industries you talk to automobile manufacturers and labour union representatives in their plants. If you want answers about agriculture, should you not talk to people who have had long experience in agricultural organizations? Believe me, the prairie farmers in particular will not disregard ideas which are valid. They want some kind of direction from the government. They are like sinking men, ready to grasp any rope that is lowered to them. They are willing to try any good idea.

We need to be told frankly what is the situation with respect to the International Grains Arrangement. Reports vary from week to week. One day the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) tells us he has attended a nice meeting in Washington, that everything will calm down and that the national representatives are going back to their country to work out new arrangements. The next day we hear the United States has slashed grain prices by 12 cents a bushel. I do not know what the new, lower Canadian Wheat Board asking price is. Is the farmer not to be told the status of the International Grains Arrangement? If it is not working, why do we not ask representatives of responsible nations which signed the agreement to meet? After all, the agreement was part of the GATT negotiations. Responsible nations negotiated the agreement. Should we not ask them at a meeting, "Look, is this a piece of paper or is it an honourable arrangement reached by honourable representatives of honourable nations?" Why does the government not do that? Are we to wait forever before knowing whether the International Grains Arrangement can be made to work and what the new minimum price is to be? Does the government think for a minute that farmers will survive when prices have dropped from $1.95½ to $1.80, $1.75 and, after that, to $1.62½ per bushel on the international market, basis Fort William-Port Arthur. With prices like that does the government think for a minute our farmers will remain in business? Surely, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) should know that with these low prices our farmers can not survive. That farmers cannot operate their farms on a $1 per bushel cash advance for six bushels per cultivated acre. How can anyone operate a farm under these conditions? Some parts of

the country are on a four bushel delivered quota right now; others are on three bushels; other areas have delivered five bushels. The price of wheat is nosediving on the international market and I plead with the government to heed the plight of farmers in western Canada. Let us forget all about the gimmicks and the bickering. Let us try to help the farmers of western Canada before it is too late.

Mr. Dinsdale: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gleave: We do not want handouts and charity; we want some plan that will enable our farmers to operate their farms. Many practical steps can be taken. For instance, it is amazing that the Canadian Wheat Board, which has been in operation for 20 years and has a pricing policy, should have no storage policy. We have never said that in this country "We will store this much grain and no more." In Saskatchewan we can now store an entire crop of grain on the farms. We have storage capacity in the elevators on the track and storage capacity at the terminal points. Why does the government not get down to cases and examine these facilities. Talk about a guaranteed income! The grain companies are the guaranteed income boys in western Canada.

An hon. Member: Richardson and Company.

Mr. Gleave: A storage policy should be worked out and we should determine how much grain we want to store and what that will cost. We could even pay farmers for the grain on the farm, and seal it up there. That grain will be available when needed, and will cost us less to store. Is it not ridiculous that in a country like Canada we have difficulty in moving the grade of grain we want to tidewater at the right time? Should we not examine our entire system of transportation with a view to making it more efficient? We want to move grain more efficiently. After all, we have a big investment in grain. Is the government not concerned about these matters?

The fellow who has been done to death in western Canada is the legitimate grain farmer. We relinquished our control over the feed mills and, now, the situation is completely out of control. Is it not ridiculous that farmers have to haul their wheat down the highways and sell it for a pittance to avoid having their tractors and trucks repossessed? That is what we are talking about, and that is what we ought to be concerned about. Only grain grown on a farmer's own land should be delivered on a quota system. No other grain ought to be included and any one abusing his quota privileges ought to be called to account. The Departments of Agriculture, and Industry, Trade and Commerce ought to be concerned about this matter. We ought to enforce our quota system and try to expand our export markets to the maximum.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I think I am right in saying that from the time the International Grains Arrangement was signed the government and the Wheat Board found themselves in a bind, to put it bluntly, for two reasons. One is that the very large productive capacity of the Soviet Union was left out when, under the auspices of GATT we negotiated the new International Grains Arrangement. The U.S.S.R. was in the old International Wheat Agreement, but when we negotiated the I.G.A. the U.S.S.R. was left out. I am satisfied, after reading the record of what happened subsequently with the common market countries, that the second problem is that the International Grains Arrangement never came to terms with the common market countries.

The common market countries have done just as they wanted ever since. We have been trying to live with the grains arrangement and hold an umbrella over prices, in the face of countries who did not care whether a price was maintained or not. When I asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce about the situation with respect to importers, he said they wanted cheap wheat.

How cynical these countries are. They signed that agreement. As importers, they are equally responsible with exporters. How do we ever hope to have peace in the world if countries cannot be depended on to keep an ordinary commercial agreement? They should be called to account, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member to remind him his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in this debate on the situation in which prairie grain farmers find themselves, particularly in view of the recent cut in wheat prices by the United States which has been followed

in part today by Canada. I spent last week in Saskatchewan because of the visit of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to my province on Wednesday and Thursday last. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the Prime Minister's day in southern Saskatchewan last Wednesday, for all of which time I was with him.

In the forenoon we had a very cordial and frank meeting with the executive committee of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. They presented a brief which was a model of clarity and objectivity. It was a good source of information for the Prime Minister and a fine preparation for meetings with farmers on two farms later that day and in other parts of the province the next day. The wheat pool requests were moderate, well reasoned and thoughtfully expressed.

I wish to point out in passing that the government recently appointed Mr. Charles Gibbings to the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Gibbings had been President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool for over eight years. He is a practical wheat farmer in Saskatchewan, one of the best informed and respected farmers in the grain business. Farmers have been asking for such representation for many years and I believe the people of western Canada are very appreciative of the fact that this government has made this extremely significant appointment which I believe augurs well for the future operation of the Wheat Board.

We had a noon meal with Premier Thatcher and members of his government. The discussion again centred around the farm income problem, including box cars, quotas, prices and markets. I am sure the Prime Minister must have been impressed with the gravity of the farm income situation and its evident effects on the urban centres, the provincial economy and the dangers inherent for the national economy.

After abruptly concluding this luncheon meeting in order to keep on the planned schedule for the afternoon, we were met by a group of people outside the hotel, many of whom I am sure were not farmers. Our Prime Minister was asked to speak to the crowd, which he agreed to do. It turned out to be one of the worst displays of bad manners on the part of some individuals in the crowd that I have ever been unfortunate enough to witness.

The Prime Minister was interrupted constantly by catcalls, unfriendly remarks and some that were almost obscene. Many placards were displayed, some of which were to the point, but many others were rude, crude and vulgar. We were struck in the face by handsful of wheat thrown by someone in the crowd. The private cars which had been arranged for transporting the Prime Minister's party to the airport were damaged by sabotage. We were not able to use them and had to use R.C.M.P. cars instead.

An hon. Member: We read all this in the newspapers.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): I do not quarrel with the right of people to put on demonstrations, but this was unreasonable. I wish to take this opportunity on behalf of the vast majority of the people in Saskatchewan who were shocked, embarrassed and saddened by this shabby display, to publicly apologize to the Prime Minister for the appallingly bad manners exhibited by some persons in that gathering.

I am happy to say the rest of the day was pleasant and informative. We went to two farms south of Regina, in one of the main wheat growing areas of the west, one of which was my own farm.

An hon. Member: That figures.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): There, the Prime Minister discussed farm operations and intimate financial problems with ten selected farmers and their wives.

An hon. Member: Carefully selected.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): These farmers were chosen because they were representative of different age groups, different sized farms and different stages of the development of their farm enterprises. The Prime Minister saw and operated some of the high-priced farm equipment which is required on grain farms. He saw bins full of grains that cannot be delivered. He saw the figures for last year and this year which show that even in good farming areas farmers cannot pay their expenses at present quotas and prices, much less meet capital payments where they, on advice from agricultural authorities and experts, have tried to expand to become economic units and to increase their efficiency.

I know from news reports that the other days in the prairie provinces were also very informative and, for the most part, cordial and candid. I am sure that the Prime Minister is much better informed, especially about grain farming and the current problems surrounding that industry, than he was before his trip. I trust that he and the government

will give sympathetic and favourable consideration to at least some of the representations made by the responsible people with whom he had serious discussions last week.

I do not propose to go through the whole catalogue of those proposals, but I would like to dwell on some which I regard as basic minimum requirements. In my opinion, the federal government can do no less than support the price of wheat at $1.95½, the floor in the International Grains Arrangement, which runs for two more years. The support should be retroactive to include the past few months during which the Wheat Board has been selling below the minimum. This arrangement was drawn up by governments, signed and ratified by governments, and has now been broken by governments. It is nothing more than ordinary justice that the government should bear the cost of this price cutting, instead of the farmers who produced the wheat in good faith. Such a guarantee would obviate the necessity for reducing initial payments.

This was one of the unanimous recommendations of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. It has the support of the prairie provincial governments and of all rural and urban organizations in the west. The government set the precedent for such action by supporting the price of wheat at that level for the 11 months prior to the commencement of the I.G.A. on July 1, 1968. There is even more justification for doing so now because the arrangement is a legal fact as well as a moral obligation.

• (10:10 p.m.)

There is some question about the cost. It could be expensive. Perhaps prices could drop as much as 25 cents below the minimums, although I fervently hope not, on possible sales of up to 500 million bushels. This could amount to $125 million a year, which is about equal to the annual subsidy to dairy producers and only a drop in the bucket compared to the subsidies accruing to industry and industrial workers because of protective tariffs. I want to again suggest that the proposal for a two price system for wheat should not be discarded without a thorough investigation, as I still believe it is an eminently fair proposition. It is reported that the Prime Minister has turned down the idea. If this is so, I think we should be told how much investigation took place and all the reasons behind any decision that may have been made against it. Incidentally, the agricultural committee favoured the two price system too.

Other action that should be taken includes some further incentive to reduce wheat acreage; that is, in addition to the very severe quota restrictions which have already resulted in a 12 per cent reduction in wheat acreage this year. I suggest a cash payment of at least $10 per acre to farmers who have voluntarily reduced their acreage this year and to all farmers who will do likewise next year. This would help the cash shortage position immediately and assist farmers to adjust their farm operations to alternate production. Grants or low interest loans to assist farmers to convert to livestock production or feeding should also be provided. There should be an exhaustive inquiry into the grain delivery quota system with a view to making it more equitable and to eliminating abuses which have developed. It seems obvious to me, notwithstanding the assurances of the Wheat Board, that thousands of farmers will only have space to deliver three or four bushels per acre instead of the promised five bushels. Farmers know they must have low quotas when grain sales are down, and they are realistic enough to accept this fact. But they will justifiably and understandably resent inequitable distribution of those marketing opportunities there are. These inequities that I foresee will arbitrarily, unpredictably and sharply affect ther incomes and their very ability to survive.

Farmers and all western people would applaud some plan which would allow all farmers to share equitably in the grain market. The most common suggestion is to have the crop year extended past July 31 for a limited number of days or weeks until space is made available at delivery points where it is needed. I understand, however, that this plays havoc with the tremendous bookkeeping operation of the Wheat Board.

My number one proposal would be to have a continuous quota. That is, instead of cutting off at three, four or five bushels on July 31 then starting back at one some time after August 1, why not continue on to nine or ten or twelve bushels or more next year, to whatever level sales will permit and of course top priority should at all times be given to maximizing our sales. This would allow the railroads and elevator companies ample time to equalize quotas. It will be said that this will allow people who did not have much wheat last year to deliver up to two years quota out of the new crop. Perhaps there would be a few but what is wrong with farmers who had

a crop failure or a poor crop last year being permitted to make up for lost income in the coming year? I think this is a very fair proposal which should be tried through 1969-70. If it proves successful I do not see why a continuous quota should not become a permanent system, as long as the grain surplus may continue.

Another possibility is the addition, with affidavits if necessary, of the number of bushels farmers may not have been able to deliver on the five bushel quota by July 31 because of the vagaries of boxcar distribution to their authorized deliveries in their 1969-70 quota books. There is also the suggestion that the Wheat Board inspect the grain on the farm, grade it, seal it and pay the initial payment on it with delivery to be made when space becomes available over and above the new crop year quotas. Solving this dilemma would cost the government very little, perhaps nothing at all, but it would go a long way toward demonstrating the good faith of the government and its understanding of farmers' needs and feelings. Lacking such a solution I fear that many farmers will have their gross incomes arbitrarily reduced by up to 50 per cent and as anyone remotely knowledgeable about grain farming will recognize even a five bushel quota is not sufficient to pay operating costs.

Again, I plead for the appointment of a transport controller to co-ordinate grain movement. An effective controller would have averted the various bottlenecks we experienced throughout the season and would have prevented the anxiety and difficulties that I know we are confronted with now and will be in the next ten days. Many of the suggestions I have just made would cost the taxpayers little or nothing; others could cost a considerable sum. The question has been raised as to how such expenditures can be justified. Let me offer these few suggestions.

First, the government has a responsibility with regard to the minimum prices under the I.G.A. which I referred to earlier. Second, for several years farmers have been encouraged by government and other food experts to expand production. They did so in good faith and are now left holding the bag. Third, our Liberal farm program in the 1968 election campaign included an undertaking to export 1.3 billion bushels of wheat in three years and we are far behind in progress toward that goal. Fourth, the same program included a proposal for farm income maintenance and now is an appropriate time to put the proposal into operation.

[Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia).]

Fifth, other sectors of the economy have been able to organize, with government encouragement, to raise their prices, their profits, their professional fees and their wages to keep their incomes in line with costs. Farmers have been unable to do this, at least partly because of inadequate marketing legislation. Sixth, other Canadians are receiving varying amounts of government assistance. Examples are dairy farmers, fishermen, people requiring low rental housing, the auto industry, mining industries, special assistance to the maritimes and so on. Seventh, wheat and Canada are almost synonymous and the wheat industry will continue to be of major importance to the national economy and deserves some temporary special assistance to keep it viable and from becoming bankrupt.

Time will not permit me mentioning other desirable programs but I urge immediate action on these suggestions, especially on the guarantee of the I.G.A. floor price and on some system of equalizing delivery opportunities.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would permit a question, I should like to ask him whether he has submitted these proposals to the government. If so, could he tell the house whether any member on the government side listened to him and what hope he has that any of his suggestions will be adopted.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): In answer to the question I should say I have submitted some of these ideas to the government at various times and I am in the process of submitting them again. I have not had favourable answers yet but I am still hoping.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I think he has made a far greater contribution to this debate than either the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) or the two of them together. I can assure him that if the government would listen to his views we could go home for the evening instead of being here through the night in an effort to support some of the things he has said. I regret very much, however, that the hon. member had to apologize for the action and the manners of some of the people last week in front of the Prime Minister. I certainly

have to agree with what the hon. member said in respect of such action, because certainly we cannot condone that type of manner among us, let alone to the man who holds the high office of Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Really, what we witnessed in Saskatchewan was an inept Prime Minister in confrontation with an infuriated people.

• (10:20 p.m.)

What bothers me is that the week before last when we were denied the right to have this debate before the Prime Minister left for the West, he called the debate on the fundamental rule changes a stupid filibuster. He called the question period, which is intended to prod the government and keep it on its toes, a waste of time. In view of this he should not expect anything but the kind of abuse he got when he goes out to meet a public which cannot find the answer to its problems. It is about time the Prime Minister understood this because he is goading Canadians facing these problems to action which might well be more serious than what we have witnessed. Unless there are solutions to their problems we may see something more drastic than we have seen in the past. There is an agricultural crisis in the country far greater than anyone has suggested from the other side of the house, except perhaps the last speaker, that hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

An hon. Member: This is a crisis in the world.

Mr. Thompson: It may be a crisis in the world, but right now we are concerned with the Canadian farmer. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture stated this very well at its last meeting in Calgary a few days ago. Let me quote from a press release that came out of that meeting:

> —Their review of the deteriorating grains market situation and of the income situation in the country has served only to add strength and urgency to already overwhelming evidence that immediate and very substantial action must be taken by the federal government. The disastrous income losses being suffered by western farmers and the western economy demand cash assistance now and very early initiation of action plans for the longer run. The seriousness of this situation cannot be overemphasized.

I am shocked tonight that the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Olson) is not even here for this debate. He was here long enough to make his own speech, but he was not even here at all this afternoon. This crisis is worthy of far more action than his remarks tonight which were related strictly to the immediate cash crisis. It is also an interesting fact that the Minister of Agriculture when he talks about this problem today is talking in an altogether different language than the language he used when he sat with me in another section of this chamber. It would be very interesting to put the speeches he made then and the speeches he makes now alongside each other. He certainly speaks in support of policies which according to his earlier speeches were not acceptable then.

An hon. Member: You also sound different.

Mr. Thompson: What I am saying tonight is what I have always said about this farm crisis and I will have to continue to say it until some different agricultural policy comes forth from the government. Let me quote from an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on July 18. This is not a newspaper which is known to criticize the government. The editorial reads:

> The wheat farmer today is not in the situation of the Indian, the Métis or the fisherman. For these latter groups, poverty and low income are entrenched in their way of life: The challenge to society is to change that way of life.
>
> The wheat farmer, on the other hand, is like a man hit by a tornado, a flash flood or other natural disaster. His fortunes have been spectacularly reversed overnight. He possesses a viable, highly developed business operation—and his problem is to keep it from going under in this crisis period.

Those are correct words, and that is why the right hon. Prime Minister is wrong when he tries to make a comparison for the benefit of those people down east who are facing trouble of an altogether different nature. The editorial continues by giving Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures in relation to the situation in respect of farms:

> (D.B.S. figures give some indication of the impact of the trade slump to date: In the first quarter of this year, wheat farmers received $94.3 million for delivery of their wheat, plus another $27.1 million in clean-up payments, compared to $154.2 and $77.2 million a year earlier, and a total of $392.2 million in 1967).
>
> No country can afford not to make a financial set-back of these proportions a top, emergency priority, however anxious its government is to balance the national accounts. The alternative which is no alternative at all, is to see an industry, or a goodly part of it, wiped out over night—and to create displacements that will endure long into the future.

I submit these comments and say to hon. members opposite who do not even have the politeness to listen to what is being said, that it is not only a short range problem that

farmers are facing, it is a long range problem. Furthermore, the Bureau of Statistics farm cash receipts report of July 9, 1969 points out that the total market returns to the producers of wheat at the time of delivery was down $60 million.

Let me say to hon. members that the farming industry is the only industry in this country that is asked to operate on less than what it costs to operate. Unfortunately, the farmer does not have the ability to set the price for what he produces; he has to accept the market price given to him.

What happened as a result of this cash crisis is that farmers face cost of operation which has gone up in the last 20 years by more than double whereas the price he receives for what he produces has gone down. It has been said by the Minister of Agriculture that those farmers who have stock are not so badly off, but one must remember that the prices farmers get for cattle today, even though they are higher than they have been, are not more than double what they were 10 to 20 years ago. At the same time the farmer is being asked to take something like $\frac{2}{3}$ of the price for coarse grains and considerably less for wheat because he is often forced to sell his wheat to feed lots of 60 or 70 cents a bushel instead of 1.50 at the least. As a result he is caught in this price squeeze about which he can do nothing.

The farmer is not asking for charity, he is asking only for a fair price which will cover the cost of production and give him something to live on besides. To justify the action I have suggested let me point out that the farmers can provide evidence to the effect that no industry has improved its efficiency as much as the agricultural industry in the last 20 years. That is the only reason farmers have been able to survive.

In view of this deficit cash position the western farmers are in trouble. This situation does not only affect the western farmer but the farm implement dealers as well. We have been told they have dropped 50 per cent of their sales this year. The Saskatchewan Implement Dealers Association reports that the decrease in the sales of grain will result in 50 per cent of its 450 members being forced out of business due to an inability to finance inventory.

We do not have to consider only farm implement dealers. What is the situation in respect of the farm fuel dealers and the problems they have in collecting money for fuel necessary for the operations of the farm? It is all right to compare a farmer to a fisherman, but a fisherman does not operate without a boat, and a farmer today, as efficient as he is, cannot farm without equipment and a heavy overhead cost.

I agree with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in its protest to the federal government and the statement which came out of a meeting of July 16 which reads:

> All agree there is a crisis in the prairie grain economy—a crisis of low income caused by falling prices and sales. Detailed proposals have been made by the federation to the federal government for short term assistance, for minimum price maintenance, for a more adequate domestic wheat price for human use, for a systematic longer-term policy approach. Yet no response to these proposals has been received by us one way or the other.

• (10:30 p.m.)

There is one exception. A week later there was a response by the Prime Minister when he said, "we are going to put in $250 million as a cash injection into the western economy". This was not something he decided last week. This was something this house approved several weeks ago. But again it has no relation whatsoever to the long range and basic problems that the farmer faces, and it is small wonder that the farmer reacted in the angry way he did. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture said specifically that the government has done nothing for the grain farmer except to increase his advance payment and help him go deeper into debt. This is what we have done three or four times through different pieces of legislation this past year. The federation says that the government has failed to take the action necessary to set up national marketing boards which have been requested by producers. A request for a Canadian egg commission was made more than a year ago, the federation stated, and there is still no answer in this regard.

The government has fobbed off producer requests for federal-provincial producer discussions once a year at which producer representations can be received. Then, there is the Agricultural and Rural Developmsnt Agency, known as ARDA, which has been lumped together with the new Regional Economic Expansion Department which no longer has any agricultural base at all. These are some of the other things about which the farmers are angry.

In the short time at my disposal here this evening let us come back to some of the suggestions that have been made today by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce

(Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). It was only a couple of months ago that the Minister of Agriculture reaffirmed his own belief in a two price system. I quote from a Canadian Press release dated May 1, 1969. It reads in part:

> Agriculture minister H. A. Olson reaffirmed Thursday his belief in the principle of a two price system for wheat, but gave no indication that it would become government policy.

Why did he not have something to say about that tonight? Why did he have to wait for a backbencher from his own party who knows about farm problems to talk about alternatives other than the short range advance payments and increased debt solution which the Minister of Agriculture suggest? The article goes on to say:

> As a Social Credit MP for Medicine Hat before joining the Liberals, Mr. Olson persistently called for a two price system.

We do not hear very much about that at present. When there is talk about a wheat crisis and when some members from across the aisle talk with not much evidence that they know very much about problems in agriculture, and when the farmers are told they should not grow so much grain, I wonder just how foolish the government can become in its reasoning. At least a third of the world's peoples, and that is more than a billion people, have gone to bed hungry tonight. Why cannot we do something drastic as far as the agricultural policy of this country is concerned. Why can we not back up what the Liberal party said in the last election, that is "Go ahead and sow your grain; we will sell it"? I remember it very well. Why can we not take what our farmers can produce in their efficiency and make it available to a hungry world?

We have heard some suggestions made here today. One which was made by a member to my left was ridiculed by the other side of the house. I do not think there was anything to ridicule about his suggestion. When there are people starving in the world and we have more grain than we know what to do with, there must be some way of making our surpluses available to those who do not have enough to satisfy their hunger. Why do the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce not take the lead in convincing the government to say to the farmer, "We will buy your grain. We will help you provide storage for it; we will store it on your farm and we will see that this grain goes out to the people who need it all across the world." It may require the adjustment of the whole system of international settlements to different criteria. It does not necessarily mean a complete give away. It may require us to accept credits from countries in their own monetary exchange rather than demanding dollars for what we sell.

In the long range program we will not be able to continue using crutches and putting out palliatives of more debts and advance payments without solving the basic problems that our farmers face. Why do we not build more elevators to store grain? It has already been mentioned that one does not have to go farther than the scriptures to see why grain might be stored. Perhaps we should put the extra crop away for a few years until a time when we might not have grain or make it available to other parts of the world who do not have it. This is what we should hear the government talking about. Some of our newspapers are becoming aware of these problems and offer solutions which might be a little different from the status quo which is being advocated by the government. I am referring to the Toronto *Telegram* of July 16 where the following was stated:

> As long as there are people in many parts of the world who go to bed hungry each night, Canada, as one of the major food producing nations, should continue to raise cereal grains and other foods and distribute these free to the needy countries.
>
> The government should pay reasonable support prices to the farmers for wheat and the other food essentials produced.

No industry can survive when they are being forced to operate at less than the cost of their operations. I say to some members across the floor who are making a lot of noise at present, in the words of the article:

> Since the Trudeau government took office, it has been reassessing Canada's contribution to such military alliances as NATO, NORAD and to various police-keeping forces. The Prime Minister has indicated that cutbacks in these could result in the savings of millions which could be used to assist some of the developing nations.
>
> What a glorious opportunity he has now to help these countries in a tangible way. They could use the wheat and other food we have in great surplus and we should get it to them.

We could make arrangements and settlements other than those we now make. We could take the lead in convincing the rest of the wheat producing world that they have an obligation in this as well. The government hopes that the United States might listen to their cries as we beg for mercy from them and from their policies as they relate to the International Grains Arrangement. Why do

we not take the lead and try to show them that we have a responsibility which goes beyond the immediate economic situation of the day? The article continues:

> Canada's fertile fields should not be permitted to lie fallow when the world needs their production.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McBride: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Thompson: I only have a few minutes left. The hon. member can ask his question afterwards.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Thompson: I am merely following the pattern of the Minister of Agriculture and of other speakers who have preceded me on the other side of the house. What we need is a long term agricultural policy in addition to short range and urgent help which must be given now. What kind of pressure and what kind of demonstration will move the Trudeau government to this kind of action?

The crisis is here now. Unless we do something in this regard so far as Canadian agricultural industry is concerned we will be into an economic crisis before too many months have passed, one that we cannot even visualise now. The Canadian economy cannot afford the consequences of further delay. While it may help farmers for the few months during the harvest period to get an advance on the grain that they are not able to sell, unless we bring in some policies such as the ones that have been suggested here not only from this side of the house but, for example, such as the very sound ones that have been made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) we are going to destroy the basic industry of this country which is still agriculture. This industry is the strength and backbone not only of our economy at home but also of our whole foreign policy in our relations with the countries less fortunate than ours.

Mr. McBride: Will the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member will need the unanimous consent of the house since the time allotted the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has expired.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): The need for this debate has arisen because of the lack of government action and policies to deal with the crisis that is facing western Canada at the present time.

Mr. Gibson: Nonsense.

Mr. Burton: You do not know anything about it. This afternoon and this evening we heard two ministers of the government take part in this debate. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in his genial way took us around the world and dealt with the international grain picture. I think that most members are aware of some of the problems that exist. I cannot say that his review added to the knowledge of hon. members in this regard, but I have no objection to his pointing out some of the factors that exist in the international grain markets.

• (10:40 p.m.)

The minister went on to list a number of things he suggested had been done by the government and that the government was doing to deal with the present situation. He pointed, of course, to a number of policies which were in fact introduced prior to the coming to office of the Liberal administration. Then we had the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). It seemed to me that when the Minister of Agriculture was preparing his notes for this debate he must have written a marginal note in which he said: Case weak. Shout like hell. I say this because I was very disappointed in the contribution of the minister. He first of all suggested that the major problem is cash flow. All hon. members will recognize that there is a cash flow problem. But surely if the Minister of Agriculture and other ministers of this administration have not as yet recognized that there is a more basic economic problem facing the agricultural industry in western Canada, they are not exhibiting a very high degree of competence.

The minister went on to reject one of the proposals put forward by hon. members, namely, acreage payments. I recognize that there are pros and cons with respect to the administration of acreage payments. However, I suggest it is one way of providing a cash injection into the western Canadian economy that would bolster the general economic picture. Other proposals have been made. My colleague the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) proposed a series of deficiency payments which could achieve the same end and possibly avoid some of the administrative problems referred to by the Minister of Agriculture. However, the minister did not deal with that proposal.

Unfortunately the Minister of Agriculture is no longer in his seat. He was here for only a short time this evening, as was pointed out by another hon. member. If the minister is not prepared to consider acreage payments and other proposals put forward, what proposals has he for alleviating the situation that exists in western Canada? If he rejects this form of payment, surely he should come up with some other means of providing a cash injection into the western Canadian economy.

The two major farm organizations, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the National Farmers' Union made clear in their presentations to the government this spring that while they might favour one particular means of cash payment over another, in fact they thought the major problem was to provide a direct infusion of cash into the western Canadian agricultural economy. The government has apparently failed to take this into account or give it any serious or adequate consideration.

The Minister of Agriculture went on to point out the advantages and benefits accruing from the cash advance program. Of course, the cash advance program was approved by all of us in the house. It has made a contribution to the welfare of the agricultural community and has in fact given farmers an advance on the production which they are unable to market immediately because of problems with which we are all familiar. This is why the cash advance program was advocated some 15 or 16 years ago; it is why it was introduced some ten or eleven years ago. It has played a very useful role in the western Canadian economy. But surely, Mr. Speaker, the government must by now have received the message that something more than this program is required. It must by now realize it is not enough.

The Minister of Agriculture also referred to two steps taken during the past year with respect to the cash advance program. I do not blame him for attempting to take the credit for these steps. However, when the minister and the government overplay this measure and say it is the solution, it will provide great benefits, and trumpet the $250 million figure about and say this is what the government is doing for the farmers of western Canada, I suggest it is the type of statement which produces the kind of reaction and frustration which in fact resulted in some irrational actions during the past week which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) could tell us more about. This type of proposal simply will not deal with the problem that exists at the present time.

I am very glad that the Minister of Agriculture has again resumed his seat. I place this on the record because I commented on his absence just a few minutes ago. Other hon. members might have done the same when they were referring to certain absences earlier in the evening.

The final clincher of the Minister of Agriculture was when he said that as of May 1, 75 per cent of the farmers owing money to the Farm Credit Corporation made their regular payments, and only 25 per cent, I take it, were in arrears. Is the minister seriously suggesting that this is an indication that everything is all right, namely, because one quarter of the farmers owing money to the Farm Credit Corporation were in arrears as of May 1? I know farmers in western Canada who were able to scrape up some of their last pennies to make their payment on May 1, and they have no idea where the next payment will come from or how they will meet it.

The minister then referred to the remaining 25 per cent who were in arrears and suggested that one half of them were already in arrears. I would not attempt to suggest the motive of the minister in making that statement. However, the effect of his statement was to cast a slur on all western Canadian farmers. His statement that roughly 12½ per cent, or one-eighth, of the farmers were already in arrears left the impression that those farmers were in effect a bad credit risk and were not meeting payments they should be able to meet. I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture, who seems to be flitting in and out of the house at the present time—

An hon. Member: He is back again.

Mr. Burton: The minister is again in his seat. I suggest to the minister that the fact 12½ per cent, or whatever is the exact figure, of our farmers were in arrears prior to April 30 last, was due to the already serious financial trouble they were experiencing. The fact that one-eighth of our farmers were in arrears as of April 30 is, I suggest, one indicator of the seriousness of the situation that is developing. Farmers in western Canada can see that the picture is getting worse, and it will get even worse. I suggest this is one reason why they are not swallowing the statements of ministers who suggest that the cash advance program is such a great thing and will solve the present situation. The government knows very well that you cannot

borrow your way out of debt, that in fact this is simply an advance loan on money already owed the farmer for the production sitting in storage on his farm. He will have to pay it back as soon as he is able to make deliveries. Thus, I suggest, the government should look further afield to some sort of effective solution to the present situation.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), to his credit, put forward a number of proposals most of which were in line with those made by my colleagues and myself. But somehow he seemed to be a voice crying in the wilderness. He could not even work up any applause from the government benches while making his speech and placing his proposals before the government. To the credit of that hon. member, he was perfectly frank and honest when he answered a question from the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), and stated he had placed these proposals before the government but as yet had not received a favourable reply. What sort of response are these proposals receiving? This is an example of what is causing the frustration that people are now witnessing in western Canada.

• (10:50 p.m.)

A while ago the Prime Minister made reference to psychological alienation in western Canada. I suggest to him that some cold, hard cash in the hands of the western Canadian farmers at the present time in the form of income assistance would go a long way toward relieving the psychological alienation that he had noted over the last few months, and which I have no doubt he observed more closely last week.

One thing I noted about the speeches of both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was that neither dealt with the substance of the motion introduced by my leader and seconded by myself. Neither dealt with the immediate situation that had brought about the motion, namely the reduction in wheat prices in the United States during the past few days. Neither minister indicated to the house what action the Canadian Wheat Board or the Canadian government is taking in this regard. Neither minister would even indicate what was the response of the Canadian Wheat Board. I should like to know whether they have lowered their prices today.

We on this side have heard reports through the media that wheat prices are being lowered, yet, as I say, the ministers would not make a statement about what the Canadian Wheat Board had done in response to the United States announcement. It seems to me that if these ministers wanted to make a positive contribution to the debate, this is one matter on which they should have reported to the house.

In addition, neither minister dealt with the basic income situation in western Canada which is the consequence of a whole series of things that have happened over the past year, the latest development being one further example. Neither minister chose to deal with the income situation or to voice their own views about it, let alone indicate the attitude of the government. I do not expect them to have any policy proposals to offer tonight. After all, this would be an indication that they were bowing to and giving in to the opposition's demands. I suppose they have to stage these things in order to get the best possible advantage. But the farmers of western Canada are not going to put up with any more staging in regard to this particular matter; they demand action, and they demand it now.

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), in commenting on some of the incidents that took place during the Prime Minister's tour last week, quite rightly pointed out that the root cause of some of the demonstrations was the refusal of the Prime Minister prior to his visit to meet representatives of two major farm organizations the Saskatchewan Farmers Union and the National Farmers Union. When people who have the right to speak on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan and western Canada cannot get to talk to the Prime Minister, I suggest the reaction we witnessed in Regina, Saskatoon and other points last week has to result.

Let me, along with others, make it quite clear that I do not condone some of the events that took place last week. But if in fact we are going to have some sort of participatory democracy about which we have heard so much from the Prime Minister and members of the government during the past year and a half we will have to have both a change of attitude and a change of heart. We will have to take a different approach to problems such as these.

The background to the present situation extends over a number of years. I am not going to take the time of the house to deal with it in any detail. Mention has been made of a number of developments over the past three years, and since hon. members are

familiar with the general pattern I will not elaborate on it. However, I should like to refer to a statement made by a former Minister of Trade and Commerce, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), as well as to some statements made by Mr. Winters when he was Minister of Trade and Commerce. The general attitude at that time was to tell the farmers of western Canada: "You grow the wheat and we'll sell it".

This indicates to me that neither minister knew what he was talking about. Neither had any idea where he was going in terms of agricultural and trade policy. What they said was simply an item of political propaganda.

The farmers of western Canada are getting fed up with this sort of cavalier attitude on the part of the government and its ministers and they are demanding straightforward answers to straightforward questions. They want action taken by the government. During the past two or three years we have witnessed a series of developments which have steadily eroded the economic position and welfare of western Canadian farmers and placed many western Canadian farmers on the verge of bankruptcy.

The government has asked us what our proposals are and what we suggest the government should do. We have put forward all sorts of proposals. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) tried to make a little political hay when he said that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) had placed more proposals forward tonight in regard to this particular matter than had been put forward at any previous time in this house. The minister knows that that is not the case. He is aware that both within and without the house spokesmen of the farmers of western Canada have advocated a comprehensive program involving both short-term and long-term measures to deal with their problems.

Just one example of this was given at the meeting between officials of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Prime Minister in Regina last week. At that time several short term, immediate proposals were put before the Prime Minister. The first was that there be an immediate payment to the grain producers based on 1968-69 cultivated acreage of $2 per acre up to a maximum of $2,000. Secondly, that there be a guaranteed floor price for export wheat of not less than the present International Grains Arrangement minimum of $1.95½ basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead. The third was that sales of all wheat for domestic human consumption by the Canadian Wheat Board be at a price of $2.95½ per bushel. A number of other long-term proposals were also placed before the Prime Minister.

I do not see how the government can get around providing a guaranteed wheat price based on the International Grains Arrangement minima. After all, this was an agreement that was entered into with other nations of the world, not by the farmers of western Canada or by the Canadian Wheat Board, but by the nation of Canada. It is the Canadian nation that has the responsibility of living up to the agreement in terms of its consequences for western Canadian farmers.

With regard to the two-price system, farm organizations, my own political party and even friends of hon. members opposite have made certain representations. I am sure that even the premier of Saskatchewan advocated a certain course of action. I am sure that members across the way are familiar with this hon. gentleman.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman but his time has expired, unless he has unanimous consent to continue.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Burton: Typical Liberal arrogance!

• (11:00 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Boulanger: On a point of order, sir, I had hoped you would recognize me. I have been on my feet a couple of times trying to catch your eye.

Mr. Paproski: What does the hon. member know about wheat?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I have already recognized the hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

Mr. Boulanger: On a point of order, sir, while I would not question Your Honour's decision, I wish to point out that I have been here all day as an observer. I am not a farm expert, perhaps, but that does not prevent my noticing that only two socialists and one Creditiste member remain in the house. It was the socialists who insisted on this debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Order, please. In my view, the hon. member's remarks have nothing to do with the Standing Orders.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Does the hon. member feel better now?

Mr. Boulanger: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should not say things like that.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member's remarks have nothing to do with the Standing Orders.

[*English*]

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the frustration of the hon. member who raised a point of order a moment ago in not being able to participate in the debate. Ordinarily I would gladly forego my opportunity to speak, if he could be given the floor. The hour is getting late and, as the hon. member who raised the point of order said, not as many attend here as attended earlier in the day.

Mr. Paproski: Liberal members are staying only because they have been told to.

Mr. Dinsdale: I am speaking at slightly after eleven o'clock this evening, Mr. Speaker, because this is the only opportunity we shall have to speak on the matter which is most important, not only for the prairie grain farmers but, for the entire economy of Canada.

Mr. Gibson: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: I appreciate the applause coming from that agricultural expert, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson). He has been most vociferous in this debate and I hope he will make some formal comments before we finish.

I was in the west last week in response to a growing chorus of protest that has come to me from farmers in my constituency. Last week the Prime Minister was also in western Canada. I am sure that the strength of the protest greeting him made manifest to the Prime Minister—especially when representatives of prairie grain producers confronted him—that we are faced with a fundamental, critical, economic problem in Canada even though it is obvious, after listening to comments from the other side of the house, that hon. members over there are not yet convinced that the situation requires immediate and urgent action. I was amazed, as the Winnipeg *Free Press* so aptly put it last Saturday that in taking this pilgrimage to the west the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was going on a voyage of exploration and discovery to find out what makes things tick in western Canada. It was shocking to realize that after having been in office for one year, the Prime Minister for the first time was going west to discover what western Canada is all about.

It seems I have been under the wrong impression. I had thought that the Prime Minister's lack of information and resultant lack of action in dealing with the situation had been due to the fact that the regional advisers had taken the place of the elected representatives in his own party from the western part of Canada. After listening to some hon. members from the other side of this house, particularly the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) who comes from a western province, I have come to the conclusion that the fault is not with the representatives in the regional desks, but with the failure of some western M.P.'s sitting on the government side of the house to correctly interpret the situation to the government.

The hon. member in a carefully prepared and well read speech obviously was acting as an apologist, trying to explain away this critical economic problem. I heard other members, not in formal speeches, commenting that the situation arises from an uncontrollable world situation, world economic agriculture problems and world surplus. That seems to be the excuse for failure of the government to act on a matter that has been brought in dramatic terms repeatedly before the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the balance of the cabinet.

I have a stack of formal briefs on my desk, some of which date back to last April. I quote from a brief presented by the Manitoba Farm

Bureau dated April 18, 1969, which concluded with these very strong words:

> At the risk of being repetitious, we feel we cannot overemphasize the seriousness of the immediate situation of some Manitoba farmers. We appeal to you for some means of short term assistance such as a transfer payment which will allow these people to literally survive until effective readjustment programs can be implemented.

The Prime Minister went west last week to discover this fact, although it had before him and members of the government for several months. To put it in specific terms, I think one of the best presentations that came across my desk, and I am sure the desks of other hon. members, was from the Canadian Federation of Agricultural. It is dated May 28. I wish to read to hon. members, who still apparently think what we are dealing with is related to an international agricultural crisis and not an emergency that has been described by several members in the debate as putting the grain producers of western Canada in a hopeless and impossible financial situation.

The situation was described last May 28 by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture as follows:

> The income position of many prairie grain farmers is clearly disastrous. Deliveries of wheat to prairie country elevators are running (April 23) 84 million bushels less than the previous year to the same time. The previous year's deliveries ('67-'68) were in turn down 158 million bushels from 1966-'67. It is clear that the two-year drop in annual deliveries ('66-'67 to '68-'69) will reach from 250-300 million bushels at least which at $1.60 per bushel represents from 400 to 500 million dollars. Farmers cannot live with this kind of decline in their returns.

• (11:10 p.m.)

Here is the situation, presented in the proverbial nutshell, so that the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) and others who have spoken in an apologetic vein this evening on behalf of the government, must realize there is a real financial emergency in western Canada. The government has known about this for the past four or five months. As I say, I was shocked when the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) tried to present the myth that there are wealthy farmers who take trips to the south and drive Cadillacs, and all the other nonsense we hear from hon. members in this house, in an effort to avoid facing the economic reality that was so clearly presented last May in the excellent brief of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. This not only affects western Canada. Wheat is one of Canada's basic export commodities. If we are down $500 million in financial returns because of the disastrous decline in wheat exports, this will have a significant impact on the Canadian economy from one end of Canada to the other. It will have an effect on the manufacture of machinery, automobiles and all the other articles which largely one way or the other affect manufacturing industries in central Canada.

It was the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), when he was the minister of finance in 1964 when the boom was really under way in Canada, who made a statement to the effect that one of the main ingredients in the buoyancy of the Canadian economy was the strong position of prairie grain exports on the international market. If it was true that this was one of the reasons for the national buoyancy then, the converse is precisely true that the position of prairie grain exports now could have a disastrous effect on the total Canadian economy. We must get emergency cash into the hands of the farmers together with some long term program to deal with the disastrous effect of the lack of dollars. Farm income requires immediate emergency action on the part of the government of Canada. The western Canadian economy suffers from other disabilities in addition to the immediate crisis. The proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Richardson), the minister in charge of supplies, is to decentralize the Mint and establish it somewhere on the prairies. This is hardly adequate consideration.

Let me try to destroy the myth perpetuated by the hon. member for Calgary South as a spokesman for the west. His viewpoint is incomprehensible. Let us look at the figures in the green book brought down by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) recently which covers the fiscal year 1966-67. This is from the records of the Department of National Revenue itself. Of the 89 cities listed in order of income tax paid, Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba, was 53 on the list. Brandon, my own city, was 79 on the list. Portage Laprairie, in the heart of the rich plains, the great grain producing part of Manitoba, was 89 on the list of the 89 cities so far as income and taxes paid were concerned. Here is a real measure of the actual state of the economy. It does not indicate there are too many prairie folk taking holidays in the south or driving gold plated Cadillacs. I could give the picture for the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatoon is 38, Regina is 46, Prince Albert is 49 and Moose Jaw is 65. Oakville and Oshawa are near the top, and they had the benefit of an $80 million injection into the automobile

industry. The explanation was this was good for employment and good for the economy as a whole.

By the same token a cash injection into a sorely tried prairie economy at this particular moment would have the same beneficial effect. Toronto is 13. Montreal, which is supposed to be operating under financial straits and has had to resort to lotteries and such like as well as having had the cancellation of the $125 million Expo deficit, is 20 on the list. This is not too bad when you compare it with the general picture. The city of the hon. member for Calgary South, Calgary, was 16. That for the most part I think is due not to the wheat economy but the oil economy. Lethbridge is 56 and Red Deer is 60. I present these figures to indicate that in addition to the immediate crisis as outlined in the statement from the Federation of Agriculture, there has been a relative position of financial inequity because of the problem outlined by the minister of supply with regard to location of industry head offices and all the other disparities which affect the western economy in broad terms.

This is the immediate crisis. Obviously, the many supporters of the government do not appreciate it. The Minister of Agriculture does not realize the significance of it. According to press statements, the Prime Minister is now aware that there is a major crisis because certainly it was brought home to him in a very vociferous manner which indicated the degree of the farmers' frustration. We take the opportunity of this debate today and this evening to urge upon the government some action to relieve the hard pressed prairie farmers.

Before I conclude, perhaps I might be allowed to mention a more immediate and urgent problem. That is the assurance from the government as we come to the end of the current crop year that every delivery point in western Canada will be assured of at least a five-bushel delivery quota. One of the protests I heard last week, as well as the letters which come across my desk copies of which were sent to the Minister of Agriculture, the Prime Minister and so on, are to the effect that there is still a shortage of box cars. Many points are still on a three-bushel quota without any hope of any delivery of the three-bushel quota. We need immediate emergency action to at least assure this minimum delivery to all points across western Canada.

Finally, because my time is limited, let me say in respect of the Prime Minister sallying forth into the west last week on a voyage of discovery to see what the prairie problem was all about, that he was really motivated by political events in the province of Manitoba. I do not think there was a more direct indication of a political protest than that which exists on the prairies. This message came through very loud and clear to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house. They are aware of the political facts of life, and some of them might be whistling in the graveyard, if we may judge from the speeches made today, but the events in Manitoba above all else should convey a message to the politician that these people demand action from the government at this time.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, having come from a metropolis such as Edmonton, which is the Klondike city of western Canada and strongly in support of the underdog, I find the government treatment of the wheat situation a rank scandal. In his trip to western Canada, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) revealed the mind of a bureaucrat, bound by regimentation, quoting regulations, and reiterating old policies as though these things were the answers. Wheat farmers cannot eat policies. He parroted the economists' argument that if wheat is not selling, if farmers are short of cash, it must be because they are running uneconomical farms. How is it that farms now described as uneconomical were making money a few years ago when this government first came into office?

• (11:20 p.m.)

The Prime Minister's argument is simply to put the blame on the Canadian wheat farmer for the government's failure to sell wheat. It is a straight case of buck passing, one of the most blatant ever seen in Canadian politics. The Prime Minister's brand of suave, philosophical soft-soap no longer washes with people desperately in need of a clear, effective policy from the government. By that I do not mean words. I mean action and cash guarantees.

As soon as the word "cash" is mentioned, the little coterie around the Prime Minister start yelling "subsidy". Subsidy is not necessarily a bad word. Ask the auto-makers. It is too bad that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is not here at present. I ask those in search of the solution to the wheat problem to read the Bible. My friend, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr.

Thompson) mentioned it. He took the reference right out of my mouth. Read about the seven lean years and the seven fat years. That is the cycle in which we find ourselves. Joseph's solution was to store the wheat in the fat years and sell it in the lean years, just in case hon. gentlemen opposite do not know about it. Nothing has changed. The situation now is the same in its essentials as was the biblical situation 4,000 years ago. The only difference now is that the government is asking the farmer to bear the storage costs, the handling costs and all the other costs resulting from the government's stupidity and mismanagement.

Let us look at how this came about. When this government came into power wheat markets were flourishing and taxes were 30 per cent below what they are now. Our national income was up while prices were down. I am referring to 1963. The Liberals came to power on a phony issue which no one ever bothers to discuss now, namely the Bomarc issue. It is as dead as last year's wheat sales. They proceeded by mismanagement and neglect to destroy the huge wheat markets we had built up from 1961 on. Last summer they sat with their hands folded for months during the interim period after the International Wheat Agreement ran out. They trotted over to Europe and let the Canadian farmers be sold down the river, while prices dropped. They were afraid to stand up to the United States when that country, along with France, shot holes in the International Grains Arrangement which has now been totally repudiated by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who has no more understanding of wheat than he has of trade or industry. I am sorry that the minister is not here because I hate to say things like this about the fine gentleman.

Mr. Dinsdale: This is the truth.

Mr. Paproski: The government refused to step in during the month-long grain handlers strike last year. They refused to step in while shipping piled up in Vancouver harbour because box cars were not available to transport wheat. They did nothing while our markets went down the drain. Now, the Prime Minister goes to western Canada and puts on a performance that can only be described in waltz time, perhaps "Voices of Spring", or "Tales from the Vienna Woods". Here we have the Prime Minister of a government which lost the Russian wheat contract and the Chinese wheat contract and sat helplessly while our customers went elsewhere because of uncertain delivery. Then, the Prime Minister has the gall to say to the most efficient producers in the world: You are not economical. Western Canada should rise in its wrath and give its answers to the government; I am confident it will do so. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the wheat issue is not a local nor a regional issue, as the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) knows; it is a national issue of first importance.

Mr. Boulanger: To you it is a political issue.

Mr. Paproski: This nation cannot afford to lose the massive injection of income we have received through wheat sales. The economy will suffer a heavy blow because of the loss of half a billion dollars in international wheat sales, or even half that amount, which is the expectation for the coming year.

The impact of the government's failure to sell our wheat will show up almost immediately in the economy of western and eastern Canada. Not only is the western farmer a major producer; he is also a major consumer. The effect will be seen in reduced sales of new automobiles manufactured in eastern Canada, reduced sales of farm machinery also manufactured in eastern Canada, reduced sales of appliances, clothing and a host of other consumer goods on which the economy of the country is balanced. An economy already on the razor's edge and suffering from overtaxation, overpricing, over inventories and unjustifiable interest rates cannot easily sustain the shock of a major blow at this time.

The tragedy is that in the face of a national calamity the Prime Minister has no solution beyond the negative, bureaucratic formula of overproduction and uneconomic operation. Surely, we have gone beyond the stage in our economic capabilities to react to a situation such as this by burning production or plowing it under. The Prime Minister's text books must be 35 years out of date.

It is up to the government to produce a solution that will get the farmer off the hook, move the wheat and restore confidence in the Canadian economy. If they cannot do that, they should resign and we will do it for them.

The farmers' union proposed the solution that the government take over our surplus wheat. What is wrong with that? The government's answer is to let the farmer take it over. Why should the farmer, the producer, who has fulfilled his part of the contract by

producing the world's finest wheat at low cost, now be told he must hold the bag? The government should take over the surplus wheat and pay the farmer the price he would have received if the government's incompetence had not allowed the price to drop. The farmer should be paid, say, $1.65 a bushel and the wheat should be stored in government granaries. In a year, two years or three years, when wheat is once again in worldwide demand, the government could sell it and get its money back. The government is acting as though it is up to the farmer to sell his wheat. It is not, it is up to the government. The farmer has grown the wheat, now let the government do its part.

• (11:30 p.m.)

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing one of the most crucial problems that confront the Canadian economy today. My remarks will be brief because the hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew (Mr. McBride) seems to indicate that he wishes to participate.

In discussing this subject we are talking about the livelihood, not of just a few hundred or a few thousand people, but literally tens of thousands of people in western Canada. The International Grains Arrangement breakdown is not going to help them but will increase the danger that each and every one of them is facing. Yesterday was one of the most important days in the history of mankind. Mankind finally realized a dream that has existed for centuries. Man perfected his technology and skill, reached out and landed on the moon. We hope that within the next couple of days a successful return to earth will be achieved. I think all of us would want to congratulate those involved in this mission, but I hope that this great achievement in technology, science, cybernation and so on can be translated into the commencement of a new chapter in moral and social improvement the world over.

I have often said, both in this chamber and outside, that it is something of a contradiction that we are able to land a man on the moon but yet we are unable to sell grain. It is even more ironic that although we cannot sell our grain, half the people in the world are either starving or suffering from malnutrition. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) talked of this earlier this evening. This situation creates a certain unrest and alienation in the world today. When people are hungry they are not happy, and this leads to restlessness and rebellion. It opens the door to war, revolution and so on. We, in Canada possess one of the best means of promoting friendship—food, bushels of grain. Yet we are sitting here tonight when this country has a surplus of about one billion bushels of grain and yet people go hungry.

This is not the result of the inefficiency of the farmers. In a recent by-election campaign in Saskatchewan I talked to dozens of farmers, and one of them who lived outside the town of Foam Lake had a 1968 Pontiac parked in his driveway without any licence plates. When I asked him why the car was not licensed, he said that he did not have the money, though he had 17,000 bushels of unsold grain in his bins. This is one illustration of the situation of some of those who live in the west and gives those who have not visited the west some idea of conditions there.

The leader of my party mentioned the fact that a year or so ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of this country told the farmers: "You grow the grain and we'll sell it". During his recent trip out west he said that the government could not sell any more grain so our farmers should not grow it. That statement came from the Prime Minister, who, not long before, had talked about hypocrisy. If that attitude is not one of sheer hypocrisy I do not know one that is. That suggestion, coming from the leader of the nation, the Prime Minister, was one of sheer hypocrisy. The Prime Minister is supposed to be an example to us all.

The farmers are efficient and are growing grain. May I read a few sentences from a statement made by a representative of the farmers' union to the government at Ottawa on May 5 of this year. The statement concerned grain policy and reads in part:

> Grain farmers on the prairies face a serious income crisis in 1969. Inadequate levels of efficiency and productivity cannot be described as a cause for the income problem which currently faces the wheat grower.
>
> In the five-year crop period 1958-59 to 1962-63, the average wheat production of prairie farmers was 1,965 bushels. In the five-year crop period 1963-64 to 1967-68, this average had increased to 3,322 bushels. This represents an increase of 69% in the average of the past five years over the average of the previous five years—

Those words indicate the sort of person who lives in western Canada today. Our farmers have fundamental problems. It is not their fault these problems have arisen. The

problem of the farmer is felt by many other industries across Canada. I continue quoting:

> It is ironic that in a world where millions daily suffer the pangs of hunger and thousands daily die of malnutrition, the abundance of Canadian agriculture should prove to be an embarrassment to the nation and before the world.

That statement summarizes pretty well our present situation and narrows our focus to the point of the problem confronting us. Really, there is no farm problem, because markets could be found. There are hungry people all over the world and we should be trying to feed them. Therefore, what we are discussing is basically a national policy. We are considering this government's policy towards the international grain market, as well as towards agriculture in our country as a whole.

There are three basic questions we must ask ourselves. First, what is the situation in western Canada today? Second, is the government aware of the situation on the prairies? Third, what are the solutions? During the next few minutes I hope to mention a number of things which may help. I hope my suggestions will enlighten hon. members about the current situation in western Canada. The situation, and I mean this sincerely, is very, very grim. As a matter of fact, in many prairie areas today it is disastrous. Tens of thousands of prairie farmers are facing bankruptcy. Many have already gone bankrupt; many others are being forced to leave the land and go to the cities. One could go on talking about the many problems these people will face once they get to the cities. Many of these people have no skills and will become the new urban unemployed and the urban poor.

One can see readily that many farmers are broke. I met many such farmers when I was in Saskatchewan a few days ago, for the week end. When farmers go to banks for loans or loan extensions, they discover interest rates have gone up, and this situation has led to a vicious circle. Many farmers cannot afford machinery. Many are having their machinery repossessed. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) was telling me about some farmers he met at a week-end picnic; many of them did not know where they would get money to meet their next payment on farm machinery. The effects of their plight radiate out in circles. Not only is the farmer of western Canada being affected by the situation, the small businessman also is suffering—although our teachers are not suffering quite so much. The suppliers of farm machinery and owners of small businesses in small towns such as Yorkton, Melville, Kamsack and Kenora are suffering. They are suffering because there is not any money around. We need more money in the western economy, otherwise there is going to be a national disaster in the very near future. On June 10 of this year, 55 per cent of the delivery points in Saskatchewan were on a three-bushel quota or less. A year ago, in 1968, not one was on a three-bushel quota or less. Also, in comparison, on June 10 of this year there were no points in the west that were on the six-bushel quota. A year ago some 35 per cent of the delivery points were on the six-bushel quota. I think this is another illustration of the situation as it exists.

• (11:40 p.m.)

In addition to this, the farmer is caught in the cost-price squeeze. The cost to produce a bushel of wheat has gone up and the farmer's income has gone down, in many cases drastically. We are appealing to the government to save an industry. Many members have talked about subsidies today. Western farmers get angry when members talk about subsidies. They say, why does the federal government subsidize General Motors and the Ford Motor Company to the tune of $80 million a year? Why are *Time Magazine* and *Reader's Digest* receiving subsidies? Why are gold mines receiving subsidies when farmers are not even getting an even break in our society? Farmers are not going to put up with this kind of nonsense any longer.

We saw what happened out west last week. I say this is only the beginning unless the government institutions make some radical changes at this time. Farmers are organizing in order to protect themselves. Almost every other sector of our economy is organized today, whether it is labour or business.

I wish to quote from page 2 of the farm union brief I was quoting a few moments ago:

> It is the goal of the National Farmers Union to organize farmers from sea to sea in Canada into an organization of farmers and for farmers. We believe we must face the realities of the times, that farm problems are primarily national and international in nature, and that the problems which farmers face across Canada must be rationalized by farmers at the national level in an organization that can, in fact, be an important forum in participatory democracy.

I endorse the actions of the western farmers and I encourage them to get together and organize. It is very sad that all too often governments only react to what is happening in the community. A government will only go as far as it is forced. If the government does

not do something soon, more and more farmers are going to become more and more militant.

I now come to the second question. Is the government aware of the type of situation that exists in the west today? Many farmers feel they are not aware of this. I will quote from a press release issued on July 1 by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool:

> More and more western farmers are saying that the federal government does not understand the seriousness of the agricultural income situation, says E. K. Turner, president, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.
>
> Individual farmers and their organizations, from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool through to the Canadian Federal of Agriculture, have documented their case accurately, have made reasonable requests, but so far, Ottawa has not taken positive action.

This type of reaction is found in almost every part of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I maintain that the government is aware of the situation which exists in the west at this time. If they are not aware, they should be.

I wish to go over some of the representations which have been made. Nearly every day in this house the opposition has questioned the government in an endeavour to get them to do something and to inform them of what is happening in western Canada. The government of Saskatchewan had made a request that the federal government implement the two-price system for wheat. Other provincial governments have submitted briefs, have met with the minister and have met with the Prime Minister. Farm organizations have come to Ottawa time and time again. The National Farmers Union has submitted a brief, and the Federation of Agriculture has submitted a brief. Still, very little is done. Even more important, a committee of this house comprised of members of all political parties, including the hon. member for Lanark and Renfrew (Mr. McBride), made a tour of the west. They spoke to the farmers, attended meetings, and then came back and made a report. During their tour of the west they met with some 18,000 farmers on two different days. In summation, the committee concludes that the situation out there needs some drastic remedy if many farmers are to be saved.

Finally, there is another point I should like to make. Two or three cabinet ministers are from the west. One is from Saskatoon and I do not think he could help but be aware of this situation. There is another from Winnipeg. But apparently the Prime Minister did not believe any of these sources, so he went west himself to find out. He was presented with briefs. He met with some of the premiers, the Union farm leaders and the farmers themselves. I should like to read part of an article which appeared in the Regina *Leader Post* of July 16. It reads as follows:

> The farmers were obviously intent on getting some action. One farmer, who was in charge of a group of tractors, said the demonstration will continue and, if necessary, farmers will take more drastic action.
>
> "We can't afford to see some of the best farmers in Saskatchewan going bankrupt," he said.
>
> If the farmers were not "badly off" they could not be here, he said.
>
> He knew of one farmer who has 70,000 bushels of grain on his farm and had to borrow money to carry on his operation.
>
> But he said the sale of grain is not enough.
>
> What is needed is a graduated minimum price as well as grain sales, he said.
>
> A farmer from Tantallon said farmers have a choice of either protesting in hopes of accomplishing their goals or going bankrupt.
>
> He said he knows of farmers who have 40,000 to 50,000 bushels of grain in storage and "yet will likely have to fold up."
>
> At least 96 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan are facing serious financial difficulties, he said.
>
> Tractors converged on Regina from No. 1 highway, No. 11 highway and No. 6 highway—from all directions.
>
> Most of them carried signs with slogans such as "Trudeau is a bum steer," "My grain headache is killing me"—

• (11:50 p.m.)

I think these are just some examples of how serious things are getting in western Canada. I think these demonstrations are a warning signal for the government that if something is not done immediately things are going to be much more serious. Many farmers will seek more drastic alternatives in an attempt to make their rights known to this government. After all, it is their very livelihood and the future not only of themselves but their children that is involved. These people will naturally become very insistent in search of alternatives to make their situation known.

Let me finally come to what must be done. First and foremost, all of us realize that the farmer alone must not bear the cost of an international price war. If something happens which causes the price of grain to fall drastically, the farmer alone must not bear the full brunt. The Canadian public as a whole should share in any loss which occurs, if there is to be one.

There are many long and short term solutions which have to be investigated. Many

people on this side of the house, particularly those who belong to this party, have offered solutions today. Let me be as brief as possible. On the short term basis, we need an immediate influx of cash into the western economy, something in the nature of $100 million or $200 million. We had a budget brought down in the house not long ago with a projected surplus of $250 million. At that time I, and many of my colleagues, asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) whether they might consider diverting some of this projected surplus into an emergency plan for western agriculture. We did not get an answer. They just said the government had done enough. We must inject some cash into the western economy immediately, otherwise we will be confronted with many more serious economic problems in the very near future.

Members of our party have suggested many ways of solving this problem. One possibility is the adoption of a deficiency payment of 20 cents per bushel up to about 5,000 bushels, or a payment of some sort bringing the price up to $2 per bushel to the extent of 500, 600 or 700 acres, or perhaps a combination of these on a short-range plan to help the western economy. We must realize that we need many long-range programs. We cannot solve this situation with only short-range planning. We have to sell grain and get it to the people who need it. We must start working toward long-range credit plans and a more comprehensive trade system. We must give the farmer a better guaranteed price for grain. We should have a two-price system in respect of wheat. This has been suggested by many organizations.

Farm income has dropped by some $430 million in 1968-69. This is why something has to be done now. As a final suggestion, I should like to recommend something which I think is unanimous in the minds of almost every western farmer. The Minister of Industry Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) should resign immediately from his post as minister in charge of the Wheat Board. I respect the intelligence and the integrity of this minister, but his record thus far, and from all indications he has given to us for the future, point to the fact that he is not the man for this type of job. His resignation immediately as the man in charge of the Wheat Board represents the very least the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) could do for the western economy. Many other things must be done, but it is time the government got its head out of orbit and came down to earth.

Wheat Export Prices

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate. I shall not attempt to unduly aggravate the good spirit and mood of this house by being too lengthy in my contribution. It is because we are dealing with a matter of utmost urgency, which has progressively become a crisis, that I have been prompted to enter this debate.

After all, one might have expected that following numerous reviews, task force reviews, submissions made by numerous people, the thorough study and investigation of the Standing Committee on Agriculture when it travelled out west, and the importuning of the many western members of parliament, along with the great trip of the Prime Minister, (Mr. Trudeau) even at this late date we would have some firm policy statement by this government aimed at relieving the crisis caused by a critical shortage of cash and deteriorating prices in our farm economy.

The government should have acted long before now and made such emergency consideration of this long standing problem unnecessary. We have been in session for something like ten months, but we have had no positive or realistic approach brought forward to alleviate this urgent matter, despite the fact that we have had a continual dialogue with members involved in the farm community. Leaders of the opposition parties have been helpful in offering suggestions and solutions, nevertheless the government has failed to act. After all, the wheat problem we now face is not new. It has been with us since the bungling and the grossly inept actions of a previous Liberal government, which left the Canadian wheat producer defenseless in the world market place, when they agreed to go along with the general cereals arrangement instead of the old International Wheat Agreement, thus opening the door to almost one full year of a free world grain market.

This latest crisis, grave as it is, is only one more chapter in a long and dismal story. We all know that despite the pious submissions uttered by the amiable Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) on his return from Washington, Americans are realists and will trim their prices to meet market conditions. Where does the recent U.S. cut of 12 cents per bushel leave us? Sitting self-righteously on our mountains of unsold wheat. Where does this leave the producer in this climate of economic uncertainty, of rampant inflation, of high interest charges, of

increased taxes? The farmer is being faced every day with cuts in revenues and, correspondingly, with an increase in production costs, living costs and taxes as well as an increase in the cost of doing his business.

Certainly, there can be no other path but to meet competition. If we are to stay in business in a competitive market, there is no other way. However, the corollary to this is, of course, that the producer cannot be permitted to suffer because of conditions over which he has no control and because he has voluntarily given up his selling initiative to the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. I say that the government has to go out and sell the wheat at the best price it can get in the world markets, but at the same time let the government pay a support price to the farmer which will ensure that he benefits from the full $1.95½ a bushel that still stands as the agreed world minimum price. The Canadian wheat producer did exactly what the government urged him to do. He planted all the wheat he could. He was asked to become more efficient, to expand and to produce enough wheat to feed a starving and hungry world. He trusted the government promises to sell what he produced.

Now that the government has difficulty in selling wheat, something that it has by law a monopoly to do, it seeks to throw the whole burden into the laps of the producers. The recent U.S. action has precipitated an immediate problem, but it is just another problem within a much larger context.

We, in Canada, must get into step with the rest of the world. We have been left behind by our competitors. So far as I am concerned I believe that one cannot merchandise goods, whether it is grain, soap or vacuum cleaners, if one develops a negative attitude, and that is exactly what is happening here. While grain deals were being made, the government stood idly by losing sale after sale. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, a very amiable fellow, stayed in his place this afternoon seeking the advice of the Almighty. One could almost feel sorry for him, but may I say, with all due respect, that I am now convinced more than ever that the job of marketing our grain is beyond this man's capacity. I think he would do much better as a minister of culture, or perhaps as a goodwill ambassador for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in some of the hostile areas, such as the ones which the Prime Minister visited in western Canada. All that we heard from the minister today was a bandying of words to defend his government for its positive inaction rather than laying down a formula for positive action. What we want is positive action to alleviate the immediate crisis and some long-term solutions for the future. One almost gets the impression that the government dislikes the fact that this debate is taking place. They attempt constantly to try to justify their position, blaming the opposition for misrepresentation and accusing us of being publicity seekers, even making suggestions about a stupid filibuster. When the Standing Committee on Agriculture went out west, it made a comprehensive study and proposed some solutions. When the Prime Minister went out west, the feelings of the western farmers were appropriately expressed. What more do they want?

Numerous recommendations have been submitted to this government. Solutions were offered by the government's own members, such as by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and by other members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. Why were these solutions rejected? There have been many others and many briefs from the farm organizations throughout the country and from the Federation of Agriculture, as well as suggestions from members on both sides of the house. The answer we continually receive is that the policy is under review. This house, the people of the country in general and farmers in particular are entitled to know what the government intends to do to solve the problems of our once great agricultural industry.

• (12 midnight)

Our immediate problem, and the reason for this debate, is that we must sell our wheat and the return to the producer must be fair and equitable. If in order to do this we must modernize our whole system of marketing and distribution, let us start now. What has happened to the activities of the Grains Council? This was to be the great revolutionary mechanism for streamlining all our grain handling operations, producing, distributing and selling.

I suggest that as a start the nation's wheat selling apparatus should be thoroughly overhauled. The government has the obligation to undertake this task. I believe that in this day and age—the lunar age—the Wheat Board should be rejuvenated and its aims and objectives reviewed and upgraded. While it has the exclusive right to sell grain, it has sublet this right and responsibility to officially designated agents. It must be remembered that

these agents are not primarily moved by patriotism or a feeling of sympathy for the Canadian wheat producer. They make deals for profit, not patriotism.

The Wheat Board is not empowered to approach governments, yet more than half our potential customers are represented by government purchasing agencies. We need a modernized board that can go anywhere, approach anyone and make deals without the endless business of consultation and waiting for government policy to be determined. We need more modernized and flexible regulations in order to meet the demands of potential customers. There is no future in Canada sitting on mounds of top grade wheat if customers want lower or mixed grades. There is no future in setting up bodies, such as the Grains Council, if we hear nothing from them from their inception. What has happened to the Grains Council? Industry needs action, not advice. We need one simple, dynamic body that can get things going. We have spent too long in consultation, study and advice. We now need swift, positive action.

I would not be surprised if the government announced shortly the formation of another task force to study the situation. Canadians have been task forced into a stupor. Let us have a "do it" force and get our wheat moving. Let us inject cash into the agricultural community so we may once again enjoy a balanced economy in western Canada. I do not wish to belabour the gravity of this development, because it must be apparent to everyone. I simply repeat what I said at the outset: we must sell our wheat to whoever we can, at the best price we can obtain, and make up from federal resources difference between that and the guaranteed minimum. This is in no sense a handout; it is simply sensible, economic assistance to a very important segment of our national economy.

The sluggish wheat market is already showing signs of affecting eastern industry and businessmen, taxpayers and consumers all across the country. It is only common sense that the federal government should step in and do something now. Despite what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) says, there is no way in which he can convince me that all is well on the prairies. The business community and the farm community are suffering. Repossessions and foreclosures are numerous. The minister today dealt with payments to the Farm Credit Corporation. I suggest to him that the arrears of the corporation are no greater than they have been at any time in the past. The minister knows that payments to the Farm Credit Corporation have priority as far as the farmer is concerned. Accounts receivable by merchants, that is, fuel, fertilizer accounts and so on, are the ones not being paid.

This is a typical example of the many letters that I have received, written by a farmer from Lloydminster, Alberta. He writes:

> As a farmer living in your voting area I thought you might be interested in the following bit of information.
>
> I just hauled out my fifth bushel of quota today. I now have a cultivated acreage of 465 acres. 465 × 1.17=$543.05.
>
> My municipal taxes (now due) amount to $662.93 which leaves me a quota of approximately 3⅘ bushels on which to live and operate my farm. How long are we going to last?

The Edmonton *Journal*, a proponent of Liberal philosophy, in an editorial dated Saturday, July 19, headed "Crisis in wheat demands action" states in part:

> Many suggestions have been made for meeting this "truly desperate situation" which must be met quickly or the West as a whole, not only the farmers, will suffer. Perhaps the best and simplest short-term solution would be a form of acreage payments, with a reasonable maximum. And so-called "rich" farmers are entitled to participate as well as poorer ones.
>
> With such a plan in operation, the government and its agencies, farmers' organizations and others, including individual farmers, should lose no time in putting Canadian agriculture on a much sounder, long-term basis than it is at present.

I could cite many more examples but I do not intend to take up any more time of the house. May I close by saying that action must be taken to meet immediate problems. After we solve some of our short term problems, we must modernize the agricultural industry and streamline our grain marketing machinery. Only by radical and swift action will we be able to salvage a once great industry that in the past has accounted to one in every eight of our export dollars and one in every ten of our tax dollars.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take very long because I realize that many people here, particularly the staff, have had a long day.

I think it is a change for an opposition motion to deal with a real problem. The motion recites the difficulties arising from wheat prices in the world today. The maintenance of world prices and of the prices set under the International Grains Arrangement is of fundamental importance to the wheat

producers and farmers of the world. The government has made extraordinary efforts in an attempt to keep in full operation the terms of the International Grains Arrangement. However, the fact that prices are not in line with the arrangement has tragic consequences for the farmers and wheat producers of the world, not only for those in Canada. It will remain the intention or the government to work as hard as possible to restore the I.G.A. to full operation

• (12:10 a.m.)

The problem facing the prairie wheat producers and farmers is a serious one indeed. It is a problem which this government recognized and which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on his recent visit to the prairies saw at first hand. The Prime Minister's trip to the prairie provinces was particularly arranged so that he could meet face to face small groups of farmers, chosen in fairly random fashion across the provinces, and talk to them for a few hours in a small room in detail about the problem. This, after all, is a true way of communicating and is far superior to the one followed by politicians in the past, who have seen only crowds and communicated only by making speeches to the people, without hearing what the people have to say. The Prime Minister of Canada is not a politician of that sort. He went to hear the views of the people, to learn of their problems and to reason with them about those problems. He did that in a remarkable fashion on his recent trip.

An hon. Member: The minister may be the only one to think that.

Mr. Lang: Hon. members opposite have recited the difficulty. Being new to this place, I am given to understand that they consider their conduct politically proper. They refuse to recognize that hard action may be necessary to tackle this problem or to give credit for action the government has taken with regard to the grains arrangement. I know my colleagues, and other hon. members on this side, have spoken at length about the tremendous advantages accuring to farmers as a result of our cash advance program. Hon. members opposite tend to downgrade this program, as though interest free advances at a time when interest rates are high are insignificant and as though potential advances of several hundreds of millions of dollars at this time, too, are insignificant. Hon. members opposite also have heard described government programs which will enable the Wheat Board to sell Canadian wheat. It can be said that thanks in large part to the leadership of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) no restrictions whatever have been placed on the flexibility the Canadian Wheat Board enjoys in seeking sales for credit. The facility which has been made available is indeed remarkable.

Hon. members opposite have asked for solutions.

Mr. Gundlock: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Lang: Later, if the hon. member does not mind. Hon. members seem to have forgotten that Canada's share of the world wheat market has actually gone up this year as compared with last year and that it is the reduction in total commercial demand in the world market which has had a drastic affect upon sales. They failed to put two and two together to realize that the large cash advances mean that the government has undertaken a program of buying wheat on the farmer's farm.

It ought to be obvious to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is not lack of sales alone, by any means, that is the problem. Prices in relation to costs of production must also be considered. Hon. members opposite from time to time have said that farm costs have gone up, largely as a result of the protection afforded to many people in our society. That protection has caused the farmers financial difficulty. Although they have referred to this fact, some hon. members have not referred to other steps in the right direction the government has taken towards long term sales and reducing farm production costs. For instance, we have such programs as the accelerated introduction of the Kennedy Round reduction of tariffs.

Here, I might also refer to plans to balance the budget and specialized depreciation items which were introduced to take some of the inflationary heat out of the economy. I also refer hon. members to the prices and incomes commission, which is designed to be one step along that road we must travel in bringing some control over those who abuse t heir power to set prices and incomes at levels which are not fair having regard to the position of the economy and true economic indicators.

Mr. Gundlock: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Gundlock: On a point of order or personal privilege, I do not know which is correct. Your Honour can correct me. The hon. member is putting words in the mouth of someone.

An hon. Member: What about making up your mind if it is order or privilege?

Mr. Gundlock: I asked the Speaker about that. It is up to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we might allow the hon. member to make his point. I would appreciate the co-operation of hon. members. I realize it is getting late but it will not help the situation if hon. members do not allow the hon. member to state his point, after which I will determine if there is a point of order.

Mr. Gundlock: I want to say to the hon. minister that I hope he is sincere. However, when he talks as he has been about interest rates today, and what they mean to the wheat farmers, he certainly cannot be sincere.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Having heard the hon. member, I am now in a position to make a ruling. I think that is not a point of order.

While I have the floor I would like to suggest to hon. members that although it is late and the debate may continue for a while yet, the general rules of decorum continue to be in existence. We have never permitted hon. members to bring drinking cups into the House of Commons. I do not think we should begin this procedure, even if it is late. I invite hon. members not to bring in coffee cups. I am not sure whether these cups contain coffee or what they may contain, but I think it is not appropriate to have them in the house.

Mr. Lang: Just a final few words, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to refer, in addition to those measures which are being taken in this area, to several others which have long-term importance. I refer to the creation this year of the Canada Grains Council which is designed to be a body which will help in great measure, both in research and markets. It will supply information to farmers about markets, and the difficult choices they will have to make willingly with regard to the products they ought to grow at any given time.

I want to refer to the importance of the market system which the Wheat Board is introducing, that is the block system, through which they expect great improvements in the moving of grain from the farm to the market. Early experiments with the block system have been very successful. It is being expanded into many other places in the prairies. The consultants' estimates had indicated initially that by a simple rearrangement of the manner of putting shipping orders and the request for cars into the proper places, the same equipment at home, en route and at the elevators could handle up to 50 per cent more grain with no additional change whatever.

• (12:20 a.m.)

These are the important things which are being done that in no way take away from the seriousness of the current situation which the Prime Minister so well recognized and described when on the prairies. I think hon. members opposite might once in a while notice these accomplishments while they proceed with their harangues.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the hon. member?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lethbridge rises for the purpose of asking a question of the minister if the minister will allow it.

Mr. Lang: Yes.

Mr. Gundlock: Has the government considered shipment through the port of Churchill and all the ramifications of that decision?

Mr. Lang: I am very happy to be able to tell the hon. member that the Canadian Wheat Board arranged for sales of wheat through Churchill. Approximately 22 million bushels, at present reckoning, will go through that port at this time. I might say this reflects great credit on the management of the Wheat Board, because the placing of sales of wheat through that port came at a time when, because of marketing conditions, Canada was making no sales. That was before the lowering of prices in March. Despite that fact, the Wheat Board has managed to place this large quantity through Churchill.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit another question? He stated that Canadian penetration of world markets had increased significantly this year. Would the minister give the house some figures in respect of that increase.

Mr. Lang: I said that Canada's share of the world wheat market went up this year. I do not have the exact figures in front of me. My recollection is that last year the share was 17 per cent and this year it is 19 per cent.

Mr. Burton: Could the minister indicate what income support measures the government has under consideration at the present time.

Mr. Lang: I think it is well known to hon. members that the government is looking at this question from all angles. There is no proposal that has not been before the government. Before any announcement is made in this regard, a decision by the government will be made in the ordinary way.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question which is supplementary to my first question. I should like to ask the minister whether he considers that the 22 million bushels through Churchill is an increase.

Mr. Lang: It is a dramatic increase over the zero which had been booked during the regular time for booking this year.

Mr. Gundlock: No, no. On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will realize we are not on the question period and we are not in committee of the whole. I wonder whether hon. members want to pursue the question period at the present time. However, if hon. members have further questions and the minister wishes to reply his time has not yet expired.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and with due deference to you, it certainly is not from zero to 22 million.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether the government is still considering a two-price system for wheat or whether at this time it has completely rejected the idea. I would ask the minister to be specific in his answer.

Mr. Lang: My answer will be very specific. My previous answer applies completely.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Having heard the minister and the subsequent questions and answers, I am satisfied that the debate has been concluded. Pursuant to section 13 of Standing Order 26, I declare the motion carried.

The house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. later today.

At 12.25 a.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 22, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE—SUSPENSION OF SITTING FOR FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as both Your Honour and the house know, there have been certain discussions regarding possible avenues of approach to the debate on the rules amendments. In order to enable discussions to continue and perhaps arrive at a solution, I rise to suggest that the house might now make an order that upon completion of the oral question period today the sitting be suspended until 5 p.m. later this day.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed and so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS—REPORT BY MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in response to queries from members I am pleased to report on our continuing campaign to help students find summer jobs.

From previous statements I have made, members will be aware of our efforts and special programs in this area. These include the setting up last fall of a special departmental task force, a $259,000 publicity campaign at local, regional and national levels, the hiring of some 450 special student counsellors at manpower headquarters and centres across Canada, and a program to increase by 10 per cent the number of students employed this summer by the federal government.

My department has also been very active in enlisting the co-operation of other governments and agencies with interests in the student employment problem. We have had meetings with representatives of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, University Career Planning Association, various university summer employment committees and other federal departments. We have also maintained a close relationship with various provincial governments in order to achieve maximum results and to prevent duplication of effort and expenditure.

We have reason to believe our efforts are paying off. For example, between May and June of this year some 155,000 persons were added to the Canadian labour force. This net figure resulted from additions of 155,000 in the 14-19 age group and of 38,000 in the 19-25 age group. There were offsetting declines totalling 38,000 in other age groups. Meanwhile, employment growth between May and June in the under 25 age group was 154,000. While no one can claim all of these 154,000 persons are students entering the labour force temporarily during the summer months, it can be safely assumed that the vast majority are students.

In this connection it is interesting to note that last year between March and July some 600,000 persons under 25 joined the labour force; by September almost 500,000 in the same group had left the labour force, presumably to return to school or university.

At our manpower centres some 90,000 post-secondary students had registered by the end of May; this number could be a bit exaggerated as some students may have registered both at on-campus manpower centres and at local centres.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Precise statistics on confirmed employment are not available at this time—students frequently do not report back to their C.M.C. counsellors when they have obtained jobs—but there are some encouraging trends. For example, a random sample survey carried out by my department in mid-June among students at Ottawa's Canada Manpower Student Employment Centre indicates that 86 per cent of those canvassed had already obtained jobs at that point; another 4 per cent were no longer interested in finding work, leaving a total of 10 per cent still looking for employment. We plan to carry out the same type of survey later this month in three Canada Manpower Centres in each of our five regions,

Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia; the surveys will be based on a sampling of 250 students in each region.

Members will also be interested in another survey—a much more extensive one—which we plan for this fall. We are currently arranging to have some 18,000 students from 38 universities and community colleges questioned on their summer employment and job-hunting experiences. The sampling will represent approximately 5 per cent of Canada's post-secondary student population, and I am confident the results of this survey will be most helpful in developing future programs to find summer jobs for students.

As far as high school students are concerned, 102,768 have so far registered at Canada Manpower Centres; as these students have only just become available for employment I cannot at this point give any reliable statistics on placements.

Another aspect of our student summer employment program has been to intensify efforts to encourage farmers to hire students for available agricultural jobs and to alert students to these job opportunities. Many farmers have responded positively to our canvassing but I must note that some students are still reluctant to take this type of work.

By the end of June, some 6,937 students had been placed in farm jobs, the majority being pre or secondary level students; at the same time there were 2,653 active or deferred vacancies for farm jobs recorded in our C.M.C. files. Up to June 30, approximately 3,000 students had refused summer jobs in agriculture.

I am hopeful, though, particularly this month and in August, that students who have not found jobs will accept summer employment in agriculture. In this connection members will recall that this year I have reduced by 50 per cent the number of foreign students coming to Canada to work on farms; this was done so that more of the jobs could be filled by Canadian students.

I assure hon. members of my concern about the student summer employment situation in Canada, always bearing in mind two important considerations. One is that any federal program of this kind must be studied in relation to resources and that services for one group of individuals—in this case, students—must not be disproportionate to services expected by other Canadian citizens who have employment difficulties.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

The second is the fact that the government of Canada cannot accept sole responsibility for the employment of students during the summer months. Other levels of government and interested groups such as education authorities, unions, industries, and students themselves must share this responsibility and be involved in initiatives and activities which help provide financially and socially meaningful summer jobs for this particular segment of our population.

The problem cannot be solved this summer or in the years to come, by governments alone, but only through the joint efforts of everyone concerned—employers, voluntary agencies, educational bodies and the students themselves. As I indicated earlier, my department will be evaluating this year's program and experiences throughout the summer, and I will be in a better position in the late fall to give a more complete and detailed report on the success of the program and the extent of the problem this summer.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) for making a statement about student summer employment. To be fair, we must commend the minister and the department for their efforts not only in finding more jobs for students in agencies of government but in taking the lead in encouraging private industry to take a greater interest in our young people and to display a greater sense of responsibility toward them. I know the minister thinks, as I do, that we have a responsibility to our young people who, at this most important time of their lives, are endeavouring to further their education. Many students depend on the money they earn from summer jobs to pay for the following year's education. We owe it to our young people to encourage private industry and departments of government to make as many summer jobs available as possible.

The statistics the minister brought to our attention this afternoon are deserving of a few comments. They point out, it seems to me, that we need a better system to show statistically what is actually happening. I say this because, in spite of what the minister said according to the figures I have from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics relating to employment and unemployment, there are still 144,000 teenagers out of work. These statistics are as at the end of June; therefore they do not really include all those who might

be involved if high school students were also taken into consideration.

Employment of young people between 20 and 24 years of age increased by 53,000 during the months of May and June. This is very good. But when we set alongside that figure the fact that there are 252,000 university students in Canada, the majority of whom are looking for employment, it is evident we are still just scratching the surface of the tremendous need, whether it be government or industry that should assume the responsibility of providing summer employment to our student population.

I bring these points to the attention of the minister because I believe there is an even greater need than we realize from this report to continue in an accelerated way to do even more to provide summer employment for our young people, particularly those who are involved in their educational process and need summer employment to help them to remain in school. I want again to express appreciation to the minister for all that he and the department are doing. I trust they will continue their effort not only through the reports to which he referred in preparation for next year but also by a greater concentration of effort this year, along with a greater degree of participation by the private sector as well.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I want to keep in mind your directive that we should not be too long at this stage.

I am sorry I cannot join the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) in congratulating the minister on anything he has stated to the house in his report. The statistics he gave are, in my view, extremely misleading. To make a sample study of Ottawa students is about as irrelevant to the situation across Canada as can be imagined. With the government and its various agencies in Ottawa, obviously students looking for work in this city are in the preferred place in Canada. This is an example of the kind of ill thought-out way in which this problem has been pursued by the minister and his department. They think they can satisfy parliament and the people by taking a sample of student employment in the one place where student employment is necessarily much easier to obtain. This is clearly misleading as to the true picture across Canada.

While some of the things undertaken by the department are obviously useful, as I have said on other occasions I am at a loss to know why these things take so long to implement. It did not take a genius to know last winter that the problem of summer employment would be very serious this summer. It did not require a genius to know, in light of the policies pursued in a deliberate attempt to slow down the economy, there would be a general increase in unemployment and therefore more difficulties for students in the summer. Yet it was months before the minister could be persuaded to institute the inadequate program he has outlined today.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Therefore I cannot congratulate him or his department, although I am sure the officials are doing their best.

I also want to say I am getting thoroughly fed up with the attitude of ministers whenever any problem arises of emphasizing the fact that it is not their sole responsibility. We know that. No one in this house is unaware of the fact that there are things that have to be done by all parts of our society, both governmental and non-governmental. But the fact is that the Department of Manpower and Immigration is the only department of the federal government and the only over-all department of any government in Canada with the machinery to tackle the kind of problem that unemployment presents. It is nonsense to say, "It is not our sole responsibility". I wish ministers would stop singing this song as if it were a broken record. We know this government cannot do everything, but we also know that the responsibilities which are responsibilities of this government must be lived up to. The government cannot excuse itself by pointing out that other people have to do something as well.

I can only express the hope that the minister and the department will make a genuine, effective and nation-wide study of this problem so that if the government continues its policy of increasing unemployment generally the students will not be hurt even more than others. Even though students ought not to get any special consideration, surely we are dealing with a generation in this country which obviously represents our future technological and scientific progress and future leadership. Therefore the students at university and high school levels obviously need our attention, and in my opinion the government has failed to give them the kind of attention they deserve. I only hope that as a result of the department's studies somebody will wake up in the future a little earlier than the eleventh hour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): First of all, I want to thank the minister for having sent us the French version of his statement.

I also want to congratulate the government and the minister for what they are doing to secure summer employment for students, at the urging of hon. members.

I also want to take this opportunity to praise several manpower centers that are doing commendable work to cope with the endemic state of unemployment, particularly in Quebec. Let us hope that those efforts will one day serve to render financially feasible what is physically possible.

I was sorry to hear that some students had refused employment on farms. Young university students like them could learn a whole lot of practical things, because even in university it is necessary to know that cows are milked twice a day. It is not necessary to wait until one becomes prime minister to learn that.

Every week, I draw the attention of the house to the problem of unemployment. As many other members, I receive a number of requests for employment from people between 35 and 50 years of age, who are unable to get any kind of work and are sometimes replaced by students. This problem should be considered seriously.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let us hope that with all the people of good will, we will work together in order to find a solution to the unemployment problem. Otherwise, socialism will take hold in Canada and I would fear that this would inevitably lead us to communism.

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDIAN AFFAIRS

FUNDS TO PERMIT STUDIES BY NATIVE PEOPLE—REQUEST BY NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development a question arising out of the renewed request of the National Indian Brotherhood for funds to allow an independent investigation by Indians of treaty and aboriginal rights following the announcement of the position taken by the minister. Bearing this in mind, is the minister prepared to review his position and consider the renewed request of the Indian people through the Brotherhood as opposed to leaving the matter to the unappointed commissioner and the department as the minister had in mind?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that the government intended to supply funds to the National Indian Brotherhood to help them establish this research committee on Indian rights and treaties.

We shall carry out that intention. We have said that the funds will be provided through the commissioner who is to be appointed. At any rate, whether the funds come directly from the government or through the commissioner, the Indians will be free to carry out the investigations required to throw light on the situation.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the minister does not seem to think it makes very much difference whether the funds go directly to the Indian people or through the commissioner, is he not prepared to meet the wishes of the Indian people in order to provide funds directly so they will feel they are in a position to cope with the kind of negotiations and arrangements the minister has in mind?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the commissioner, once appointed, will be able to work in co-operation with the Indian people and also that the system we have suggested is adequate. Any way, Thursday morning, I believe, I am supposed to meet, with the president of the National Indian Brotherhood, Mr. Deiter, and I shall discuss the matter with him.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, will the minister please bear in mind the importance of what he has launched getting off to a good start and consequently consider very urgently the direct provision of these funds as requested by the Indian people rather than leaving them in a state of uncertainty for some time until the commissioner is appointed?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I hope I can discuss all those problems with the president

of the National Indian Brotherhood on Thursday. The necessary announcements will be made in due course.

[*English*]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, would it be reasonable to conclude from the minister's remarks that this rejection of the proposition put forward by the National Indian Brotherhood is simply another way of saying that the government is going to impose its policy regardless of the feelings of these people?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member—

[*English*]

That the question as asked is argumentative.

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite important to let the people know we are not imposing anything of that kind. I will not let go insinuations like the hon. member put forward, after he tried last month to get the paternity of the policy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Perhaps I could comment in respect of the point of order raised.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that would be in order. The hon. member might perhaps have risen on a question of privilege, but I would have to rule that there is neither a question of privilege nor a point of order. I do not think it would be in order to comment. The hon. member may have a supplementary question later but for the moment I will recognize the hon. member for Churchill who has a question.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I was trying to draw your attention to. It is obvious from the apoplectic reply of the minister that we have drawn blood.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, can the minister assure the house that in appointing the commissioner consideration will be given to appointing a person of Indian ancestry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly appoint the most competent man we can find, and if he is an Indian, we will be most happy.

[*English*]

FISHERIES

COHOE SALMON—BANNING OF OPERATION IN STRAIT OF GEORGIA

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry with respect to the restrictions placed upon commercial salmon fishing in British Columbia. The notice sent to the fishermen by the minister's department, dated July 9, reads in part as follows:

> The foregoing action is being taken in order to provide for a more equitable distribution between the sport and commercial fisheries of stocks of salmon available for capture in the Strait of Georgia area.

Is that the reason for the restriction being placed upon commercial fishermen, rather than the reason the minister previously gave the house, namely, that there is a shortage of available salmon stocks?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): There is a shortage, Mr. Speaker. The run of cohoe, salmon, our best sports fish, is the lowest in years; therefore, there is concern about supply. There are on the waters of the west coast at any one time, roughly 3,000 anglers and 200 commercial fishermen. The commercial fishermen's take however has amounted to 90 per cent of the total and therefore a more equitable distribution of the catch appears to me to be in order.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are sports fishermen being required to secure licences, as are commercial fishermen, and is the minister's department imposing a daily limit on the number of fish a sports fisherman may catch?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, no licence is required by sports fishermen on the west coast. Sports fishing is one of the few things that are free in our part of the world at the present time. On the other hand, commercial fishermen are required to have licences, as they sell their fish to earn a living.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker. The minister did not get around to answering the second part of my question. Does the minister intend to impose a daily limit on sports fishermen with respect to the number of fish that may be caught?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is a limit on the number of fish any particular angler may take in any one day. That is the only limit imposed on them and the only limit we intend to impose on them this year.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister may have partially answered it. In view of the situation the minister has described with regard to the cohoe salmon run, is he considering a reduction in the daily allowable catch for sports fishermen?

Mr. Davis: Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

OFFSHORE BANKS—CONSERVATION CONTROLS —INQUIRY AS TO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the statement made by Mr. Roy Jackson to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization meeting in Halifax that there is a pressing need for global studies as a prelude to some form of international management of deep sea fishing, can the minister indicate whether any progress has been made toward establishing an international conference at which the question of conservation controls on our offshore banks can be discussed?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, considerable progress has been made recently through the International North Atlantic Fisheries Commission toward the establishment of over-all quotas for fishing of the various stocks in the north Atlantic. We are hopeful that these can be applied in the next few years.

SEALS—DISCUSSIONS REGARDING CONSERVATION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to report to the house the results of the discussions at ICNAF with regard to the conservation of the seal herd off the front of Labrador?

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we have been holding discussions in this respect. I think the major developments for 1970 will be within our own control and as a result of our discussions with the Norwegians.

FINANCE

BANK LOANS—AVAILABILITY TO SMALL BUSINESSES—BUILDERS' FINANCING

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The minister said recently that priority would be given to areas of lesser development and to small businesses in respect of the lending of funds. Can the minister advise the house what agreement or arrangements have been made to ensure that small businesses have adequate and immediate access to credit? Also, can he say how successful these arrangements have been?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I made this submission to the banks as did the Governor of the Bank of Canada, and I understand this is the policy being followed by the banks.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister examine a question which has been raised in some areas outside our large cities, namely, that the house building industry is suffering because of the failure of the banks to provide interim financing?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting question that has not been brought to my attention. I will, of course, look into the matter. It is true that the restrictions being placed upon the monetary system in Canada for the purpose of fighting inflation will prevent some people getting all the money they want.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question arising out of the minister's answer to the question posed by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte. Apart from his general impressions, would the minister be prepared to make a statement to the house on motions, if we are still in session, or table a report on this matter so we may know to what extent the banks have participated in the program?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to take up this matter with the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Finance look at the situation and discuss with the chartered banks whether money is still being advanced to big industry in order to assist it while small business is being cut off because of the tight money supply in Canada?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the allegation made by the hon. member is correct. However, I should point out in fairness to the banking system that lines of credit are granted in advance for a period of time and it is very difficult for the banking system to contract these lines of credit unilaterally and immediately. Therefore it takes some time for the tightness in the money supply to work through the system and to apply exactly to those people to whom one wants it to apply.

SWAP DEPOSITS—EFFECT OF REQUEST OF GOVERNOR OF BANK OF CANADA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance in a position to say whether his hopes and those of the Governor of the Bank of Canada have been realized in regard to the restriction placed upon the banks in respect of swap arrangements? Has it had the effect of adequately controlling the outflow of capital from Canada?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall not know the results of the request of the Governor of the Bank of Canada until the end of the week when statistics are available. But I am sure the banks and the Governor of the Bank of Canada are anxious to co-operate with the government and indeed all members of the house in doing the best they can to fight inflation in this country and guard our exchange reserves.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REDUCTION OF FORCES IN EUROPE—INQUIRY AS TO CONCLUSION OF CONSULTATIONS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question may be directed to either the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence. On April 3 the Prime Minister spoke of a planned and phased reduction of the size of Canadian forces in Europe in consultation with our allies. Have the consultations been concluded and can the house expect to receive a detailed statement of what these reductions are to be?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there have been a few lengthy exchanges of notes between SACEUR and the Department of National Defence. One must remember that a new SACEUR was appointed to take over as of July 1 and therefore there has been some impediment to the conclusion of our negotiations. But it can be expected that these negotiations will be accelerated in the near future.

GAGETOWN, N.B.—EXERCISE ALLEGEDLY REFLECTING ON LABOUR

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that the Canadian forces base at Gagetown, New Brunswick, is reported to have had recently an exercise in which a supposed labour leader led a supposed insurrection in Canada, and in view of the fact that Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, has rightly protested to the minister about this insult to two million Canadian trade unionists, would the minister investigate this matter and report to the house at the earliest possible date?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have already investigated this problem. In order to do justice to the question I have a rather lengthy answer. Perhaps it could be printed in *Hansard*; otherwise, I could not read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The difficulty is that the statement cannot be made at this time unless we revert to motions.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: In fact, there are many members who are anxious to ask questions. Does the minister have leave to revert to motions for the purpose of making a statement?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement. Perhaps the minister might communicate with the hon. member later.

Mr. Broadbent: In light of the serious nature of the question and the insult felt by many Canadians, can the minister make a very brief statement at this time?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I could speak generally on the report I had. First of all, I

should indicate that the Department of National Defence has always maintained the friendliest possible relations with the unions, and we intend to continue this. In his question the hon. member referred to a Canadian union. We are faced here with an over-all exercise in command and control and in urban control, as well as all sorts of other things in which Canadian Forces have to participate elsewhere. There was a scenario in which a mythical union in a mythical place, not in Canada, acted out a part. There was an exercise in which a political problem was involved in which a union formed a political party, and that is again a mythical situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): This is the type of exercise that went on, and it was explained repeatedly by the P.R.O. in the region to the local newspapers. First of all, there was no intention to be injurious to the labour unions. If that were the case, I would have to conclude that the Canadian Forces are probably better at peacekeeping than at acting.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): You are getting better than Paul Martin.

Mr. Broadbent: I find the minister's answer totally unacceptable, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence which arises from an earlier answer he gave. Is the house correct in assuming that since the Canadian Armed Forces are now being trained in counter-insurgency activities, the insurgency is expected to come from our civilian population?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is not in order.

TRADE

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF SALES TO NATIONALIST CHINA

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In light of the statement attributed to the minister of economic affairs of Nationalist China that that country wants Canadian wheat but Canadian officials have not tried to sell wheat to Formosa, will the minister undertake to have a mission sent immediately to Nationalist China, and will he explain why Canada has not tried to open markets in Formosa?

[Mr. Cadieux (Labelle).]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I will inquire, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Yewchuk: In light of reports quoting the same gentleman as saying that Canada has also failed to seek Formosan markets for Canadian lumber—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask the question directly, not quote from the statements to which he is now referring.

Mr. Yewchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase my question. Will the minister undertake to investigate also the possibilities for sales of Canadian lumber, machinery and heavy water nuclear reactors to Formosa?

WHEAT—SALES REPRESENTATION IN TAIPEI

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that the United States has a permanent wheat selling office and representatives in Taipei and that Canada has no direct sales representative there, either through the government or through the Wheat Board, will the minister take steps toward establishing some type of sales contact for the potential sales that are awaiting Canadian wheat there?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): As a general policy the Canadian government allows Canadians to make sales to Taiwan. There is no problem about that.

Mr. Thompson: Through whom?

Mr. Pepin: In the usual way.

Mr. Thompson: There are no representatives there.

Mr. Pepin: I said I would look into that aspect. There is probably a question of price competition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister might be allowed to make a reply to the hon. member.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REQUEST FOR MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member for

Lasalle in his capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. In view of the fact that the length of the present session is somewhat uncertain, would he give an assurance to the house that a meeting of that committee will be held before the house adjourns to deal with the matter involving the Great Slave Lake Railway?

Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle): If it is the wish of the committee, I am willing to call a meeting.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF BOX CARS—ABILITY OF PRODUCERS TO DELIVER

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Earlier I asked the minister whether there would be an assurance from the railways that adequate box cars would be supplied to all country delivery points so that at least a minimum five-bushel quota could be delivered. Can the minister bring us up to date on what are the hopes for the supply of box cars by the railways inasmuch as there are only a few days left before the end of the crop year?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I was in touch with the Chief Commissioner of the Wheat Board just a few minutes ago. He assured me that maximum efforts are being made by the railways in order to reach the objective which is the five-bushel quota level. I may say in passing that 940 stations are now on a five-bushel quota, 709 are now on a four-bushel quota and 167 on three bushels. So there is progress every-day. It is still considered physically possible to reach the objective, but I must add immediately that difficulties have arisen in recent days because of unusually large offerings by producers as a result of circumstances with which the hon. member is familiar.

Mr. Korchinski: In view of the fact that there are only a few more days left, would the Wheat Board immediately open up the remaining delivery points to the five-bushel quota and concentrate on the delivery of a sufficient number of box cars?

Mr. Pepin: I hope I understand the hon. member well. If he has in mind the opening up of all delivery points and telling everybody that they should be on the five-bushel quota, this would not do much in reality to bring about the objective which we have in mind.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Inasmuch as there are only eight days left in the crop year and in view of the figure he gave as to the number of points on a four-bushel quota, did I understand him correctly that he is seriously informing the house he expects the producers to be able to deliver a five-bushel quota in the current crop year?

Mr. Speaker: The question as asked is clearly argumentative. Perhaps it might be asked in other terms.

Mr. Gleave: May I rephrase it? Is the minister informing the house that producers will be able to deliver a five-bushel quota in the current crop year?

Mr. Pepin: I was very careful in the choice of my words. I said that this was still the objective but I also said that the realization of the objective was made more difficult every day because of the number of requests for delivery that are made. Many people who did not have wheat to deliver a few days ago seem to have found some to deliver now.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): May I ask the minister whether he would give consideration to recommending changes in Wheat Board regulations to allow deliveries to elevators with space that now have a five-bushel quota by those people who cannot deliver to points that have no space and are only on a four-bushel quota, so that at the end of the crop year all the available elevator space will be utilized?

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon Souris): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the block system of grain movement recently introduced by the Canadian Wheat Board and referred to by the Minister without Portfolio last evening as one of the government's solutions to this problem assist in a major way in ensuring the delivery of the five-bushel quota at all delivery points? If not, what other emergency plan has the government in mind to deal with this problem?

Mr. Pepin: I was informed the other day that this system was of assistance in the limited number of districts where it was operative. I was also informed that the block system would be implemented everywhere by the end of this year. Consequently it will help even more next year.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the numerous suggestions made in the debate yesterday and that have been made by organizations outside the house for the solution of this problem and in view of the fact that almost half of the shipping points are not yet on the five-bushel quota, can the minister advise us whether the Canadian Wheat Board or the minister is prepared either to recommend the extension of the crop year or to allow the country elevators to store grain wherever they wish, including outside, in order to complete the delivery of the five-bushel quota by July 31?

Mr. Pepin: I understand that storing outside is not a cautious measure to take, but I took notice last night of the several suggestions made by the hon. member during the debate yesterday. I had them passed along to the Wheat Board this morning. I was able to confirm that I had answered correctly two or three of the questions regarding the use of gondola cars, the renting of extra cars from the Canadian Railways and of cars from the United States. These are some measures that have already been taken by the Wheat Board to cope with the present difficulties.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question that I should like to direct to the Minister of Transport. Has the minister had a statement from the railway companies indicating that they will not be able to provide sufficient box cars in order to take away the five-bushel quota at country elevator points?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, I have had no such statement from the railways.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Benjamin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether or not authority to suspend the allocation of cars to shipping points where the five-bushel quota has been achieved lies with the Canadian Wheat Board or with the railways? If it lies with the railways, will the minister investigate allegations that cars are being withdrawn from shipping points before the five bushel quota has been reached

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I have received many representations on this general subject. Some farmers feel that they are not being as well treated as others. I regularly take these observations to the Wheat Board officials and they try to solve any problems in co-operation with the railways. Again, the Wheat Board commissioner told me this morning that he was receiving maximum support from the railways in these difficult times.

TRADE

WHEAT—STABILIZATION OF MINIMUM PRICES UNDER INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the announced wheat price cuts established by the Canadian Wheat Board at the opening of trading on Monday of some two to seven cents a bushel on most grades, has the minister any reliable information that I.G.A. minimum prices will now stabilize within that range?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I did say yesterday in the debate that I could give no such assurance. It will all depend upon the reaction of other countries, like Australia and the European Economic Community members, to the United States move. I also said yesterday in the debate that I was very much hoping that prices would level off at a new plateau as a result of the United States and Canadian adjustments.

Mr. Gleave: A further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to hon. members that to some extent we are now reviving the debate that took place all day yesterday and last night. I appreciate that the questions hon. members are asking are important, but in view of the fact that the question period is running short of time we might pass on to another subject. However, I believe there are two members with supplementaries who might be recognized.

Mr. Gleave: In view of the minister's answer to my last question, are further meetings of the nature of the Washington meeting contemplated? In other words, are the exporting countries prepared to meet continuously until they arrive at some stabilization of the minimum prices?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, a meeting of the working group to which I referred when I came back from Washington is planned for next week.

WATER RESOURCES

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF WATER ACT

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of resources. My question relates to the long awaited water act which he expected to introduce in mid-July. May I ask the minister whether there is any possibility that this act will surface this summer?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, mid-July was the hon. member's expression. The end of July was my expression, and it remains my expression.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question. May I take it from the series of answers that have been given that the government is waiting for the house to adjourn before introducing this legislation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. Aiken: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I heard the hon. member's question but as asked I do not think it is in order.

FINANCE

INFLATIONARY EFFECTS OF POSSIBLE BELL CANADA RATE INCREASE

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the Department of Finance considered the possible inflationary effects of a rate increase being granted to Bell Canada of the extent that is now being sought? If so, what conclusions have been drawn by the department?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a hypothetical question; the hearings are not finished.

TOURISM

INQUIRY AS TO REVIEW OF ADVERTISING PROGRAMS

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and it relates to tourism. Will the minister advise whether Canada's trade and tourist advertising programs are now under specific review?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker. The decisions that need to be made are made with respect to the publicity program of the Canadian Travel Bureau.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has been able to make any progress in selecting a new chairman for the Cape Breton Development Corporation. Can he also inform the house when he expects to be in a position to announce the appointment of a chairman?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have made some progress but I am not in a position to make any announcement.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the Prime Minister give the house the assurance that he will give this task very high priority? I am sure the Prime Minister will agree that any substantial delay in filling that office might very well prejudice the work of the corporation as it affects the communities concerned.

Mr. Trudeau: I do agree with the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, and we are giving the matter high priority.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LONDON, ONT.—CLOSING OF KELVINATOR PLANT—PROVISION OF WORK FOR JOBLESS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that the Kelvinator Company of Canada plant in London has now been closed, putting about 300 employees out of work, and also in view of the fact that on February 10 the Minister of Labour assured the house on behalf of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration that this minister's department would seek to prevent these lay-offs or, alternatively, help these men find other employment, what is now being done for the 90 per cent of the men who are without jobs?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the full facilities of the department are at the disposal of the employer and the employees.

They have been at their disposal for some considerable time and they will continue to be at their disposal.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With what result?

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EFFECT OF INJECTION OF $250 MILLION INTO THE PRAIRIES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the right hon. gentleman's statement that there will be an injection of $250 million into the western economy and in view of the government's professed intention to fight inflation, does the Prime Minister consider that this injection will be inflationary in itself?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question as asked is not in order.

FINANCE

DEMAND LOANS—APPLICATION OF INTEREST RATE INCREASES BY BANKS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the policy of the chartered banks of applying interest rate increases to outstanding demand loans as well as to new loans, would the minister consider approaching the chartered banks and urging them to desist from this practice?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as explained by the governor of the Bank of Canada, the banks themselves have to determine their own interest rates chargeable on loans. I did make that quite clear. I would also point out to hon. members opposite that my so-called pious wish of last week still stands, and I am still hopeful that the banks which have not increased their prime rate will refrain from doing so.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, the chartered banks are applying these interest rate increases to outstanding demand loans even though a set time period for repayment has been set down on paper. I have here three letters I received recently stating that this is the case.

Mr. Benson: If there is a set time period for repayment, then it cannot be a demand loan.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

TRANSPORT

QUEBEC NORTH SHORE AND LABRADOR RAILWAY—EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ORDER

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Since a substantial lay-off of men at the Churchill Falls project is pending because the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway is not transporting fuel supplies, etc., and since severe inconvenience is being suffered by residents of Labrador City and Wabush because of the embargo on the transportation of automobiles, will the minister consult the Canadian Transport Commission with a view to having its recent order extended to include the transport of supplies to Churchill Falls and the transport of private automobiles to and from Wabush and Labrador City?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport not only will; he has.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peddle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister tell us when this action took place and what the result of his consultations is?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I have been in fairly constant consultation with the C.T.C. ever since this strike started and fuel supplies into Labrador Ctiy were delivered, I think, earlier this week. Now we are casting about to find ways of taking care of the matters to which the hon. member has referred. Of course, the simplest way to get the matter resolved is to get the strike settled, and I hope the parties will do that as quickly as possible.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the minister doing to bring the two parties together in order that they may settle the strike?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, all I can do is put them on the train.

Mr. Baldwin: I wish the minister would think more about box cars for wheat.

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—REPLY TO CANADIAN OFFER TO PROVIDE NEUTRAL RELIEF FLIGHT OBSERVERS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Can he say whether he or the Secretary of State for External Affairs have yet received an answer to representations made to Nigeria and Biafra with respect to mounting an effective daylight relief operation and utilizing the services of people from our country to act as inspectors in this relief operation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I checked quite recently and we have had no such acceptance. Possibly there is some later news. If there is, the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be able to inform the house about it when he is here.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

WESTERN CANADA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON TOUR BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is it his intention to give a report to the house on his recent tour of western Canada. Also, does he intend to report about any policy he may have arrived at as a result of his tour?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that depends on how long we sit around.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How long do we have to sit around before the Prime Minister can make up his mind?

Mr. Trudeau: Not very long, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question that is supplementary to the one I asked a few minutes ago. Could the Prime Minister possibly undertake to make a statement to the house tomorrow with respect to his trip to western Canada?

STUDENT LOANS

INQUIRY RESPECTING INCREASE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday I asked the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether, in view of the great unemployment among students, he has any plans to increase the size of student loans. The minister implied that the question ought to be directed to the attention of the Minister of Finance today. Has he any plans to increase student loans in view of the difficulties many students will have in paying for their next session's tuition?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter involving a change in the statute. There is no intention to change the statute during the present session.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Is he now in a position to announce government policy with respect to self-government for the Northwest Territories?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, Mr. Speaker, we are not ready at this time, but I hope that we will be in a position to do so before the end of the summer.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which is related to the misleading way the minister has answered our questions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): My question of privilege relates to the manner he has answered questions of this nature both recently and in the past. For example, on January 21, 1969, the minister said, as reported on page 4551 of *Hansard*:

> —I have taken a decision on this matter and submitted a proposal to the cabinet. I hope it will receive approval within the next weeks and I expect to be in the Northwest Territories, to announce the new policy, in early February.

When asked similar questions on other occasions his answer has been "soon", "fairly quickly", and so on. I submit that the minister has been misleading the house by making answers of that kind with respect to self-government for the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I can rule fairly briefly on the question of privilege. I do not think the hon. member can bring this

matter foward as a question of privilege. He may have a grievance and feel that the answers received were not those he would have liked to receive. Merely because the hon. member is not satisfied with the answers given by the minister does not mean that there is a question of privilege, and the matter cannot be raised in this way as a question of privilege.

I suggest there is no point in allowing the minister to reply to the point raised by the hon. member. That would merely bring on debate.

Since there is an order of the house that we should now rise until the call of the bells at five o'clock, we might continue discussing the question of privilege when we return. The hon. member may do that if he still feels it is worth pursuing the matter further. However I think it is the desire of hon. members that we rise at this time.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to an order of the house, the sitting is suspended until five o'clock.

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

At 3.10 p.m. the sitting of the house was suspended pursuant to special order.

SITTING RESUMED

The sitting resumed at 5 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Combines—Drugs—Price fixing by B.C. pharmacists; the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert)—Agriculture—Eggs—Request for steps to protect Canadian producers against imports; the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins)—Sports—Trotting Races—Refusal to licence lady drivers.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE—NOTICE OF IMPOSITION OF CLOSURE ON DEBATE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have general consent to revert to motions to make a statement about the discussions on the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization and also about the business of the house?

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house having reverted to the order for motions:

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As Your Honour and hon. members know, negotiations have been going on since Thursday last in the hope of arriving at a compromise which would enable the government to discharge its responsibilities for programming the business of the house, but also taking into account some of the points made in this debate by opposition members.

Specifically we proposed to the opposition parties a number of amendments in addition to those proposed in government order No. 99, which together seemed to us to offer hope of a reasonable compromise. Briefly, these are as follows:

1. To remove the standing or special committee stage of public bills from operation of proposed standing order 75C;

2. To provide that at second reading and report stage one full-day's debate must take place before application may be made for an order, that is in addition to the minimum of a full-day's debate which must be provided in the order;

3. To permit the Speaker to extend the time for debate on allocated days for an additional two hours, and on report stage to extend it up to a maximum of two additional days;

4. Where there is an order in effect, to reduce the time limit on speeches to twenty minutes.

After consultations I am advised that those amendments would not enable hon. members opposite to withdraw their opposition to the proposed standing orders. We must, therefore, consider what arrangements should be made for completing the business before the house.

There seems to be some measure of agreement that the continuation of the debate would not be a useful exercise. In addition it is the view of the government that it would be in the best interest both of arrangements for planning the business of the next session, and of members themselves, and indeed in the interest of the house staff that the house should adjourn for this part of the session. But the government also feels some progress in achieving a procedure for programming house business should be the result of the past two weeks' debate even if it is not possible at this point to incorporate in the rules the changes which I have proposed and which have not been accepted.

In our view, if it is desirable to make amendments to the proposed standing orders in the future, these could be brought forward at a later date. In the meantime we feel that the house should move ahead and take a decision on the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

It is for this purpose, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice, pursuant to Standing Order 33, that at the next sitting of the house—

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —immediately before the order of the day is called for resuming the debate on the motion, "That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be concurred in", and on any amendment or amendment in amendment proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate shall not be further adjourned.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We hope in this way, Mr. Speaker, to be able to bring the debate to an end and to have some opportunity to reflect on the Standing Orders. As I have said, if it be considered desirable at a later time to amend the Standing Orders, we would then have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), realizing that the very reasonable alternative proposals advanced on this side of the house were going to be rejected, prepared what he was going to say today, as was his right.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Baldwin: It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, that these negotiations were not brought into the forum where they should have been conducted at an earlier stage in this session, the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, so that there would have been an opportunity for the flow back and forth of arguments of reasonable men to have reached a culmination, to be brought into the house by the committee as the accepted co-operative effort of all parties, and not in the bulldozing works of a government that wants to ride rampant over members of parliament.

Having listened to the proposals advanced by the President of the Privy Council we advanced our alternative suggestions, which were consistent with the position that this party has taken from the very inception of this debate, which can trace its beginning back to last December and proposed standing order 16A. We have said this is neither proper nor advisable in a legislative body. Predetermined periods for debate should not be set for important issues concerning the country. This has been our position throughout.

We in the Official Opposition have said to the government, and the leader of our party made this abundantly clear in this debate, inside and outside of this house, that proposed standing orders 75A and 75B, and a revision of the present Standing Order 33 dealing with closure, could be adapted to meet the changed circumstances of the report stage which was introduced during the course of the debate on rules last year. That was a very sensible and reasonable idea. As I say it was advanced inside and outside this house. The government rejected it then, and are still rejecting it.

• (5:10 p.m.)

We were prepared to go further and make additional concessions. In the first instance we said there must be a limitation as to the minimum amount of time for the over-all period which is available for discussion in calendar days from the inception of a debate, from second reading until the question is put on third reading. This is of the essence. It is the pith and substance of a determined opposition which has the right to see that the country is advised of measures which, in our view, are not acceptable, so that public opinion can be gathered together throughout the land, which in turn can bring pressure on the government. So, we have set a minimum of 30 days.

Mr. Pepin: —reaching for the moon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: You will be in orbit soon enough.

Mr. Baldwin: Some of the proposals of the government obviously have been brought back from the moon. We made it plain that 30 days, in a country as widespread geographically as Canada is, with a diversity of problems, should be acceptable so that there would be 30 calendar days from the start of a debate until all questions were put on third reading. We proposed this to the government. It was rejected.

We also say to the government that if it is possible to arrive at some form of arrangement, then so far as the adoption of 75c is concerned it must be on a temporary basis, or on a provisional basis. We are prepared to discuss the period of time which would be established for the working of this proviso. During the course of the last session of parliament the government, in particular during the debate in December, was given more power and more authority than any opposition has given any previous government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: They are now in a position to know beyond any doubt that supply will be granted to them by a certain date. They know beyond any doubt that the estimates of government departments will be discussed, not in committee of supply but in the standing committees. During the course of the session members of this party, and of all opposition parties for that matter, have engaged in very, very reasonable co-operation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Baldwin: In fact, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Pipeline debate again.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I cannot—

Mr. Speaker: May we have order, please?

Mr. Baldwin: I call upon the record to substantiate my statement. Not only have we co-operated, but in many instances members of the parties in opposition have initiated steps to bring to a conclusion debate on measures which the government indicated it considered to be essential for the proper governing of this country. No government has ever had greater co-operation from an opposition than have hon. gentlemen opposite—

An hon. Member: Honourable?

Mr. Baldwin: I am compelled by the usage of the house to say "honourable", Mr. Speaker. Another conditions we propose in respect of the government's 75c, with its changes, are that there must be before each stage of a debate, subject to the allocation of the time rule, one day's debate, and that there should be no right to initiate proceedings under the allocation of time rule until there has been one day's debate. We would then be in what in effect would be closure proceedings. This would be the proper way for the government to meet its responsibilities.

This would apply to the second reading stage, the report stage and third reading stage. If the government then should be of the opinion that the circumstances warranted their moving to what in effect would be closure, they would have the right to move the motion at the conclusion of that day's debate. We say there must also be an over-all limitation of 30 days so that the country can be apprised of the issues and the circumstances so that if necessary that great weapon, public opinion, might be brought to bear on the government.

Finally we said that it must be tried on a temporary basis. We said that if it can be demonstrated that it is essential that it work, there will be every co-operation by this party to make sure that the rule, or an adaptation of it, will become practicable. Instead of this the government have rejected our offer and pursued the path of a bulldozer rather than the path of reason. Mr. Speaker, we will meet them on their battleground.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I suppose the first thing to say is that the government today has achieved a genuine first. Without taking the trouble to read all the pages of *Hansard* I can be sure that this is the first time in the history of the House of Commons closure has been invoked to impose further closure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is what has been imposed today. Instead

of acting on the basis of consultation and consensus, we are now—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friends can laugh, but it is a fact. I have been here as long as most people in this house—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Be quiet over there.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): During the past six months we have had more dealing with parliamentary business by consensus and consultation than in all the years I have been here.

An hon. Member: Right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, that way of doing things is being destroyed by the action the government is now taking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I would point out, as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has said, that during the past several days we have had a number of meetings, five or six I believe. During the course of those meetings we have laid our various propositions on the table. Sometimes the discussion has been a bit tight, but most of the time it has been quite civilized. We agreed to a number of things. For example there was agreement among all of us that it does not make sense to apply 75c to the standing or special committee stage of a bill. Now we are being told that 75A, 75B and 75c are to be put through in their present form, and that 75c will apply to the standing or special committee stage of a bill.

Under this provision it will be possible to send a major or most important bill to a standing committee and give that committee one day in which to deal with it. This is being proposed by a government that has traded on the phrase "participatory democracy".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Disgraceful.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The whole theme of this parliament has been the upgrading of the work of our committees so that they can do a better job, and give all members of all parties a chance to participate in the legislative process by the upgrading of the work of the committees. Now we are being asked to put through, under the old 1913 closure rule, another closure rule which can be invoked to limit the debate in committees to one day. They talk of participatory democracy—this is not democracy at all.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I say to you, Sir, and to other members of the house, that there were a number of other things agreed upon in our discussions since four o'clock last Thursday afternoon. We agreed that perhaps one day's debate on second reading was not enough, and that perhaps one day on the report stage was not enough. This is what is possible under 75c, but we did reach an agreement to modify this position. Some of us wanted more than the government was willing to give, but the government was willing to move a bit. Now that is all down the drain. Negotiations are over. Negotiations have been broken off by a government decision announced to us about 40 minutes ago, with the government coming in here and indicating that what is before us has to be put through under the old 1913 rule of closure.

They tell us over there to get up to date, get with it and live in the 1960's and 1970's. Yet they are going to employ a rule that was brought in in 1913 in the midst of a debate that the Liberals were filibustering. They complained at the time that the thing that was wrong with the rule was that it was brought in in the middle of a debate and then used to put a stop to a debate which had started under a different set of rules.

That is what is going to happen now. We started this debate, on a motion to adopt the third report of the committee, under certain rules of debate. We are now being told there is no more of that, and no more participatory democracy and no more freedom of speech. By one a.m. tomorrow night, or in other words in the early hours of Thursday, July 24, the will of the government will be voted on in this House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hope *Hansard* will note that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet, most of whom are here for this occasion, are applauding the fact that at one a.m. on Thursday, July 24, the government, with the support of its backbenchers, will get its will, which is the use of closure to invoke a further rule of closure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: Something new; rape by closure.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that for the past six months, at least up until June 20, we have had a régime regarding house procedure that has been a pleasure. We have been able to reach all kinds of agreements. We have had only two instances during this six months period when we could not reach agreement. I submit it does not do parliament any harm to have two debates in the course of six months during which the feelings people have are fully and freely expressed. It was good for parliament to have these two lively and contentious debates. This was good for the country and good for democracy. Having had those, during the rest of the time we got along on the basis of consent and consultation.

I thought that after my motion of last Thursday for the adjournment of the house, which led to the meetings we have been having, we were getting back to the proposition that negotiation is better than standing off at arm's length, and that consultation is better than confrontation. Apparently this whole attempt to negotiate in the last four or five days has been an exercise which has now been proven futile. I must not impute motives. I am the last person in the house to do that, but I am wondering what kind of negotiations we have been having that we have reached the point at which we now find ourselves.

The result of this decision, if it is carried through, is as clear as can be. Proceedings during the next session of parliament will not be of the kind that they have been during this session. There will be confrontation and frustration. There will be work to rule, no more participating democracy. I appeal to the government even at this late hour to reconsider its position if it wants to retain the respect of the Canadian people who, as I say, believe in democracy.

The President of the Privy Council made reference to the proposals that the government placed before us during the course of our negotiations. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) indicated the proposals made by his party during the same negotiations. There was agreement among us on some of these points. The particular position I put forward on behalf of this party was a very clear and direct one. My hon. friends opposite, at least through their house leader, were not prepared to accept it.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I think I have the right to state that we in this parliament did a good job last December. The job was not all done then, but it was an accumulation of four or five years' work. When we organized our legislative process the particular things we did were to downgrade slightly the importance of second reading and upgrade the importance of third reading, and to take the committee stage off the floor of the house and put it into standing committees. I think this was good and I think it has worked well. One of the reasons it has worked well is that we brought in something new, namely, the report stage at which it is possible to zero in on the points at issue and the points of contention.

I assert that one of the things which made the effect of new rules regarding the legislative process work was that the report stage included the right of all members to put down amendments to clauses of a bill that had been considered by a standing committee, or a committee of the whole. I think the experience we have had during the past six months demonstrates that this was a good rule.

The proposal now is that what we have achieved by our own common consent is to be frustrated and truncated and taken away by a rule that says no matter how many amendments there are it is within the power of the government to limit the debate on the entire report stage to two minutes and one day. I shall indicate in a moment or two what I intend to say about this through another point.

Let me make the point here that in our view one has to look at this legislative process in its broad perspective. One has to realize that second and third readings are important but not as important as they used to be, and that the report stage is supremely important. Therefore we proposed, and I did this at the meeting of the house leaders this morning with the full endorsation of the N.D.P. members of this house, that we would be willing to accept a time limitation even under some kind of a 75c on second and third readings. We suggested that the time limitation should not be less than three days at each of these stages. I think this is a pretty real offer for an opposition party to make.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hear my hon. friends laugh over there. They do not know what this is all about.

Relating this to the philosophy of our legislative process we said, having been willing to

agree to a time limitation on second and third readings, the important report stage or the committee of the whole stage, in the case of a bill that does not get debated at the report stage but only at the committee of the whole stage, should not be subject to any time limitation imposed unilaterally by the government.

I want to make it clear that this morning when we met I indicated that in spite of the strong stand we had taken across the board against 75c, and in spite of all the things we have said against time limitation under 75c at any stage, in the interest of expediting the work of parliament and of gearing our rules to the realities of the present debating process, we were prepared to accept limitation on second and third readings, but we asked that there be no unilateral limitation on the debate at the committee of the whole stage or at the report stage.

• (5:30 p.m.)

It is that proposition, which I submit stands up and is in keeping with a realistic philosophy of our legislative process, that the President of the Privy Council, the government house leader, has rejected. We submit that this rejection should not have taken place. The President of the Privy Council, said in his remarks a few minutes ago that in his view there was no value to the continuation of this debate. I think he said: The continuation of this debate would not be a useful exercise.

I admit that there are times when debate gets out of hand and takes too long; but when a government simply says that a debate on a matter as important as the rules of parliament is not a useful exercise, it is admitting that it does not know what parliament is all about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Parliament is not just a place where we make speeches, where enough time is allowed for us to speak and get on the record. If we were doing this, we would follow the advice of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) and just put our speeches on the record in printed form. The whole theory of parliament is that the debate be carried on, and out of debate something is achieved; that the cut and thrust of debate is real and purposeful. We have had instances of that in this session. I submit that because of debate the official languages bill is a better bill than it otherwise would have been. I submit that because of debate the omnibus Criminal Code bill is a better bill than it otherwise would have been.

I could name instances by the dozen where in the past legislation has been improved because of debate. But this government says: Debate is not necessary. We will let these boys, elected to parliament at a cost of $18,000 a year, sit here and make speeches now and then, but we do not intend that the debating process shall be one that results in the making of decisions. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this attitude illustrates a complete failure to recognize the purpose of parliament and the importance of parliamentary debate. There will be other occasions on which to raise points with regard to what debate is all about and what our rules are. I shall indicate in a moment the heading under which I may do it.

I regret that the government house leader has stood in his place and said that the continuation of debate on the rules of parliament is not a useful exercise. There is nothing more important to us, and nothing that is a more useful exercise. The government house leader says he will use the old 1913 closure rule and bring the debate to a conclusion at one o'clock Thursday morning, even though in the process some of the changes he has put forward are not accepted and some of the things we have agreed upon are sent down the drain.

I submit that this is a shameful way of proceeding. It is not a good day for parliament. The very real tragedy is that it need not have happened at all, because we have demonstrated in six months of parliamentary practice that we can make the House of Commons an effective chamber for the practising of participatory democracy. However, Mr. Speaker, this government does not want that. The government wants to be the master of the house. It has no awareness of the fact that we all come here as equals, with equal right to freedom of speech, that we have the right to freedom of speech unless we voluntarily give it up. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for parliament.

The only other thing I want to say is that in my view the effort to put through the third report of the standing committee, which as everyone knows did not have the support of any member of the opposition, is contrary to the rules, traditions and practices of this House of Commons. There is a Standing Order that has something to say about this matter. I should like to give notice now that

at the appropriate moment I shall raise a point of order against the motion, under Standing Order 51.

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the first times that we see the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his seat to participate in a debate, and he takes advantage of it to impose the closure rule. Having concluded his—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I would like your co-operation to call the clowns opposite to order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fortin: I notice with dismay, Mr. Speaker, that the first presence of the Prime Minister to participate in a debate of utmost importance, in relation to the very existence and good operation of parliament—the first institution of this country—is only to impose closure under another closure rule. In my opinion this is shameful. The members opposite who have been smiling and laughing since the unfortunate announcement of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) should have sat instead of the representatives of the several parties of the opposition at the meetings held since Thursday last, with a view to arriving at a compromise.

First, the government claims that the opposition is not really seeking a compromise. I shall point out that the proposal to find a compromise as a token of our good will, was put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Center (Mr. Knowles), who is a member of the opposition and not a government member.

This is the proof, Mr. Speaker, that all the members of the opposition agreed, not to fight stupidly against the government but remain as co-operative as they have been since the beginning of this session, in order to conclude this debate as a result of a parliamentary agreement.

Now the government, following friendly consultations and the almost superhuman attempt by the representatives of the various parties of the opposition which extended their co-operation, and submitted some proposals has shown the extent of its intelligence by sweetly stating that closure had to be put through, but I repeat that it is dictatorial and absolutely unacceptable.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

The strangest thing I find, Mr. Speaker, is that among the government members there are veterans of the two World Wars who have fought dictatorship they are now party to.

Mr. Speaker, we, of the Ralliement créditiste, say "yes" to co-operation, "yes" to consultation, "yes" to agreement "yes" to understanding. We are prepared to listen to government proposals and to co-operate at any time. However, we are not prepared to sell ourselves or to be muzzled.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the famous Standing Order 75c was first imposed upon the Committee on Procedure and Organization. From there, it was imposed upon the special committee, which has just met. Negotiations have broken off because the government, at this meeting, has once again forcibly imposed upon us this Standing Order 75c. A third time, the government imposes it on the house. In my view, the government had decided a long time ago that it would use its dictatorial power, its majority, to impose its view upon parliament.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, may I point out that Parliament is not at the service of one cabinet or of one man, but of all the people of Canada. All hon. members are equal here; all have the right to speak and to propose amendments for the purpose of improving our laws. laws.

What is most odious, in my view, with regard to clause 75c is that, normally, members of Parliament are elected to examine legislative proposals, to read them, study them and to attempt to improve them.

But, under rule 75c, which the government has imposed, a time limit is fixed without any regard as to whether the opposition members have any amendments to submit or any points to bring forward. In consequence, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members do not have the freedom nor the instruments needed to improve legislation and do their job to the best of their ability because the government is able to control the primary factor, the conerstone of Parliament, that is the time factor.

The government, Mr. Speaker, has become the master of its own members, by muzzling and gagging them. The government now wants to become master of the third parties in the opposition, and in that it shall not succeed.

It has been recognized for a long time, Mr. Speaker, by all observers that government

members do not have the chance, the opportunity of carrying out their duty according to the wishes of their electors. Why? Because they are simply gagged by the government. And many things bear witness to the fact that it is exactly the same within committees.

Government members have been muzzled and with the imposition of Standing Order 75c, opposition members will also be muzzled. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the government party is afraid of the opposition, especially of the smaller parties, because we are not afraid to speak our own mind, because we are free, because we are not tied up to any special election funds, and because our leader leaves us free to speak, to do our duty, something you do not find on the government side.

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, must not be a test tube to be used for experiments by each minister and each government member. It should not be used either as a spring board for one's own publicity and I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is listening. It should be used either as a place to play hide and seek in order to deny information to members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the three points which I have just mentioned, namely that parliament is a test tube, a spring board and a hiding place, agree exactly with the conception held by the Prime Minister and his party since the beginning of this session.

As for us, we believe that parliament—and this is our earnest conviction—is a melting pot where positive business has to be carried out for the good of the people, where there can be some sober-second thoughts and where legislation is developed. To that end, we nust have available the tools necessary to study it seriously and it is not with this rule of closure that we achieve this.

Government members might think that the Créditistes want to impose their views on parliament or the government. This is not our intention. Hon. members might also think that we have refused to co-operate but I will point out to them that they are mistaken, and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) as well as the members of the committee on which I had the privilege to sit, can testify to that.

On behalf of the Ralliement Créditiste, I have suggested that Standing Orders 75a, 75b and 75c be put in effect for a period of one year even though they might have to be revised following a study of the consequences, either good or bad, of their implementation. I felt that request was reasonable in the sense that before adopting a permanent rule, it is better to test it in order to determine whether it is actually in the best interests of parliament.

Now, the President of the Privy Council, on behalf of the Liberal party, turned down that proposal and imposed the closure rule because it serves the interests of his party rather than those of parliament and of the Canadian people.

We are willing to co-operate and to that effect, we have made numerous proposals. The hon. member representing the Conservative party, the member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin)—whom I want to congratulate in particular—as well as the member for Winnipeg North Centre did a tremendous job, and nobody can say that they lack parliamentary experience. Indeed, they could even teach a thing or two to several members on the other side of the house.

As for me, I had the opportunity of getting better acquainted with the rules and to realize the important part a member can play in the house, in parliament. I had the honour of representing my party on this Committee.

The final result is a feeling of deep frustration. We were wrong to suggest negotiations, because we should have known that the government had already decided to impose closure. This has been obvious ever since this debate started.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring my remarks to close on that period. Indeed, I should like to tell the Prime Minister, as well as his government, that they will surely regret their decision to impose closure.

The government wants to give itself more authority to control its legislative program even more to schedule it more efficiently. They want to control parliament even more. We agree, Mr. Speaker, with making parliament, that supreme institution, more efficient, and to that end we offer once again—perhaps for the hundredth time—our co-operation to the government. But if they absolutely want to have more rope the better to hang themselves, we are willing to give it to them; the sooner they hang themselves the better, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to remind hon. members that this is my first mandate. This is my first session in this 28th Parliament. Roughly 50 per cent of hon. members, on both sides of this house, are in exactly the same position.

This year, Mr. Speaker, is a memorable, outstanding year for me—not only for me but for all the new members, and especially those of the Ralliement créditiste. This institution was, to our mind, the most respectable and respected body in Canada. To us parliament was the supreme institution where democratic rights could be fought for, where our points of view could be freely expressed, where we could attempt, through our own limited means, to improve the laws and represent the Canadian people with dignity; we were happy with our first experience.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude on a very sad and melancholy note, because on the eve of the adjournment of the session, the very few rights we had left are snatched away from us. We shall not be able to call it a holiday because the government has decided this to give a rest to its own members who have been twiddling their thumbs since the beginning of the session.

Mr. Speaker, this year in the house has been a most enlightening experience which unfortunately is ending in a most inauspicious way. I would like to tell the government that new members are sorry that it decided to apply the rule of closure and to do so with a smile.

The government sank in the estimation of the Ralliement Créditiste, and the only thing to do is to disregard the Standing Orders entirely, since from now on governments will most probably assume rights they do not possess.

Not only does the government wish to force its views upon us, but it also want to control the business of the house and of the hon. members. But they would never be able to have under their thumb and to control the hon. members of the Ralliement Créditiste, because we are free agents. We shall stand up and be counted, in spite of the liberal dictatorship!

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member for Egmont rising on a point of order?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): No, Mr. Speaker; I am rising to speak in the debate.

Mr. Speaker: We are on motions and I have to call orders of the day. When we return to the debate, the hon. member for Egmont will be recognized.

[Mr. Fortin.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Friday, July 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it does not give me any particular pleasure to speak in this house this afternoon, but perhaps it is typical that as I rise to speak on this issue, the most important issue to be raised in this house, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) sees fit to absent himself. What is involved here is an issue so basic to the future of this parliament that one wonders whether it is possible for us to discuss this vital matter with passions fanned to the boiling point.

It is unfortunate that one of the high points of this era, the week than man descended upon the moon, will also be identified by Canadians as the week that the government chose to descend to dictatorship. As others have indicated this afternoon we have seen a parliament, in which rested the promise of great things, suddenly soured and now brought almost to the point of impotence as a result of the action of an insensitive and, one must conclude, unaware government. If I were a man of stronger language I would not merely talk of the souring of parliament, but of its contemplated rape. For what we have witnessed here during the last few minutes is, to my mind, the death knell of the just society.

From a phrase, "Come work with me", introduced little more than a year ago, we have reverted this afternoon to "Don't bother me". We have learned that a government, unable to sort out its priorities, now considers that the best way off the hook is frankly and blatantly to tell us that parliament is a supreme nuisance. Those with any knowledge of history know that democracy, at any period in time, can survive for only a generation or two without the support of the people. Those who sit on the government benches this afternoon, those who conclude that the majority has rights, have also now declared that minorities must have no rights. We who have been led to believe that a government in

this country must govern with parliament and within parliament are now told that, to all intents and purposes, we will be governed without parliament. We in this party, Mr. Speaker, and members in all parties on this side of the house, refuse to accept and will refuse to accept this proposition for as long as we are here.

Those on the government benches who talked freely and fully not too many months ago of government by dialogue have now opted for government by monologue. I will take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, before the supper adjournment I was indicating in a general way how shocked I and many others in this house were this afternoon to hear the announcement the government house leader made. What we are witnessing, quite likely, is part and parcel of the passing of a free parliament. The Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) role is that of an undertaker, and that of his cabinet colleagues of pall bearers. Tomorrow we shall see the last act played out, and we shall all be witnesses at the wake.

Many in the country have wondered what we have been doing for the past month. The attention of our people to a large measure, understandably, has been directed to the fantastic space achievement of the last few days. They noticed parliament and took note of this debate only a few days ago after the Prime Minister made the inadvertent suggestion that he had better things to do than listen to a stupid filibuster. Some hon. members at that point became disturbed at the idea that, in referring to this debate as a stupid filibuster, he was attributing a motive to some hon. members of the house. Although it may not be unparliamentary for the Prime Minister to call a filibuster stupid, I think we have discovered that his words were not really meant to refer to a filibuster as much as to parliament itself. We have seen very real evidence in this debate that this government has become tired of dealing with parliament and wishes to be done with it.

The government has talked about negotiation. After the government house leader received permission to revert to motions this afternoon, he spoke about the advances the government had made in working out some kind of solution. He seemed to think it strange that by today we had not come to some sort of agreement. Is that his understanding of reasonable negotiations? They were not initiated by him last Thursday but by other hon. members. If one can judge from the relatively small amount of time the government has been willing to spend on negotiations, it is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion that the government has been preparing for some time to carry out the action it announced today it will carry out.

Mr. Bell: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The slogan we heard not too many months ago was "participatory democracy". All the available evidence shows that either the Prime Minister does not understand what participatory democracy is, or that he cannot be bothered with it. Time and again when important questions or important issues have been directed to him, he has resorted to the technique of posing other questions rather than giving answers. That may be an excellent classroom technique but does nothing to promote those useful exchanges that must take place between a leader and the people. Part of his classroom technique, and here the Prime Minister has demonstrated his debating skill, has been to reduce the matter before him to the point of *reductio ad absurdum*. He has set up straw men to be knocked down. This time he cannot be bothered going through these exercises. This time he wants to muzzle parliament.

Before the government house leader introduced the closure motion I had thought that he and the Prime Minister did not really understand what they meant when they talked about participatory democracy. Now, I save come to the sad conclusion that, instead of not understanding that term, they did not really mean it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): One of the hallmarks of an effective parliament down through the years has been the mutual respect with which hon. members on either side of the house have regarded each other. Surely, any reasonable leader realizes that men in this forum will act reasonably. Tonight the government is trying to say that reasonable

men must accept unreasonable measures. And this is one measure our party will refuse to accept with all the strength in its power. Never before, in the few years I have been an hon. member of this chamber, have I witnessed anything approaching the travesty that the President of the Privy Council indicates he is about to perform.

In the 700 year history of parliaments, the free and honourable parliaments were those in which the government at all times was responsible to parliament. Today, the teachings of 700 years of history are to be reversed. No longer will the government be responsible to parliament; it seems that parliament now will be responsible to the government. This is something no free people can accept.

Mr. Basford: Let us be responsible to the people.

Mr. Stanfield: Right. The minister has said the right thing.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Exactly. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) says we must be responsible to the people. He is absolutely right, and I hope he contributes to this debate.

Mr. Bell: Let the minister stand up. Let us hear from him.

Mr. Stanfield: And it has taken the government six months to appoint a commission.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the minister made his contribution from a sitting position, which he no doubt thought was appropriate. His suggestion is that parliament must be effective, and that is quite true. But what the minister, the Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues are asking for is not an effective parliament; they want an emasculated parliament. Although this issue has not been in the nation's headlines in the last few weeks, it is nevertheless vitally important and is not a matter of housekeeping, as some would have our people believe. Basically the issue is, will our people continue to enjoy responsible government. That is possible only when you have a free and responsible parliament.

• (8:10 p.m.)

One could spend a great deal of time thinking of the utter inconsistency of the government's position. We have made many worthwhile changes in the last year to make this parliament relevant to this country and to this age. One worth-while change was the establishment of Your Honour's position as Speaker with the most complete kind of independence a Speaker has ever enjoyed in a Canadian parliament. I think it was a mark of great advance that all parties, and all party leaders agreed some months ago, in order that parliament would be free and all members could be responsible, that Your Honour's position would be given an even greater place of freedom from any kind of political pressure or control.

It was agreed by all parties, including the Liberal Party, that Your Honour should occupy that special role. We were told this would make parliament more effective and responsible because Your Honour's office and the rules Your Honour administers are the prerogatives, not of any one party or group, but of all members of this house. Suddenly, the government, by its action today, has indicated that they believe the rules are their prerogative to do with as they please.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): This is something no member should be asked to accept. It has been said by the government house leader and others on that side that we must protect the rights of the majority. I have always had occasion to smile when people have suggested to me that we must be concerned about the rights of the majority. I have heard this phrase not only during this debate on rules, but also in connection with the debate on the official languages bill.

Some people have suggested the provisions contained in that legislation were going to endanger the position of the English speaking people of this country and the rights of the majority would somehow be downgraded. It was quite noticeable in that instance that no government member ever expressed that concern, and rightly so. I am still looking for an example which would indicate how the rights of the majority have been endangered. If we want to talk about an effective legislature in a free country where democracy is still operative, we do not look in the first instance to see how effectively the rights of the majority are being protected but we look at the rights of the minority.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): What we have seen today in this house has been a flagrant disregard for these rights. It is not a question,

as some would have us believe, that we must somehow on occasion tolerate these minorities. We know what the results have been in countries where that has been attempted. If that is the attitude in this house, we shudder with fear at the results which could occur.

Minorities have been dreadfully important in many different cases in numerous countries for the effective survival of basic human rights. Minorities have a right to exist on their own terms. Surely, in parliament minorities are important. They offer a type of safeguard, independence and special vantage point that is never available to the majority, regardless of who forms that majority.

We have seen a callous disregard for those rights and the adoption by this government of a motto that "Might makes right". Why have they adopted this point of view? One is tempted to believe that perhaps the members opposite or those who are in control have been too long used to power. Their vision has become blurred as to what is really at stake, namely, the protection of the vital rights and privileges of this parliament. Perhaps they have even become a bit self-centred.

In the past the Prime Minister has expressed a fondness for authoritarian régimes, some perhaps idealistic, but authoritarian none the less. We are tempted to believe that he is trying to introduce some of that same philosophy into the workings of what up until now has been a relatively free parliament. In years to come, people will not look favourably on the backward step that has been proposed in this house today.

What is really at stake in dealing with this issue? Surely, one of the basic issues in this debate has been the continual erosion of legislative power and responsibility, with a build-up of responsibility to the point of irresponsibility in the executive branch. It makes one wonder what is really happening to the ultimate responsibility of parliament. We have accepted too easily the erosion of legislative responsibility.

The rule changes accepted last December were mentioned earlier today. One of the fundamental changes was the removal of something that had been with free parliaments since earliest day, 'the power of the purse'. This power was removed almost without a murmur. That is not the only thing that has happened to the attrition of the rights of parliament. Anyone who has sat in this house day after day knows that the government unilaterally decided it was sufficient for their purposes to have only part of the cabinet present in the house each day during the question period. The government decided these few ministers could tell parliament all parliament needed to know about what the executive was doing. This downgrading of the question period was more evidence of the nuisance factor the government obviously considered parliament to be.

We have seen an increasingly rigid parliamentary discipline being imposed on government members, not only on questions of an economic or legal nature, but on issues that are highly personal, social and moral, on which the government has taken an absolutely rigid stand. In many ways we have seen the further erosion of legislative responsibility. This new evidence today surely will not surprise hon. members very much.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) referred earlier to the fact that it is the people who really count. I could not agree more. The people of Canada will realize what is being proposed here. It is not just a question of the limitation of the number of speeches that will be made on a certain bill, it is the limitation of the full and free representation that people expect when they elect a person to serve them in the parliament of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I find it difficult to believe that members opposite accepted with equanimity the proposition of the government house leader this afternoon. There are too many members in that party for whom I have respect; people who have served this country in other roles, such as deans of law and who have given leadership in other forums. If they examine closely the proposal before us, they will use every ounce of persuasion they have, both publicly and privately, to make sure we do not commit ourselves to what can only be a travesty on the dignity and validity of this house. I say, for the sake of the future functioning and effectiveness of this place, not only for its own sake but for the sake of the people of this country, in God's name let us not take this step.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am encouraged to think that the proposals of the government house leader this afternoon perhaps are more peevish, and maybe even a bit childish, than a serious examination of the steps he proposes to take. I would find it difficult to

believe 150 members of this house could accept as a good thing the fact that parliament must now be responsible to government rather than the reverse. Further, the government house leader surely has himself in a most inconsistent position. He has already told us he does not like certain elements of these rule changes as reported by the committee. In fact, on his own initiative he attempted to make changes in order to clarify the situation. Now, he tells us he really does not care that much, but if we can somehow bring this debate to a conclusion the government will accept the rule changes as recommended and perhaps at some later date they can do what they wanted to do in the first place. He is asking us to accept something which is unacceptable to members on all sides of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): How can he consider that we or anyone will believe he is acting in a rational or responsible manner when he tells us today he is now ready to accept something he was not prepared to accept a week ago.

Mr. Stanfield: Drunk with power.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): One of the issues at stake seems to be that we want to make more meaningful what we do in this chamber. That, of course, means making our debates more meaningful. Yet under this proposal we will be forced to accept, in a little more than a day's time, a rule which will provide for a forum which will be not more meaningful but less meaningful because we will in effect be saying that debate no longer makes any difference. The important thing probably will be programming, so that everything will fall within a certain period of time.

Mr. Stanfield: So we can sell more wheat.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The problem, for the government at least, seems to be that we have not been able to allocate and nail down in advance all the necessary time periods required to put through a certain series of legislation. How, if one really believes debate in this chamber is to be meaningful, can one come to that conclusion? That is not an invitation to dialogue but rather to monologue. When the government chooses to unilaterally determine cut-off time for debate and there is no agreement, then debate in that situation cannot be considered to be meaningfull.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

The Prime Minister referred to this debate as being a stupid filibuster. Under the government's proposal, a debate on that basis will become a filibuster. That to my mind will do little to ennoble this place or make it function effectively as suggested by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford).

Mr. Stanfield: Where is he?

An hon. Member: He is not here.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The government suggests that what is needed here is efficiency. They believe parliament has not been efficient.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Another hon. Member: We know you just want your vacation.

Mr. Bell: Go to Florida.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am really amazed to discover that apparently many people on the government side believe efficiency is the basic criterion for the proper functioning and effectiveness of this place. I suppose they make the equation that the number of bills passed directly equals how good the government is. I think that kind of reasoning is sophistic to say the least, and is highly fallacious.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Naturally, this might be desirable in a totalitarian régime, but surely that is not what we want in this place.

An hon. Member: One of the troika is over there.

Another hon. Member: The one with the big grin.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): One must conclude for one reason or another that the government really does not understand what parliament is. Not only that, although that is bad enough, but what makes it even worse—and I again refer to the suggestion of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—is that one must assume they do not even understand what democracy is all about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): It is not really rules which make parliament work. If the

government concludes it is rules which make parliament work, we will soon work to rule and show them that attitude does not make sense.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I have not been here for many years but I have learned one thing. I have learned that it is the attitude and willingness to work on all sides of the house which makes this parliament function. No amount of rule changes or additions to the rule book will provide a parliament of which we can be proud. If the government thinks it has contributed something worthwhile to this parliament this day, then they have been very sadly misled.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I think we must admit very sadly that the actions indicated by the government house leader today are a very real travesty of the potential purpose of this place. Members of the government have talked about the need for parliamentary reform. With that I wholeheartedly concur. Reform, however, does not start by bludgeoning minorities in this place. Reforms will not be achieved by suddenly reversing 700 years of parliamentary history.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Reforms will not be achieved by souring the will of individual members of this house. What the government has arrived at quite frankly is a confused set of priorities which show very little understanding of this place. I should like to indicate briefly some of the priorities which need to be dealt with which have not yet been seriously looked at by this government. Surely, the basic question is how can we make this house more responsive to public thought and participation. Participatory democracy may be a slogan with little meaning for some people but behind that slogan there is the urgent need that parliament become more responsive or more sensitive to public opinion in this country. What is needed for this place is not less responsibility, as proposed by the government, but more.

In parliamentary reform there is a need for greater legislative initiative and responsibility but there has been little leadership from the government in this regard. One might speak of the need for more and better assistance for individual members and the need of a more creative role for them to play. One could also talk about the need for more effective machinery by which to review the work done by departments and the whole administration. One could spend a good deal of time talking about the kind of committee system which would really work and be responsible. All these things are priorities, but not in the thinking of this government. Rather this government regards parliament as a nuisance and therefore would rather introduce government by dictatorship.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Behind all this I sense a tremendous danger for ourselves and for this country. One does not need to remind anyone in this chamber perhaps that there is still a very large amount of cynicism about, and alienation in respect of, the processes of government not only in our country but in many other countries. We know only too well the degree to which young people, particularly university students, have become disaffected with our system of self-government. What we have seen evidence of today is a widening of this gulf between the government and the people. We are not closing the gap if all of us, as members of this place, are not prepared to deal realistically with the situation, and if the name of the game is only a greater concentration of power in fewer and fewer hands. That being the case, the answer will be altogether too obvious because there will be people in the streets, there will be a revolution and there will be a rejection not only of those institutions which have served us well in the past but of many of the individual rights and freedoms that each of us cherish.

I close by asking all members to think seriously about the step which has been proposed by this government. When Neil Armstrong landed on the moon he talked about a great leap for mankind. We see here the potential initiation of a leap for this country which quite tragically will not be forward, but backward. This is something which all members must refuse to accept.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like initially to express the feeling of regret and shame which has been developing over the last few months and which thousands of people in Canada have today. There is a feeling of regret and shame within people as a result of what took place a year ago in June. During the election campaign, as everyone knows, there was great admiration developed for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

There was great affection shown for him by thousands of people all across the nation, and there was a tremendous amount of almost love and certainly support. When the people went to the polls on election day, they expressed that hope and affection by electing the Prime Minister and his followers, and I cannot think of a more polite word to use than "followers" for most of them.

The internal shame that has developed results from the fact that many people in Canada feel they were taken in last June. They feel they have been seduced or sucked in by Liberal programs of propaganda. That is why they have regret and feel disaffected. They are sad that they were taken in and that the "Trudeaumania" has now turned into "Trudeauphobia". The hope the people had of electing a Saviour as Prime Minister has turned out to be a hope in vain because, as they have seen today, they elected a scalliwag instead. The people generally have expressed this feeling not only because of what has happened this afternoon but because of what has been developing. They see in the Prime Minister now a person who, is not truly honest.

Thousands of people see in this Prime Minister someone who has no time for parliament or democracy. They see someone who has no time for parliamentary debates and no tendency to listen to opinions. He is like someone with a head of concrete, well mixed and well set, with no time for the views of anybody else. In fact I think the people in Canada see, as they might have seen this afternoon, a Prime Minister with actual disdain and dislike for parliament and its processes. At the very moment the declaration was made on motions, following an indication by the house leader that he was going to impose closure, the Prime Minister got up and walked out.

What is significant is, I think probably for the first time in Canadian history, the Prime Minister was booed as he left the chamber. That is a regrettable thing to have happened. I do not think members were booing him because he chose to leave the chamber, as he has done that many times. That is his prerogative, as it is the prerogative of other members. It was the manner he exhibited as he did leave which was booed. He appeared as a master leaving his servants; as someone flippant, sarcastic and arrogant leaving a place for which he has no use and in which he sees no purpose.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

Not only was he booed, but he was cheered by those on the other side. This is to be expected from those who have no brains to understand what is happening. One of the things I do not like to do is make reference to individuals, especially when they are not in the chamber. That is not my decision, that is the decision of the Prime Minister. I will be happy to repeat in his presence anything I say about him. One of the other indications of his disdain and dislike for parliament and democracy has been shown every time someone made reference to the imposition of closure. He applauded this with his usual simpering smirk, which is a type of smile or smirk almost offensive and embarrassing.

The Prime Minister left the chamber, went outside into the foyer and spoke with newsmen there. On a number of occasions he said he wanted to program the work of parliament. This phrase was used by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. Macdonald) so eloquently a moment ago. The concept of programming is a concept that should not apply to a parliament, but rather to a computer. My colleague behind me has referred to a robot and I am sure he was looking at some of the backbenchers when that thought came to mind.

This reference to programming means that the Prime Minister wants to be in the position following the imposition of these rules to put a bill into parliament, punch the necessary buttons, have his lackeys and bootlickers stand up and vote without any independence or feeling, following the dictates of the Prime Minister. The measure, would then come out the other end of the computer the very same as he put it in. That is programming.

This concept indicates a disregard for the views of anybody else and a disregard for debate. This reminds us of a slogan used some years ago, "No debate, just obedience." This slogan was developed by a Fascist party. I have no hesitation in referring to the fact that I fully believe the Prime Minister has great Fascist tendencies because of the manner in which he has indicated he wants to run the nation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I submit that the day the Prime Minister of this country is accused of facism is a sorry day for the country. This is a fruitless tactic on the part of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether hon. members might control the volume of their voices. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has the floor.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the best thing I can do with the point of order raised, whoever raised it, is to ignore it because he, of all people—we know there are others like him—should know how governments with a majority operate. People like the hon. member know the extent of the control that exists within the Liberal party. They know it is impossible for a Liberal backbencher to speak when he has not been given permission to do so. This is even more the case now than it was in the past. Liberal backbenchers know they are not consulted about the legislation that will be brought forward by the government. They know, more than anyone else, the degree to which they are programmed. Today I read in the *Globe and Mail* that one Liberal backbencher was complaining of the fact his role here was valueless, except as a voting machine. They have to do what they are told. They vote yes or no when they are told to do so. Where is the element of individuality in members of the government party? I have talked to members of the Liberal party. This is a confidential matter and I shall not mention their names, but there are members sitting on the other side of the house who do no agree with the imposition of closure. They reject it because it is objectionable to their sense of parliamentary democracy. They object privately, but I am sure that when the vote comes tomorrow night not one of them will have the courage to stand up and vote as his conscience dictates.

They will not follow the dictates of their conscience because they are programmed by the Prime Minister to come up with a certain answer and vote as he tells them. Where is the individuality in the Liberal party? Where is the self-respect of those hon. members who have spoken with me and said they do not like closure? We will see where their self-respect is when the vote is taken tomorrow night.

An hon. Member: Name them.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): My hon. friend says, "Name them". I tell him that I do not consider myself to be a squealer or a tattler of private conversations. My friends in the Liberal party may be used to that sort of activity, but I am not. If they have not the courage to vote as their conscience dictates tomorrow night, it will prove to the people watching us that the faces may change, the names may change, but those faces are just masks to cover the finks who are underneath. The same old gang is over there, the same old crowd. They have two policies, two faces and two things to say on every issue. They speak one way and vote another.

It is not necessary for me to disclose who these individuals are, because within their hearts they know whether what I have said applies to them. They whimper and moan privately that they did not really support the idea, but they have to support the government. We know that this sort of quiet moaning will go on, and we do not worry about it. It will continue within the government caucus with respect to the manner of operating parliament. This situation is more prevalent since the present Prime Minister assumed office. The method of operation of the government does not allow backbenchers' opinions to be expressed in debate. We do not know what happens behind the closed doors of the Liberal caucus.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I was sitting here the other day listening to some of the catcalls coming from the other side of the chamber, and it reminded me of a piece of doggerel that I believe applies right now. It is this:

> Hark—what is that we hear?
> If 'tis a voice, 'tis not too clear.
> But if 'tis a Liberal saying,
> Then only 'tis an ass that's braying.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Skeena has the floor and should be allowed to continue his speech. He may have more poetry for the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for elevating that work to the realm of poetry. I would not have put it in that class. What is important in terms of considering proposed rule 75c and the matter of closure is how the government and its caucus operates. We do not know to what pressures members on the other side are subjected in

caucus in order to get them to toe the line. This has happened in the past—

An hon. Member: Here comes Macdonald.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have just been apprised of the fact that the gauleiter has entered the chamber. Perhaps he heard me talking about what goes on in the Liberal caucus room and what pressures are brought to bear on Liberal backbenchers to make them toe the line.

Perhaps he is the guy who threatens to cut off the compaign funds if they do not vote as they are supposed to vote. Perhaps he is the fellow who tells the Liberal backbenchers that if they do not toe the line the Liberal party will run another candidate against them and kick them out at the next nominating convention, just as they did with Ralph Cowan.

An hon. Member: Where is Ralph Cowan now?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Where is the element of democracy and governmental responsibility in the Liberal party? They could not stomach Ralph Cowan's criticism, so they got rid of him. He would not toe the line; he was not subservient to the dictates of the party as are the rest of them over there. I know that every member of the Liberal party does not fall into that category. In fact, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), whom I saw earlier but who is not there now, is probably extremely happy about the events today because he was chosen, as the chairman of the committee, to act as a pawn. He will soon see his work come to fruition with the assistance of the closure motion introduced by the government house leader.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I regret also that the honourable and empty barrell from Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) is not here because at one time, and this intrigues me—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that even if hon. members take part in this debate with feeling and passion some respect for certain values should still be maintained. I am not sure that anything in particular the hon. member said is out of order, but much of it according to my humble standards—and my standards may be different from those of other hon. members—is not in accordance with my views as to how a debate should be conducted in this chamber. But again I say, that I cannot put my finger on anything that is particularly or especially out of order or that is not parliamentary. But in what the hon. member said, if this is the kind of debate we are going to have today, tomorrow, on Thursday or on other days, I wonder how long the House of Commons will survive.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with you. I wish you had some influence in the cabinet. I wish those who have brought all this about would heed your words, and would think on them overnight. I wish that last December the government house leader, who today proved that he was not very honest with parliament last December, had listened to your words then and would listen to them now. What the government house leader has done—and I say this with all respect to you and am not trying to be unparliamentary or offensive—has been to indicate how insincere he was last December with respect to rule 16A.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): He showed us today what is meant by programming because here was a seven months program to introduce an offensive rule change that would stifle debate and that would trample on the rights of the members of the opposition as well a government backbenchers, even though they may not care much about them. Everything leads up to the imposition of closure today and tomorrow in order to get another form of closure written into the rule book. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) proved to us today that these so-called negotiations to which he was referring were a sham, that he would accept nothing in the way of a compromise, and that he was talking out of both sides of his mouth.

Mr. McIlraith: You were the ones who would accept nothing.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am glad to see that the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) has finally awakened and has injected himself into this debate after having been dealt with rather unkindly by the Prime Minister at some point, in my opinion. I would think that, of all the people in the cabinet, the Solicitor General would exhibit independence. I hope he will stand up tomorrow night and vote against closure. Will you do that, George? Where is your courage now?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should address the Chair.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McIlraith: Since the hon. member spoke about me, I would like—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has the floor.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to a point of order since the hon. member referred to me. I ask him respectfully, through you Mr. Speaker, to observe some of the rules of debate in this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): We all remember that the Solicitor General used to be house leader, but he exhibited such a lack of knowledge of the rules he was demoted from that position.

One thing that has been proven today, apart from the indication of insincerity on the part of the government and fascist tendencies on the part of the Prime Minister, apart from the indication that the Prime Minister and the government have somewhat less respect now for parliament than they had even a year ago, is that it is not possible any longer to trust the President of the Privy Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It has been proven that it is also not possible to trust the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): It has been proven that it is not possible to trust members of the cabinet who are elastic enough in their principles to support a closure motion to stifle debate. Events today prove that the government reeks of political turpitude and would sacrifice any idea to impose its will upon parliament. It proved that the government is not content simply and only to control its servile backbenchers, that the Prime Minister is not happy enough simply to have a fawning and toadying group of followers. He now wants to take away any independence the opposition members may have and restrict the tenor of debate. He knows that he can call upon his minions to vote in any way in which he tells them. He asks himself: What do we need debate for if we have the assuredness of a vote? With the Prime Minister's queer approach to politics, it seems to me that a long time will elapse before we can develop again the spirit of friendliness and co-operation that is so necessary in a democracy.

By being arrogant and unfeeling, the Prime Minister has done more today to harm parliamentary democracy than even Louis St. Laurent did. By applying closure during the pipe line debate the Liberals were simply selling out part of our economy; today, they are selling our parliamentary freedom.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Let me say in closing that if the Liberals want to operate parliament by the rules of the jungle, then the only course open to us is to try to accommodate them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by the events which have taken place today.

I can remember that, some years ago, while I was listening quietly to the radio and reading the papers—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Some hon. members are preventing the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) from being heard. He is speaking from the other end of the chamber. I think his speech is as important as the others, and the Chair should be given an opportunity to hear it.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, a few years ago, while quietly listening to the radio to hear about the proceedings of the parliament of my country, or quietly reading the newspapers to find out what was happening in the House of Commons, I learned that after a few days discussion, a motion for closure had been passed. At that time, I did not expect that in 1969, I would be here as a member to witness such an event repeat itself.

I had thought, during the last week, after listening to the very serious speeches that have been made, that we would have come to an agreement of some kind, especially after listening religiously to the speech made by

the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) who expressed really peaceful and logical opinions. I had such high hopes that I told myself that, during this week, the house could adjourn, after having come to an agreement.

I did not intend to take part in the debate, letting the hon. members who are more familiar than I am with the rules discuss, on its merits, the motion of the chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on June 20 last. But, as the report recommends that the rules be amended in order to insert, immediately after Standing Order 75, the new clauses 75A, 75B and 75C, I cannot accept that and I wish to humbly express my views.

Following the motion moved by the chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) proposed the following amendment:

> That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c.

On the other hand, the government says that it needs rule 75c in order to get the legislation it introduces in parliament, adopted without delay, but that it will very seldom use it. I heartily wish it will be so.

Standing order 33 is still effective and at one time, I had thought it would have been adequate without having to resort to rule 75c.

The government seems determined to get rule 75c through so that it will be an integral part of the standing orders to use against what it calls the "small opposition parties".

Mr. Speaker, we have first been elected as members of parliament and I remember that during the first sittings of the house, several members who have been in the house for twenty years and yourself have stated on several occasions that all the members in this house have equal rights and similar privileges, no matter whether we are seated on a back or a front bench. I cannot understand therefore why a certain number of hon. members should be muzzled, only because according to the government the debates are unduly delayed.

Mr. Speaker, where are the government bills whose passage was delayed, on account of the bad faith of the opposition? I wonder. Some have suggested that such was the case at the report stage of Bill C-150, better known as the omnibus bill. Of course, consideration of this bill took more time than some small bill, and this is understandable. There were in fact several amendments to the Criminal Code in a single bill, and it was the duty of hon. members to make a thorough study of it and to suggest amendments in line with the representations made by recognized organizations and public opinion. I think it was only normal that the opposition members repeat in this house all the representations of those who were against some parts of the omnibus bill. In my opinion that is the role of any hon. member in a democratic parliament.

The opposition should not be held responsible if the work of the house is not progressing according to the wishes of the government. The responsibility lies mainly with the standing committees, which do not always operate very quickly. As long as a bill is before a committee and has not returned to the house, how can the house finally pass it?

For instance, the language bill was given first reading on October 17, 1968, but was only passed by parliament late in June. Is such a slow pace due to the opposition parties?

In my opinion, committee work could be speeded up in order that the bills referred to committees be studied without delay, and the reports brought back before the house earlier. This would surely make for a better allotment of time as far as parliament is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all members readily realized that with the number of hours spent considering various pieces of legislation, we could, I believe, with a little goodwill, expedite our business and report to the house a little more quickly, and this, in short, would enable every member who does not sit on committees to examine bills more thoroughly and to make a few suggestions if they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, how can it be explained that on the one hand, government members are boasting that a great many legislative measures have been passed during this session while on the other, it is intended to muzzle the opposition under the pretext that it delays the adoption of bills?

Mr. Speaker, we are here as members of parliament, not to destroy but to work at the development of Canada in every field, according to what we consider best for the people. I am aware that we have made an earnest contribution to the business of the house and that there is no reason for the goverment to complain to the extent of wanting to suppress freedom of speech in the house.

We know that in the course of two world wars, Canadians were called upon to sacrifice their lives and to contribute financially in the name of freedom. Many of our relatives laid down their lives during both of these wars. Had they lived, they would certainly feel unhappy to see that freedom is now jeopardized instead of being encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, if the session is protracted, it is certainly not because we used the time of the house to discuss the farming problems in eastern Canada. It is not either because we took too much time discussing the problems of the dairy industry and the government's dairy policy for 1969-70, since that item was not even put on the orders of the day by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), and yet, the situation is extremely serious. On the other hand, many problems have not been debated, although they would have interested the people of Canada. Those are certainly not the topics on which we dwelt most.

If my memory serves me well, Mr. Speaker, it was on May 24, 1967, that the farmers of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario organized a march on parliament hill. On that occasion, the farmers, respectful of law and order, came to express their grievances and ask for a little justice.

I recall that in front of the parliament buildings, TV cameras were focused on the crowd of marchers in order to broadcast the event all across Canada. The same evening, both the press and TV were reporting that the marchers had behaved extremely well because of their respect for order, and because their claims were justified and were expressed in a spirit not of destruction, but of co-operation.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Even if a few windows gave way under the pressure of the crowd and were shattered, it was not intentional. Indeed, I was there and I remember that at the door of the parliament buildings the few windows which gave way were not broken out of malice by the marchers, but gave way under the pressure of the crowd who wanted to meet the ministers and talk to them. We did not want to deprive them of their right to speak, but we wanted to give them the right to speak to us.

Mr. Speaker, the government has no call to complain about the opposition, because during this session, the days allotted to the opposition under a standing order of the house were not all used up to criticize the government, as is the opposition's right, in order to give the government more time to have the legislation it wanted to introduce in the house passed. That is co-operation, Mr. Speaker.

In my opinion, it would be advisable to try to improve the standing orders and I am sure it is in that spirit that all members wish to work, so as to adjust the standing orders to our present needs. Those rules which need to be amended, should be geared to our century of speed, but without giving up everything, especially our freedom of speech which would be taken away by a mere decision of a minister, under overly drastic standing orders.

I feel that we have made good progress by adding to rule order 75, rules 75A and 75B. Even if at the beginning, there seemed to be some disagreement about those new provisions, I think that after a thorough consideration of the merits of standing orders 75A and 75B, on the whole, all members accept them. In my opinion, we should have given rules 75A and 75B a fair trial in the next session, and if serious problems had cropped up during the trial period, the government could have applied standing order 33.

Because of the little experience I have acquired in thirty years of participation in various organizations, I can safely say that an agreement is always possible among people of good will.

Mr. Jean-Charles Bonenfant, librarian of the Quebec legislature said this:

> Any reform of parliamentary work should aim at making it more efficient and at ensuring the freedom of participants. Nothing else must remain. What is useless, or cannot really contribute to expedite our proceedings must go.

If we gave a look at that, we could find out there are traditions and practices that it would be well for us to abandon. We would thus save time, which would be to the benefit of the House of Commons.

We must all be serious-minded enough, I think, to be able to understand each other and give our country the example of a parliament working to promote the best interests of all, while always taking into account the fact that it is the public that pays the opposition, the government and the government members. I am not more eager than anybody else to spend twelve months in session, while we could do the same work, and very well, in eight months. My constituency is a very large one and during the adjournment period, it would be very useful for me, as for all other

members, to be able to meet the people. That is necessary to keep in touch with the people I represent in parliament, so as to always reflect their way of thinking and inform the government of the real problems existing in my area.

I endorse the views expressed by the leader of the N.D.P. (Mr. Douglas) as to the motion before us; he gave us a very good picture of the situation. It would be in the interest of the government to give greater consideration to the serious arguments in favour of the reference of the report to the committee, with instructions to remove section 75c, which is bound to lead us to dictatorship. Even if we do not like the word "dictatorship", we have to mention it and it could be that through our mentioning it, we shall call the attention of responsible people and of the public, in order to take a step backward if need be, precisely to avoid bringing about, without realizing it, a system that was not appreciated elsewhere and that should not be more appreciated in this country.

I shall conclude my remarks by quoting the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), who concluded his speech on July 8 with those very words:

I should like to make clear to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin)—

Who was at that time the spokesman for the Ralliement Créditiste—

—that I do not think his party should be criticized for having felt on a matter of principle that they had to take a long time in debating the omnibus Criminal Code bill.

I want to thank the President of the Privy Council for having on July 8, paid such compliment to the members of the Ralliement créditiste for he actually acknowledged that this debate had been useful and had been conducted in a fair spirit. I go on quoting his words:

—What the house has to do is to make a provision that while hon. members may feel they have to take that time they can at least be relieved of that obligation by some kind of fair allocation of time order which will enable other matters to be dealt with.

I really do not expect hon. members to support this. On the other hand, I am sure they do not expect me to favour the system whereby a minority in this house controls the business of the house.

Now, these words I find rather objectionable, for there can be no question here of small or big groups. The people concerned are always members, representing the people, here in the house. Groups may well exist outside the house, but when it comes to debating on the business of the house, members should always be considered as individuals and not as belonging to a group.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

He went on saying:

However, I trust we will have a meaningful debate in this regard, and I hope that perhaps even at this late date we may reach a genuine agreement in the house as to some effective means of programming the business—

I have been expecting this eleventh hour for the past week, and even today, and even until the last minute, I believed in the efficiency of the eleventh hour, which would have made it possible to find an alternative other than that which has been announced to us and which will take place at 1 a.m. on Thursday.

The President of the Privy Council said further, and I quote:

—bearing in mind that section 49 of the BNA Act says that ultimately the decisions of the house have to be made by a majority of voices.

At the time, he explained to us what could be the result of the eleventh hour. Today, we can better understand the meaning of the warning he was giving us when referring to section 49 of the BNA Act.

I wish, as he does, that even at this late hour, we can come to a democratic agreement as a result of a useful debate and I hope that the government will not use its majority to impose a rule which would not do honour to parliament.

If our society has to be put in a straightjacket as it develops, I do not believe that it could be described as progress. If, in order to expedite business, the members should be deprived of freedom of expression, I wonder where we are going.

It is most unfortunate that following the adoption of the official languages bill, the government should now impose upon this same parliament the extreme restriction on the use of language, which is the vehicle of the official languages.

[*English*]

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, two days ago, on July 20, man reached the moon and the spirit of mankind spontaneously soared to new heights of hope and brotherhood. Today, on July 22, the Prime Minister, aided by the government house leader, moved to throttle free speech by invoking closure. The spirits of men accustomed to free speech in a parliamentary democracy, and after all parliament is the

very hub of this democracy, sank in despair. The throb and vitality of democracy, in a world where democracy is often threatened, was never stronger than it was last Sunday. To this end, the astronauts performed a great service to the free world. Tonight in Canada the strength of democracy has dropped to its lowest ebb in history. This is a black day for this country.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I feel sorry for you this evening, Mr. Speaker. We have had some excellent Speakers in this house, but I doubt if there has been a Speaker who has had the support and unanimous goodwill that Your Honour has had. I respect Your Honour's judgment and fairness. We do not always agree with Your Honour, but there is not a member on either side who does not have affectionate regard for the manner in which Your Honour maintains decorum in this house.

It is going to be a difficult job for Your Honour in the years ahead. The goodwill, frankness and willingness to get along that has characterized this session is not going to continue. I must confess that I am emotionally disturbed tonight. This is not usual for me. I have watched the antics and listened to the remarks of some hon. members opposite. I am very concerned about the closure that has been introduced to-day. I am afraid that what has been the characteristic feature of this session is not going to be here when we return in the fall. It is going to be a drag-out struggle and I can understand why. The majority in a democracy is never stronger than when the rights of the minority are also strong. Today, the rights of the minority in this house are being jeopardized.

I can understand that in the future there will not be the same willingness and desire to get along. It will be difficult for Your Honour. This is unfortunate because at this time, when turmoil and violence seem to be the order of the day and when there is so little respect for law and order in many parts of the world, we need every bit of respect and decorum that we can get in order to hold the good ship stable. I know Your Honour understands what I am trying to say at this time.

As I watch the members on the other side of the house, I cannot help but be confused. Many of those on the other side are good friends of mine. This house produces friendships that go deeper than the general public understand. Even though we may be on opposite sides on vital and important issues, there is a bond of friendship that develops between many of us that is just as deep and real as any friendships we have in our lives.

As I look across the floor I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen). I also see the government whip, a man whose performance in this house and reputation of loyalty to this country and what it represents are beyond question. I cannot help but wonder what is going on in the minds of these men tonight. We probably will never know. There are others who were here earlier tonight. I think of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing), the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux). Some of these men have served long years in this house and I know the respect in which they hold it. I know of their own dedication to democracy.

A great deal has been said about the minority governments that existed between the years of 1963 and 1968. There were many difficult hours and days in those parliaments. Even though those of us on the opposition side sometimes disagreed bitterly with the issues before us, we always felt the former Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, had respect for this house. When you can trust a man's motives, even though you may disagree with him, there will still be bonds of friendship and confidence. There will be the stability which democracy and this house need.

I am afraid when I watch the pattern of progress of this government. I think the government house leader and I entered Parliament at the same time. When I watch the action and reaction develop in some of the members who came to this house just a year ago, having had a pattern set by some of their own leaders such as the government house leader for this type of problem we are now facing, I fear for the parliament of Canada. The expression on the face of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) this afternoon indicated his attitude. There was fear in my heart and soul because I could not see in him the respect and sense of value this institution, of which we are a part, deserves.

The other day I asked a simple question about whether the Prime Minister was going to stay in this house to take care of the ship during what I regarded as an important debate, this debate, or whether he was going to keep an announced appointment with the people in the west. He said the people in the west were more important than this "stupid

filibuster". There is no better way of describing the Prime Minister's attitude toward this institution of parliament than by that expression, "stupid filibuster".

A few minutes later, the Prime Minister imputed the motives to the opposition by describing the question period as hypocritical. This is further confirmation of the disdain and disregard in which the Prime Minister of this country holds this institution. I am concerned about this. This is why I said earlier that I regard this as a black day for Canada.

Great patriots of the governments of the past, not just common members of parliament like the majority of us, have said that the opposition in a democratic parliament is just as important and vital to the function of a parliamentary democracy as the government. There have been great prime ministers in the past such as Laurier, Mackenzie King, St. Laurent, Borden and Diefenbaker. These men have unanimously, over and again, proved in their lives of service to this house and the democracy of Canada that they regarded this institution as being something well nigh sacred.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The question which keeps coming back to my mind at this time is why the Prime Minister of this country, with his very short years of experience in this house, now seeks to bring about a basic reform of the rules and procedures of this house for which none of his predecessors ever thought of asking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: There are many statements by the Prime Minister which I could use tonight. Some of them were made during the debate which centred around rule 16A, which we discussed earlier in this session. They reveal the basic, inner attitude of the Prime Minister.

I have a few questions I should like to ask members on the other side of the house. I ask them with sincerity. I do not expect an answer directly, but I would ask them to answer these few simple questions to themselves. Why is it at this time that every single member on the opposition side is united unequivocably against this closure rule which is now being forced on us by the use of closure? In my years in this house I have never before seen the opposition in complete unanimity. Can we all be wrong?

Mr. Forrestall: They say we are.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Mr. Thompson: They say they have a mandate to govern. They insist on the right to force through future legislation which might be controversial. I want to say to the government that this minority on this side of the house, unanimously united in our own free will, represents 55 per cent of the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: There is no political pressure on any member on this side of the house to vote or take a stand on this issue. This means we are united not only in action but in spirit. If some of those on the other side who are my personal friends are telling me the truth, and I believe they are, I do not think the same situation exists over there. There was the direction which went out to the caucus and to the backbenchers a few months ago, as one of the members on the other side of the house informed his own constituents, ordering them to support government policy in committees. Tonight a telegram has gone out under the name of the Prime Minister ordering every Liberal member of parliament to come back to vote as he directs.

I want to say to the members of the government that over on this side of the house there is a strong unanimity, a firm conviction, that the issue which we are discussing at the present time is the most vital issue we have ever faced in this House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: I should also like to ask hon. members on the other side why this rule is necessary at this time. The press and *Hansard* all tell us that the record of this parliament in this session has been a good one. Yes, we were hung up for a while on the Criminal Code amendments, and I shall have a few remarks to make about that. As a whole, however, this session has been a profitable one. Furthermore, and more so than in any session in my experience in this house, there has been a remarkable degree of good will and willingness to co-operate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think that same willingness will be there in the future.

Mr. Woolliams: There is no way.

Mr. Thompson: This has been substantiated by the fact that an all party committee of the house, which took at least five years to draft

the new rules, produced a certain oneness in spirit so far as the need to reform the rules of the house was concerned. For the first time this session we operated according to those rules. Most of the things which hindered and blocked progress in the immediate past are no longer possible because the new rules have eliminated those roadblocks and hindrances. If that is so, and I am convinced it is, then why is this closure rule necessary now? I could understand it if there had been a major filibuster such as we had in respect of the pipe line debate in 1956. If this had been the case there might have been some justification for strengthening the closure authority so far as the operation of the rules of the house are concerned. But there is no such circumstance at this time.

All this closure rule, 75c, will do is force on this house a rule which, so far as the practical application and functioning of this house is concerned, is absolutely unnecessary. Perhaps there is an intention in the mind of the Prime Minister or in the will of the government to bring in seriously controversial legislation which they will be able to force through without having to answer to the public, as would be required normally under rule 33 for the application of closure. If that is the case, then we are moving from a parliamentary democracy toward a dictatorship. I do not like to use that word; it bothers me. I do not like some of the remarks which have been tossed back and forth here tonight because I do not think they are really becoming of men and women in our position. I want to say, however, that there is a genuine fear and alarm among the members of the opposition which justifies what is taking place. I did not condone, and publicly said that I did not condone, some of the things which happened and which were said to the Prime Minister when he was out west. However, by his very action and by the very flippant remarks he so often flings out, he invites that kind of action.

That is the reason what I say tonight is correct. I am not a prophet of doom, but this kind of thing is inevitable. The house leader, by his very attitude and by his very irritating offhand remarks, invites the reaction that has been evidenced here tonight. This is not just another debate. This is not a stupid filibuster. This is not hypocrisy. So far as we on this side of the house are concerned, this is a struggle toward the preservation of freedom of speech of the representatives of the people. It applies to members on the other side of the house as well because they will not always form the government.

I should like to give a bit of advice to the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) who is now making so much noise. He would be well advised to keep his mouth shut and listen a little more—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Thompson: —because his depth of experience in the house does not, in my opinion, give him the ability to understand and assess what is actually taking place.

I have another very important question which I should like to ask. Why, just two days before this house was to recess for the summer on completion of its second semester, which is the terminology which has been adopted in defining the sections of our different sessions, was it necessary for the house leader to re-introduce into this house the closure rule, 75A, 75B and 75C? Rule 75C is the equivalent of rule 16A which was so ignominously tucked in the drawer some months ago. I now understand the Prime Minister, in explaining the withdrawal of 16A to the public of Canada on a national network, said this was just a trap in order to force through some of the less agreeable rules he had in mind.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Why was it necessary to bring in closure? We were all getting along well. Was there any hold-up in respect of any piece of legislation? Was there any major piece of legislation on the order paper that had not been dealt with in so far as the obvious intent of the government was discernible? There has been none in so far as I am aware. Again, I would say that the new rules have worked well. They represent many basic improvements, although they are not yet adequately proven in practice. At this time they represent a tremendous change for the good.

May I also remind the new members of the house, particularly those on the government side, that these rules did not result from any partisan decision or politics, but were the result of years, months and hours of working together in an all party committee. A great deal of study and careful consideration was given, and finally an all party agreement was reached in respect of these rules. It is because of these rules we have been able to make good progress.

What is it that is motivating the Prime Minister, the house leader and those who are working closely with them in forcing this

issue upon us at this time? I do not know the answer but I have my own suspicions. I am sure there are members on the other side of the house who also have their own thoughts regarding this question. I am concerned about this situation.

I have another simple question. Why have none of the great Prime Ministers in the past resorted to this type of action? Why is it that in times of difficulty, and they had their problems, filibusters and disagreements—the records of this institution are full of them since its beginning in 1867—they would sooner take a longer time than they thought necessary? Why is it that they respected the opposition, whatever party was in power? I am convinced that it was because they had an appreciation of the value of parliament in a free, democratic society.

There are those who say the debate on the Criminal Code was a useless filibuster and a waste of time. I do not believe it was.

Mr. Woolliams: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) does not think so.

Mr. Thompson: No, the Minister of Justice does not think so either, but there are those who point their fingers over here to my left at the Créditistes and accuse them of a filibuster.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Thompson: I was one of those who agreed with them. I did not support the Criminal Code amendments. However, I did not agree with the length of time we were required to take to come to a final vote. To many of them I said that the opposition had gone far enough. But let me say specifically to hon. members on the other side of the house that their protest was not a filibuster. It was rather a substantial protest on behalf of those people they represent. That party had made this issue an election issue and it stood true to its commitment during the election. They carried out their responsibilities well.

To those members of the government who regard that lengthy debate as futile, I can only say it served a very useful purpose in providing a safety valve for the views of a rather large minority of people in Quebec and elsewhere. Certainly, 75c and the implementation of closure at this time is not justified in light of that debate, not by any measure. If it is, then there is 75B. The Créditistes have given their support to 75B. What then is the use, purpose, motivation or reasoning behind those who would force 75c on us at the present time? I believe that a wise government would gladly endure an occasional filibuster in a representative democracy such as we have, because such as government knows that the throttling of strongly held views leaves a residue of bitterness that can be dangerous.

It is for this reason I sympathize with you, Mr. Speaker, in the responsibilities that will be yours during the rest of this parliament. This is not going to be as pleasant a job as in the past, in spite of those occasional problems you have had with some of us. It is not only the opposition which feels this way. It seems to me that the government ought to be a little sensitive to public opinion. A majority of newspapers across this country have expressed opinions in relation to the views I have expressed. Let me read a short quotation from a recent article in the Ottawa *Citizen*. I do not always quote the Ottawa *Citizen* because it is not often regarded as a Conservative newspaper. I quoted it last night because it had something profound and relevant to say about another issue. I quote it again tonight for that same reason.

On July 4, this editorial appeared which reads:

> It is no accident that the government decided to wait until the dying hours of the present session to introduce its new closure rule—and that is what rule 75c is.

The editorial then continues:

> No parliamentarians can become as intractable, as unwilling to compromise, as those who are tired, who want to go home, but can't because they feel put upon and must stay to do battle. Much of the good work accomplished in gaining opposition co-operation to speed the work of parliament may be undone if the government keeps to its course.

I have thought that the Prime Minister and the Liberal party have tried to be sensitive to the views of students. They have watched and listened to the youth of this country, yet on July 18 I noticed a news report which stated:

> The University of Ottawa Students' Union has challenged Prime Minister Trudeau and any one of his cabinet ministers to a public debate on controversial Rule 75, which would limit debate in the House of Commons.
>
> In a letter delivered to the Prime Minister's office Thursday students council president Allan Rock decries the "apathy" of the public over the debate-limiting measure.
>
> Resolution of the debate, if the Prime Minister accepts, would be "resolved that no government has the right to arbitrarily limit debate in our nation's parliament."
>
> The students council has also mounted a country-wide campaign to collect signatures on a petition protesting the proposed rule change.

Petition forms have been sent to all Canadian university campuses and signatures can be mailed to the University of Ottawa Students Council,—

An hon. Member: They are outside right now.

Mr. Forrestall: And these are the students we were accused of bribing to do this.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give a bit of advice to hon. members on the other side of the chamber. I know they cannot always be in the house to listen to debate, and probably do not have time to read all of *Hansard*. However, they would be well advised to read *Hansard* of July 18 and the remarks of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie). The hon. member for Hillsborough is not considered to be a partisan member of parliament; in fact, he is one of the more amiable, easy to get along with members of the house. His contribution to the debate that day was profound. In order to give hon. members an idea of the kind of logic he was using I shall quote two paragraphs from the hon. member's speech. He said:

This debate is more than a discussion of the rules. It is not just a narrow discussion of a law, a regulation or a rule, but of the spirit behind it. This is what we are reflecting upon in this debate. There is more involved than the mere words of rule 75A, 75B and 75C. I think it is the essence of representative government that we are evaluating and appreciating at this time.

How very true! The hon. member went on to say:

What we, the people's representatives, are dealing with today could mark a great watershed between a parliament which, with all its imperfections, was and is a meaningful instrument of democratic action and something that is much less valuable, much less significant and much less expressive of the popular will. As I say, we are dealing today not with the routine, but rather with the essence of parliament.

What is the fundamental difference between a democracy and a dictatorship? It is the position parliament holds in the governmental process of a democratic country that keeps a country free. Democracy has preserved our way of life and made this country strong. The basic fact behind democracy is that parliament is supreme and that the executive arm, the government, must always be subservient to parliament. That is a fundamental concept of democracy. It is what Magna Carta was all about. I ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) to take note of this.

An hon. Member: He does not understand.

Mr. Thompson: In a dictatorship the government superimposes itself on parliament and makes parliament subservient to it. This is the danger we face at the present time.

I was interested the other day to read a community, weekly newspaper published in the capital area. An article in the newspaper was written by the member of parliament who is chairman of the Special Committee on Procedure and Organization. The article reads in part as follows:

Basic Problem.

"Too little time and too much talk" are the basic problems of parliament. The scandal of parliament today is that it has not been able to tackle all the important problems it should.

So said the chairman of the Special Committee on Procedure and Organization.

An hon. Member: He is right.

Mr. Thompson: That is not true, because every piece of legislation the government wanted to pass has been passed. The Prime Minister himself has admitted this.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) for interrupting him, but I wanted to invite a little more silence on the part of hon. members. However, when I rose, silence reigned. Therefore, I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting and I shall give him an extra minute after ten o'clock.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The very roots of the word "parliament" is that we, as representatives of the people, have a basic responsibility to express what we believe to be the thinking of our constituents and to give leadership through our comments here to individual, component constituencies as far as the nation is concerned. Anyone who talks the way the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) did in his article does not understand the basic purpose and value of this institution.

I am discouraged tonight because I am convinced that the action the government has taken makes this one of the dark days of our nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Thompson: I plead with backbenchers on the other side of the house who laugh—

Mr. Forrestall: With their six months' experience!

Mr. Thompson: —to reconsider their position in this respect. They would be well advised to go a little slow in their frivolous approach to this problem, because their party will not always be in government. One day they will be on this side of the house but perhaps even before that they will understand what we are talking about.

Mr. Basford: Even then we will be a more effective opposition than your party.

Mr. Thompson: I regard this debate as fundamental. It has been a privilege to take part in it. I trust that the conscience of members of parliament will begin to work as we approach the final vote which has been forced upon us by the closure action of today, and that hon. members will be very careful to make sure their convictions guide their actions when they vote. Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

COMBINES—DRUGS—PRICE FIXING BY B.C. PHARMACISTS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on June 18 I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) whether he could say when a report was expected from the Combines Investigation branch on a matter recently referred to it by the Minister of Welfare of the Province of British Columbia, namely, the legality of the $1 fee being charged welfare patients for their drug prescriptions by the British Columbia Pharmacists Society.

You suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the question might be placed on the order paper and discussed at the time of adjournment. That was over a month ago and this is my first opportunity to raise the question again. Tonight I ask whether the minister has received a report from the combines branch on the matter and, if so, what does the report say as to the legality of the $1 fee being charged welfare patients by the pharmacists society for prescriptions?

It is important and urgent to get this matter cleared up. There appears to be a cold war between the government of British Columbia and the pharmacists society, with the welfare patients in the role of helpless victims. On its side, the pharmacists society claims that the profession has the right to fix the price of its services and that the British Columbia government is not paying enough to meet those charges in respect of patients on welfare.

• (10:00 p.m.)

The society put its case succinctly in an advertisement appearing in the press in early June. The notice, under the caption "Notice to Welfare Recipients", reads:

> On April 15th, B.C. pharmacists reluctantly began charging $1 fee to partially offset their average $1.14 loss on each welfare prescription dispensed.
>
> Since that time, the B.C. government's social welfare department has done nothing toward a mutually acceptable contract agreement with pharmacists which would cause the removal of this surcharge.
>
> Welfare minister Campbell's referral of this matter to the Combines Investigation Branch has only "side stepped" the issue with no result as yet.
>
> The government has refused to meet with the pharmacists to negotiate an agreement to replace the outdated 1954 payment schedule.
>
> Pharmacists must continue unfortunately to charge the $1 fee until such time as the government will assume its proper responsibilities and reach an agreement with the pharmacists so that welfare recipients may again conveniently receive necessary medication from the pharmacy of their choice without charge.
>
> The British Columbia Professional Pharmacists Society.

Evidently this method of trying to get the government of British Columbia to the bargaining table failed to work. On June 26 we find a leading pharmacist quoted in the Vancouver *Sun* as follows:

> Pressure which B.C. pharmacists hoped to bring on the provincial government by charging $1 on prescriptions for social welfare recipients has failed to materialise.
>
> At the annual meeting of Cunningham Drug Stores Wednesday, Ralph Cunningham, chairman of the board, said that when the government had refused to do anything toward meeting the increased costs of the prescriptions, the costs had been passed on to the consumer.
>
> "We had hoped that this would result in an outcry and would force the government to do something" Cunningham said. "But people have been paying the $1 charge quite happily and there has been little discontent. What's more, there has been at least a 20 per cent drop in usage".
>
> Cunningham said the government has escaped both ways—there has been no pressure and there is less expense.

The wording of this statement is quite significant. In simple English it means that the

situation will now develop into a permanent $1 charge on welfare recipients. May I point out also that the 20 per cent drop in usage simply means in plain English that patients cannot afford now to pay that $1 charge so that the use of the drugs they need is dropping.

On its side, the provincial government appears to be quite happy to sit back and do nothing except advertise to social assistance people that the drugs listed in the drug benefit list, that is drugs available to welfare recipients at commercial drug stores, are also available at the provincial pharmacy without charge to such patients. That this does not solve the whole problem is evident. There is only one such provincial pharmacy to serve the whole province, and it is in East Vancouver. To visit it, many Vancouver residents would have to spend several hours going and coming and use two bus fares. These are simple drawbacks unless one is elderly, sick and poor, which so many of these people are. People outside Vancouver must rely on the mails. In many cases they would possibly be dead of old age before the medicine arrived, so they have to give in and pay the $1 fee to get their prescriptions filled locally.

In this age of moon landings it just is not good enough for the pharmacists' society or the provincial government or the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, which is supposed to protect consumers, to wash their hands and say: Well, the welfare recipients are now paying the shot, or going without, so why should we norry? Action is needed now. Again I ask the minister: Has he now received a report on this matter from the combines branch, and if so, has the pharmacists' society the legal right to fix this $1 charge on the prescriptions paid by welfare recipients throughout British Columbia?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I recall that the hon. member, during the adjournment debate on April 28, raised the same question of the $1 surcharge by the members of the B.C. Professional Pharmacists Society to welfare recipients for prescription drugs. At that time I assured the hon. member that I shared her concern with respect to the high cost of drugs and also proper medical care for people who need it most. I went on to remind the house of the government's five point program designed to reduce the cost of drugs to Canadians, an important feature of which was Bill C-102 which received Royal Assent on June 27.

With respect to the $1 surcharge, I also confirmed on April 28 that the minister received a letter from the Honourable Dan Campbell, Minister of Social Welfare in British Columbia, asking for a combines investigation. I also stated that the matter had been referred to the combines branch. I explained that the director then had the matter under review to ascertain whether there was reason to believe the Combines Investigation Act had been violated.

As the house is aware, it is not the practice to disclose whether formal inquiry under the act into a particular firm or industry has been undertaken. However, since that time it has become public knowledge, through sources outside our department, that a senior officer of the director's staff attended at the department of social welfare in Victoria and Vancouver early in May. In accordance with the usual practice, however, no information is given about inquiries in progress, unless and until a report is published or some other public proceeding has been taken pursuant to the act. It can be safely stated now, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is properly in hand in accordance with the provisions of the statute.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE—EGGS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT CANADIAN PRODUCER FROM IMPORTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on July 7th last, I put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) concerning a specific problem which Canadian egg producers are now facing.

That industry has become most important and provides employment to a large number of people. It is now going through an increasingly difficult period. The cost of production is going up while the cost of eggs has gone down considerably since January 1st, 1969.

According to the official figures that have been published, grade A large eggs retailed at 67.3 cents in January 1969; today their retail price is 55.7 cents. The price has gone down constantly since the beginning of the year.

Eggs are being imported in increasing quantities. For instance, almost a million dozen eggs were imported from the United States during the weeks of May 11 and May 18 alone. In the first few months in 1969, or rather during the month of December 1968, 268,400 dozens were imported. During the

month of April, 1,222,609 dozens were imported. In fact, during the first four months of 1969, 2,744,139 dozen eggs were imported.

On the other hand, we exported 140,204 dozens, which leaves a deficit of 2,603,908 dozens. The weighted average price obtained by the Canadian producer, which was 44 cents per dozen at the beginning of January 1969 has kept decreasing steadily and according to the federal statistics, it was less than 34 cents in May. The real situation is still more serious than is indicated by statistics.

Mr. Speaker, several producers have built quite modern henroosts with adequate equipment. They have invested rather large amounts and yet they see, month after month, their profits decreasing and the producer's profit margin is dwindling constantly.

I have here a comparative table on grade A eggs. In 1949, for instance, marketing costs amounted to 18.5 per cent and the producer's share to 81.5 per cent, while in 1966, marketing costs reached 30 per cent, and the producer's share was 70 per cent. It is estimated that in 1969, the situation is even worse.

A study was made to determine as exactly as possible the production cost of eggs on the farm, and this study—Cornwell—has shown that the average cost of one dozen eggs for the farmer was 35.7 cents.

So, Mr. Speaker, it may be inferred from the study I just mentioned, that the hourly salary of the main producer has been established at 67 cents for an adult, and at 57 cents for the others.

• (10:10 p.m.)

During our visit in the Maritime provinces, various briefs submitted to the committee on agriculture deal with this disastrous situation. I think it is our duty to say that in the circumstances, but for reasons I am unaware of, the committee was unable to present a report to the house.

The producers' grievances are very serious, and they are right to complain because in the province of Quebec, for example, egg producers set up cooperatives to market their product. But regardless of the efforts of the directors, Mr. Speaker, successful production planning is impossible for them if the government does not protect them from massive imports.

I explained a minute ago the nature of those imports. The profits of certain categories of businesses increase continually, while the profits in agriculture decrease steadily,

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

whether in the field of farming, poultry farming, truck gardening or dairy production.

For instance, I have here a statement published on May 12, 1969, to substantiate that there are increases in profits in areas other than agriculture.

Gulf Canada: 7 per cent increase in net profits in 1968.

For example, insofar as Bell Canada is concerned:

Operating profits have increased by 10 per cent at Bell Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if operating profits could increase at the same rate in the field of agriculture, I think that Canada would only feel better and we would be able to see that unemployment is less acute, because agriculture creates employment in related industries, for the benefit of the people.

I should like to ask the government, on behalf of those producers who rightly urge the government to take whatever steps are necessary to exert a more effective control over egg imports into Canada, to protect those businesses which really deserve its full attention, so that we may preserve a most essential industry.

The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction on imports. In his letter dated June 25, the Quebec Minister of Agriculture and Colonization informed the president of the C.F.U. that he had spoken to the federal Minister of Agriculture about the problem of egg imports into Canada during the last federal provincial conference of the Agriculture ministers held in Ottawa. The provincial Minister of Agriculture was answering the telegram of June 20 from the C.F.U., which was asking for the provincial government to make representations to the federal government, and stating he had discussed this problem with other provincial ministers.

As we said, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Bellechasse, may I tell him that I also am deeply concerned with the problem of egg production and imports in Canada.

When the question was brought up, I got together with a few members of the committee on agriculture in order to look into the matter more fully. It must be pointed out that

imports are not the only reason why the prices of eggs fluctuate. As a matter of fact, every year similar fluctuations occur depending on the time when the chickens that will become laying-hens get to the farmers.

This year, imports were equal to only 1 per cent of Canada's total egg production. On the other hand, 65 per cent of that 1 per cent was used for dehydration, for the freezing of eggs employed in food by-products which, if they were not manufactured here in Canada, would have to be imported.

For the information of the hon. member for Bellechasse, I should say that imports are slowly tapering off. In fact, during the month of June imports were as follows: first week, 9800 crates; second week: 4600 crates; third week, 3750 crates; last week, 1500 crates only. Moreover, in July, not a single dozen eggs was imported into Canada.

The department does not foresee other imports at the present time.

Besides, when prices climb a little too high, the manufacturers themselves buy in foreign countries. Production, in the province of Quebec, represents only from 65 to 70 per cent of consumption. Therefore if production is not large enough to meet the needs of consumption, we have to go elsewhere.

Since the farmers organization has now divided the province of Quebec in 16 areas, that indicates a tendency towards planning on the part of farmers—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member for Renfrew North.

[*English*]

SPORTS—TROTTING RACES—REFUSAL TO LICENCE LADY DRIVERS

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, this evening I am pleased to continue expanding the question which I asked on July 10 concerning the Canadian Trotting Association and the particular regulation which they have laid down in their by-laws.

The Canadian Trotting Association holds a federal charter and they report to the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). I wish to repeat the question I asked at that time. It is as follows:

Would he ask the minister to investigate whether or not Rule 17, section 1, of the Canadian Trotting Association rules and regulations, 1969, is contrary to the Bill of Rights, in that it declares the association's refusal to licence lady drivers for extended meets, who have not previously held such a licence—

I had a particular person in mind, Mr. Speaker. She is Miss Sandra Clouthier of R. R. 6, Pembroke, in my constituency. This young lady, who is 18 years of age, is reported to be able to handle horses as well as any man. She comes from a large family. Her father owns between 90 and 100 race horses and she participates in the training of many of those horses.

As hon. members know, many of our young people are becoming more and more interested in all kinds of sports in this country. I think it is rather obnoxious that a by-law should be laid down to prevent them from participating in racing. Nevertheless, Miss Sandra Clouthier has been refused the privilege of racing on race tracks in Canada.

I wish to read Rule 17, section 1 found on page 69 of the by-laws of the Canadian Trotting Association. The preamble reads as follows:

No driver's licence valid for extended meetings will be granted to women drivers who have not held previously such a licence valid for extended meetings.

• (10:20 p.m.)

There is no reference to fall fairs because fall fairs are not considered to be extended meetings. The fact remains that previously lady drivers were allowed to race in Canada, but recently it was decided that those ladies who held licences can renew their licences while those who have come into the field lately cannot. I feel this is a great disadvantage to young people in Canada such as Miss Clouthier. I should like to have the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) make a deep survey into this situation to find out exactly on what legal basis, and on the basis of the Bill of Rights, an association can bring in such a discriminatory bylaw.

Another item connected with this question deals with the one half per cent tax placed on parimutuel betting at our race tracks which now has been raised to one per cent. I understand that originally this tax was supposed to go to the Standard Bred Breeders Associations throughout this country to help the various breeders improve their stock. I also understand that in New York State the tax is two per cent on parimutuel betting and that it goes to the racing stables by way of subsidy to assist the owners to improve their racing stock.

The people from New York state can bring their horses over here to Ontario tracks or to Montreal tracks. They can race here and take home Canadian purses, but I am told that

Canadians must have special permission before they can take their horses into New York state to race. Of course, the additional assistance United States owners receive from the government of New York state for the purpose of improving their stock means that we stand small chance of competing with them favourably at the race tracks in that state.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to look upon this one per cent tax that is being charged on parimutuel betting in Canada as a subsidy to be allotted to an all-Canadian standard Bred Breeders Association to enable the owners in our Canadian racing stables to improve their stock. It is interesting to note that there are as many horses or stables, I am not sure which, at the moment in New York state alone as there are in the entire Dominion of Canada.

I have spoken to many standard bred breeders who are interested in this problem. They have a great deal invested in what is becoming a very popular Canadian sport. These people are interested in having an all-Canadian standard bred breeders association instead of having a Standard Bred Breeders Association along provincial lines. It is only in this way that they can become a large enough organization to compete with the stables in the United States.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins) and the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Lefebvre) called the attention of the minister to some discrimination that appeared to exist within the Canadian Trotting Association—we must not forget that this is a strictly private and independent association—the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) got in touch with the officials of that association in order to know if discrimination really existed. The minister asked that measures be taken in order to stop this as soon as possible and that an elaborate inquiry be made.

I think that the minister will receive before long an answer to his request. He will then be pleased, as well as I, to communicate to the hon. member for Renfrew North any decision that might be reached.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 23, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. FORTIN—PROTEST AGAINST STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON C.B.C. FRENCH NETWORK

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Pursuant to Standing Order 17 (2), I have given notice to the Chair of a question of privilege I intended to raise at the beginning of the sitting, following the extremely serious statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last night on the C.B.C.'s French radio and television network, that is that members of the House of Commons are rather old fogies.

He stated moreover that parliament is an antiquated institution and on the whole, his statement suggested that he feels nothing good is done by parliament and that it is only a waste of time for which the members of the opposition are responsible.

To make it worse, the injustice results from the fact that the C.B.C.'s French network was not fair enough to ask for an account from a member of the opposition to counteract the Prime Minister's gratuitous and extremely serious statements.

In my opinion it is sheer dishonesty, a breach of the members' privileges and of the right to information of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of my question of privilege.

In view of the implications of the application of closure in accordance with standing order 33, considering that closure is seldom resorted to and that most often its application is odious, considering that those who resort to it must, from a parliamentary standpoint, be held responsible for the consequences, and considering that the people of Canada have a right to get accurate information, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole matter affects the right of the people of Canada to such accurate and fair information.

Indeed, Canadians must be informed of the fact that the opposition members are doing an honest job, not as dotards or simpletons but as responsible men. I suggest that the privileges of the people are being dangerously affected. It is the responsibility of every member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition to cast some light on this subject in order to bring the Right Hon. Prime Minister to express his opinions more specifically in respect of the disparagement campaign he has undertaken against the supreme, democratic institution which is parliament.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the rights and privileges of the representatives of Canadians in the House of Commons are not properly respected by the Right Hon. Prime Minister, we will have to conclude that this is a pure and simple belittling of parliament, made deliberately and with full awareness by the government, and I suggest this situation should not be tolerated by any parliamentarian worthy of the name.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière will appreciate that, even if the question of privilege were well taken—which I doubt—I must take into account the fact that no motion has been introduced in the house. The question is not debatable and I cannot rule in the circumstances on whether or not the question of privilege was in order.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I willingly abide by your ruling which I think is sensible. But my purpose was to call the attention of the house to some unfortunate statements.

I should like however to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that every time a member of the Ralliement Créditiste rises to speak, the members on the other side, and particularly those immediately opposite, keep making a lot of noise, thus proving the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is right—

Mr. Speaker: Order. If this is any comfort to the hon. member, I can assure him that I am actually listening to him rather than to the interruption he just mentioned.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Speaker: Presenting Reports from standing and special committees. The hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: Have you called motions yet, sir?

Mr. Speaker: No. We are on the first item. The hon. member indicated he wished to rise and I thought he might want to rise on a question of privilege at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: No.

Mr. Speaker: We will get there some time perhaps, some day. Presenting reports from standing and special committees. Motions.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION TO HEAR MEMBER FOR CALGARY NORTH

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will of course see the difficulty with which the Chair is faced and which, I might say, the Chair fully expected. The President of the Privy Council yesterday gave notice of his intention to move a motion today. The hon. member for Calgary North also rises for the purpose of moving a motion.

The Chair sees two members wanting to rise at the same time. If I recognize one, I think it would be at the discretion of hon. members to make the usual motion that another hon. member be heard. In view of the fact I have received notice of a motion to be moved by the President of the Privy Council, I do not see how I could in conscience not recognize him, at the same time recognizing the right of hon. members to make a motion that another hon. member be heard rather than the President of the Privy Council.

I find it difficult to see how I can rule otherwise. It may be that hon. members might want to state their views. At this point I would recognize the President of the Privy Council.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I gave notice yesterday—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Three hon. members have risen on points of order. I recognize the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I move that the hon. member for Calgary North be now heard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before I put this motion, I understand that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also has a point of order. I assume that the President of the Privy Council is also rising on a point of order.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is with reference to Your Honour's statement that Your Honour had received notice yesterday from the President of the Privy Council and therefore felt obligated to give him precedence over the hon. member for Calgary North.

An hon. Member: It's too late now!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Someone said, "It's too late now". There is lots of time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this. If the President of the Privy Council is seeking to move on motions a motion for which notice was not required, then that notice has no effect and the two members come into the house at this point equally. That was why I had intended, if necessary, to move the same motion that was moved by the hon. member for Peace River. If, on the other hand, the minister is trying to move the motion of which he gave oral notice at five o'clock yesterday, I suggest it is out of order at this point and cannot be moved until immediately before the particular order has been called.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the Chair might be allowed to hear the hon. member for Lotbinière.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the point of order.

If, according to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) has been presented without previous notice, then as the hon. member said, both of them are on the same footing and are equally entitled to preference.

But, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the house, we have noticed that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was the first to ask to be recognized. Therefore—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Whether I was right or not, the ruling has been made at any rate. Of course, it is the responsibility of the Chair to recognize an hon. member rather than another, and such a decision is never that easy, because in theory, in practice and according to our standing orders, all are equal. The Chair has exercised its discretion in recognizing the President of the Privy Council.

As I said a few moments ago, any hon. member has the right to suggest that one of his colleagues be heard, and that is exactly the purpose of the motion of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) which has been put to the house.

[*English*]

The motion is before the house. Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. MacLean, moves that the hon. member for Calgary North be now heard. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: It is not debatable. The question has been put.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the President of the Privy Council. I cut him off a moment ago because the hon. member for Lotbinière wanted to rise on the point of order or perhaps to raise a new one. It was my intention to allow the President of the Privy Council to speak on that point of order. If he thinks it is necessary to do so I would hear him.

Division

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to make the point that the hon. member for Peace River could not make the motion he wanted to make on a point of order. In view of the fact that I have been recognized I wonder whether I could now be heard.

Mr. Speaker: I have given this point much thought. It is perhaps debatable when and at what point that kind of a motion can be made. I would agree with the minister that it cannot be made on a point of order, but the rule is that such a motion can be made at any time. The hon. member has made a motion and it would be very difficult, I think, to say that "any time" did not include the time at which the motion was made by the hon. member for Peace River. The minister will recognize that whether the motion is made now or later I assumed all along that perhaps it would be made at one point or another. It has been made and I am now putting the motion to the house. Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. MacLean, moves that the hon. member for Calgary North be now heard. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those against please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Baldwin) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Caouette
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)

Division

Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gilbert
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McKinley
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Moores
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rynard
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—79.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Clermont
Cobbe
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—125.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

FURTHER NOTICE OF IMPOSITION OF CLOSURE ON DEBATE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in the event that the motion of which I gave notice yesterday under the provisions of Standing Order 33 is not disposed of in this sitting, I hereby give notice that at the next sitting of the house, immediately before the order of the day is called for resuming the debate on the motion, "That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be concurred in", and on any amendment or amendment in amendment proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate shall not be further adjourned.

I hope it will not be necessary to prolong the proceedings that long, but I give this notice out of an abundance of caution.

An hon. Member: You're learning.

MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDER 42 (1) TO ADJOURN AT 4 P.M.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I may be recording some history. I think this is the first time in parliament an hon. member was voted not to be heard, and with Your Honour's graciousness I would recognize that.

I rise for the purpose of making a motion under Standing Order 42(1). Your Honour dealt with such a motion on Thursday, July 17 last. This motion will be similar in nature, although different in kind. At that time the

motion was moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and its purpose was set out by the hon. member as recorded at page 11316 of *Hansard*. The motion, accepted by the Chair on that occasion for debate, read as follows:

That the house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

That was the motion moved at that time. I will be moving a motion similar in kind. The precedents and reason for moving my motion were set out very clearly by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on that occasion. I will not take the time of the house to requote those precedents.

However I wish to quote again Standing Order 42(1) so there will be no misunderstanding as to the motion I am about to move, and I will set out the reasons why this motion should be entertained and put to the house to be debated. I quote:

Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the Order Paper; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the House.

Those are the important words, "adjournment of the house". I continue:

Such notice shall be laid on the Table before six o'clock p.m. or before five o'clock p.m. on a Friday, and be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of that day.

I would now like to quote from Beauchesne's fourth edition, Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 40, citation 51:

No notice is required for a motion relating to "the times of meeting or adjournment of the House." (S.O. 45). The word "times" is translated by "heures" in the French version of S.O. 41. It seems therefore that if a motion does not relate to the hour but to the day on which the House is to sit, a notice must be given. See decision given by Speaker Rhodes on May 21st, 1920.

• (3:10 p.m.)

When the House intends to sit later than 6 o'clock on Wednesday or Friday, or later than 10 o'clock on other days, a motion may be made during the sitting, and without notice having been previously given, "that the House do not adjourn at 6 (or 10) o'clock today." The reason why no notice is required is that Standing Order 41 which provides—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to interrupt him. He is discussing the point of order prior to the motion which he proposes to make is before the house. I would think it is difficult for a member to discuss whether or not a motion is in order when the Chair does not even know what the motion is going to be. I suggest to the hon. member he should put his motion and if opposition is taken to it from a procedural standpoint then he can argue that point; but he does not even know whether or not objection will be raised to it. It may be that hon. members with enthusiasm will accept his motion. I think he should put his motion and then, if necessary, we will consider the arguments he is now expressing for the guidance of the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe my anticipation was greater than it should have been.

I move:

That the house adjourn this day at 4 o'clock p.m.

I now submit copies of the motion in English and in French.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member is that this house adjourn at four o'clock. As hon. members know, when a similar motion was proposed some days ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) I indicated that I had some reservations about it. I do not feel that I am bound by the fact that it was put at that time. The matter is one of interest to all hon. members.

If there is no objection to the motion then the Chair could put it with the same reservations as expressed at the previous sitting. However, I see that the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) seems to want to rise on a point of order. Perhaps he might be allowed to do so and then we could consider the point of order of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to state my objection. I do not know whether you want me to argue the point of order or whether you want to hear the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) first.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether the President of the Privy Council wants to argue in favour or against the motion. Perhaps he might be allowed to state his point of order and if it is in opposition to the motion proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North we might hear arguments on the point of order thereafter.

Mr. Baldwin: Maybe he wants to amend it to 3.30.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it perfectly clear that I

do rise to object to the motion made by the hon. member on the procedural ground that generally speaking motions referring to business of the house are the responsibility of the leader of the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: You are the master.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I wonder if perhaps I might be heard, Mr. Speaker. There was a reference in Beauchesne's which was cited by the hon. member, but I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that rulings of a former parliament do not necessarily bind this parliament. There is also citation 88(2) of Beauchesne's which I should like to read in this regard. It is very brief:

All motions referring to the business of the House should be introduced by the Leader of the House.

There is a reference there to the Canadian House of Commons *Journals,* Volume 45, page 476. I therefore take the position that the particular motion of the hon. gentleman is in respect of the business of the house, and therefore is related to the responsibilities of the leader of the house, and that as such it should be the prerogative of this side of the house rather than of that side of the house to move it, and for that reason 48 hours' notice should be given of this particular motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, first of all may I make it clear that I support the admissibility of this motion. It is of course a motion similar to the one I made last Thursday, and of course if it is allowed I will support its substance as well.

The first point made just now by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is, I suppose, the kind of point to which we should become accustomed in this parliament. He said it is the business of the government house leader to move all motions having to do with the business of the house. May I point out to him that there is no such standing order; there is no such ruling. I have not had a chance to look up the citation in Beauchesne to which he just referred, but if it is in Commons *Journals* Volume 45 that would take it back to about 1912 or 1913, which would mean that it is a pretty old citation, bearing in mind also the difficulties we sometimes have with respect to citations in Beauchesne.

I should also point out that there have been a number of motions having to do with times of sitting and business of the house which have been made from the opposition side of the house. In this connection I would draw the attention of the house to the fact that I had the privilege of moving such a motion on December 20, 1951. I shall refer to that in another connection a little later on.

I should also like to draw to the attention of the house that prior to that—I do not have the reference on my desk—there was a report of a special committee on procedure which recommended certain changes in the hours of sitting. This was back in the late 1940's. There was some delay on the part of the government in moving that report. There was a general desire in the House of Commons to try out these new hours which the special committee on procedure had proposed. Therefore back in the late 1940's I moved, under routine proceedings, that the house experiment with these new evening hours—I think they were from 7.30 to 10.30—for the balance of that session. As a private member on the opposition side of the house I moved it under routine proceedings. It was allowed, carried, and came into effect for the balance of that session.

I am sure other examples could be given, perhaps not of many motions from the opposition side of the house being carried but of many motions being moved from this side of the house having to do with the business of the house. Although it is not quite the same thing, earlier this session there was a motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) referring a subject matter to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. Therefore I submit someone other than the government house leader, and it could be a member of the opposition, has the right to move a motion of this kind. There is no prohibition in the rules against it and there are precedents in its favour.

The second thing I have to say is that although I concede your right, Mr. Speaker, not to be bound by a ruling you made last Thursday when no point of opposition was raised, I do find it strange that the government house leader should ask Your Honour to rule differently today from the way you ruled last Thursday. I suppose this type of suggestion is something we must get used to from these people who feel they are masters of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The President of the Privy Council wishes to rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not misrepresent my position. The motion the other day was moved by him but with the consent of this side of the house. I hope he would not attempt to misrepresent our actions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, let the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) not try to misrepresent what happened in parliament and is on the record. The government supported the motion we made, and that is why it was carried, but it was not moved by the consent of the President of the Privy Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was moved on the authority of rule 42(1), and thank heavens we are not yet in a position that we can do only those things which are consented to by the President of the Privy Council.

I submit that it is at least a surprise to me and others that the President of The Privy Council would ask the Speaker of this house to make a ruling, on this difficult day, which differs from the ruling he made last Thursday. The statement he made on that occasion would indicate that the government did not mind the motion made at that time whereas they are actually opposed to it today. This casts a doubt on their position at this time.

I submit that the right to make a motion of this kind has been clearly established, and perhaps the best ruling on it in recent years, if you will consider 1951 as relatively recent, is the ruling given on December 20 of that year by Hon. Ross Macdonald, who was then our Speaker and is now the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. On that occasion I had moved a rather odd motion, I admit, but this is what I moved:

> That this day's sitting of the house continue without the usual intermission at one o'clock p.m. and at 6.15 o'clock p.m., and that the house shall not be adjourned at ten o'clock p.m. this day.

This was a motion which our friends in the opposition did not like on that particular day. They raised points of order against it. The ruling given by Mr. Speaker Macdonald, was not made immediately. In other words, he had his assistants at the table do some research so he could make a ruling which would have some substance. He did make a ruling, as recorded at page 2257 of *Hansard* for December 20, 1951, and this is what he said:

> Mr. Speaker: On the question of order, may I say that I have listened to what has been said. As has been pointed out, other motions have been made in this house respecting the hours or time of sitting without previous notice having been given.

This is the position taken by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). The quotation continues:

> In Beauchesne's second edition in citation 34, I observed the following:
>
> "No notice is required for a motion relating to 'the times of meeting or adjournment of the house', (S.O. 45)".

That is what was said, and this had to do with the motion as to the time of the adjournment of the house. This is as clear as it could be. Mr. Speaker, Ross Macdonald went on to say:

> Standing Order 45 has been referred to by a number of members. The citation goes on to say:
>
> "The word 'times' is translated by 'heures' in the French version of S.O. 45. It seems therefore that if a motion does not relate to the hour but to the day at which the house is to sit or adjourn, a notice must be given."
>
> The motion before the house does not refer to a day. It relates to the hour.

Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald was referring to my motion of December 20, 1951, but the same comment applies to the motion now before the house from the hon. member for Calgary North. It applies equally to the motion I made last Thursday afternoon. Let me continue the quotation which states:

> Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, without interrupting you, may I make a comment on that point which you have raised?
>
> Some hon. Members: No.

I wonder who they were? The quotation continues as follows:

> Mr. Drew: I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that you have touched on the very point that is in issue on this motion. It is quite clear that if this motion goes through the house will not adjourn. For that reason I submit, on the very point you made, Mr. Speaker, this motion is not tenable under the reference which has been given.
>
> Mr. Speaker: If the motion referred to days, I would agree with the leader of the opposition that it would not be in order. May I read the motion.
>
> "That this day's sitting of the house continue without the usual intermission at one o'clock p.m. and at 6.15 o'clock p.m., and that the house shall not be adjourned at ten o'clock p.m. this day."
>
> It distinctly says that this motion refers to this day only. I am satisfied that this motion refers to time and not to days. Citation 34 in Beauchesne's second edition goes on to say:
>
> "See decision given by Speaker Rhodes on May 21, 1920".

Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald goes on with the quotation in respect of this proposal regarding the proceedings of the house after saying:

I have sent for *Hansard* of that day and it has just arrived. The reference reads as follows:

"Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister):—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends are applauding, but he got ticked off that day by the Speaker. He said:

"I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday:

'That when this house adjourns on Friday, the 21st instant, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th instant'.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out, as I did yesterday, that this motion requires two days' notice and only one day's notice has been given. It can therefore only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Sir Robert Borden: I do not know whether it is applicable or not, but my attention has been directed to the language of rule 40 which says that the rule requiring notice shall not apply to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

"Mr. Speaker: I think the interpretation which has been given to the section under that rule is that it refers to the hour for meeting because in the French edition 'heure' is used. That being so, as at present advised, I am still of the opinion that two days' notice would be required to be given."

That was the Speaker's judgment in respect of Sir Robert Borden's motion in 1920, and Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald cited this decision in making a ruling in respect of the kind of a motion that could or could not be made under this rule. Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald went on to conclude by saying:

I would agree with the decision given by Mr. Speaker Rose, and that if this motion referred to days it would not be in order. But as it refers to time, I would rule that the motion is in order.

That was said by Mr. Speaker Macdonald in a ruling on December 20, 1951, in reference only to the times of sitting on that day. Mr. Speaker Macdonald, having considered a serious point of order raised, and having cited various precedents, said it was in order. He repeated himself two or three times and I do not think there is any harm in my doing so as well in order to make it clear that the reference was to the times of sittings. Because this motion referred only to the hours of sitting it was in order.

That was the basis on which I made the motion last Thursday, which was similar to this one. It dealt with only a question of hours on a particular day. That is what we have before us now, a motion that does not deal with days that parliament is sitting, but only with the hours of sitting, and for this day only. At the moment we are dealing with the motion before us which deals only with the hours of this day, and I submit therefore it is in order under the terms of Standing Order 42(1), which states:

Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the order paper; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the requirement to give 48 hours' notice does not apply when a motion relates only to the times of meeting or the times of adjournment. I think I am entitled to separate that and use the singular and say that when it relates only to the time of meeting or the time of adjournment of the house such a motion is in order under rule 42(1).

• (3:30 p.m.)

That is what this motion deals with; therefore, I submit it is in order. I would like to make the point again that this whole question is very narrow, very specific and deals with just one point; and it is a point that is clearly covered. After the motion had been put and accepted by the house last Thursday there was discussion about it. It is the kind of thing one does discuss with various people. I was involved in such discussions. Some friends of mine wondered about the motion and asked what would have happened if the house had wanted to adjourn earlier. That is no problem. The Standing Order for today is for us to adjourn at six o'clock. If we want to adjourn earlier, it can be done. We can adjourn at any time.

Under the motion we are discussing the house is being asked to adjourn at four o'clock. If we wanted to do so, we could adjourn before that. It is a little difficult now because it is 27 minutes to four, but a motion to adjourn before four o'clock would be perfectly in order. That point could be met by extra wording in the motion, but why quibble about words when we have the authority under Standing Order 42(1) that any private member may make a motion having to do with the time of adjournment?

Before resuming my seat I should like to return to one of the points the President of the Privy Council sought to make when he read citation 88(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edi-

tion. I pointed out earlier that one should not rely too much upon that citation until one had an opportunity to read what happened in 1912, the 46th year of confederation. But the words of citation 88(2) which the President of the Privy Council read were:

> All motions referring to the business of the house should be introduced by the leader of the house.

The hon. member for Calgary North is not trying to introduce a motion regarding the business of the house. We have tried on occasion to move motions that would mean our proceeding from the order we were on to some other business. That was done during the flag debate and on other occasions. Such motions have been ruled out of order on the basis of this citation which provides that only the government can say what will be dealt with in government time.

The hon. member for Calgary North is not trying to tell the government what should be taken up in government time. He is not moving a motion that has to do with the business of the house. He is not usurping that function of the government house leader. The hon. member is moving a motion that deals only with the question of the time of adjournment, and I submit that is fully provided for under Standing Order 42(1).

Under Standing Order 32 a motion of this kind is debatable. Standing Order 32(1)(p) sets out the last of a long list of motions which are debatable and contains these words:

> Such other motion, made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the house, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment.

I read Standing Order 32(1)(p) not only to make the point that this kind of motion is debatable but to show that provision is made for motions made upon routine proceedings having to do with the fixing of the time of adjournment of the house. All told, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it would take far more compelling arguments than those advanced by the President of the Privy Council to persuade Your Honour that you should rule differently today from the way you ruled last Thursday.

Last Thursday Your Honour admitted you had doubt about the motion and to-day you have claimed the right not to be bound by your decision. On that occasion the government, to our surprise, agreed to the motion and it passed, but the motion was made not by consent but on the basis of rule 42(1). I submit that the motion made today should be allowed by Your Honour on the basis of Standing Order 42(1) and the ruling given by Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald on December 20, 1951.

I submit, therefore, that the motion should be allowed and that the house should be given an opportunity to speak to the motion, if it wishes, and to take a decision on it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair is quite willing to hear hon. members, but they will realize that if the motion is not put before four o'clock it becomes a nullity and we cannot proceed further with it. We cannot be discussing at five o'clock or 4.30 a motion that the house adjourn at four o'clock. I am sure hon. members realize this. That is why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) glanced at the clock during the presentation of his argument. I thought I should bring this point to the attention of hon. members. I feel I would have to exercise my discretion and rule that the motion is a nullity if the question is not put before four o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It could be amended.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I shall be brief, Mr. Speaker. Two points were made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). The first was that the motion could be made only by the house leader. The second was that a similar motion moved last July 17 was allowed because the government consented to it. I point out that it was not a case of consent; the government merely consented to the substance of the motion. I shall put on record what took place that day. After the motion was moved Your Honour said:

> Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order in connection with the proposed motion?
>
> Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No, Mr. Speaker.
>
> Mr. Speaker: The motion has not yet been put to the house.

I believe I should place this passage on record because it seems to be the latest precedent in this regard. Your Honour continued:

> Although I may have some doubt concerning the motion, in view of the fact that it has not been questioned procedurally I will put it to the house at this time. The motion, moved by Mr.

Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre, and seconded by Mr. Winch, is that this house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) then said:

Mr. Speaker, I was rising originally to support the admissibility of the motion.

Your Honour then said:

Perhaps the hon. member might now like to speak to the motion itself.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, with those words of July 17 you ruled that it was an admissible motion and it could be moved by any member of the House of Commons, not necessarily by the government house leader. Your Honour ruled that the motion was procedurally correct and was on all fours with our Standing Orders. I submit that in view of that ruling, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) having thoroughly dealt with the precedents in this respect, this is a proper motion, it is admissible and should be put.

With regard to the argument that a motion such as this can be put only by the government house leader, I repeat that the motion does not concern the question of business. It is a motion dealing with the time of adjournment of the house. Last night we witnessed an angry parliament. If the house leaders have the opportunity to sit down and negotiate, and observe the dignity and decorum of this place, it will be worth while because Canada is watching parliament and needs parliament. Parliament will determine whether it shall live or die. The motivation behind my motion is to give the house leaders an opportunity to sit around the table and negotiate with the hope of reaching a compromise.

Had I any other motivation or reason behind the motion I would not have stood in my place and moved it. I submit that the motion is procedurally correct and is put forward on a sound basis. It is the kind of motion we can expect to raise this place to the kind of dignity Canadians expect of us, rather than having the guillotine methods which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the President of the Privy Council wish to use.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to hon. members that discussion on this point should be limited to the point of order, which is on whether the proposed motion is admissible.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

If there are no further comments I should like to express a few brief thoughts in connection with the proposed motion. I should like to state first, despite what has been suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), that no ruling whatsoever was made by the Chair when this matter first came up when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre first proposed his motion. As he knows, this is a very new type of motion; it was new to the extent of having been difficult for the Chair alone, or with the assistance of the Table officials, to accept or refuse the motion, but in view of the fact that no objection had been made to it the motion was put to the house. So I do not feel bound by anything because actually there was no ruling. A question was simply put to the house, and this is my view, one which I hold very strongly.

At the same time I still have the reservations which I had previously. I cannot agree with the argument put forth by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) because, as has been pointed out by other hon. members who took part in the debate, the precedent to which the President of the Privy Council referred did not deal precisely with the point but rather with the arrangement of the business of the house, and to that extent would not be covered by Standing Order 42(1). I think that Standing Order 42(1) is beyond the scope of the precedent which he quoted.

At the same time the very interesting precedent, quoted by the hon. members representing the opposition parties who took part in this debate, is also to some extent not quite relevant because that precedent of 1961 basically dealt with the extension of sittings and, as hon. members know, our new Standing Orders, particularly rule 6(5) (a), cover a situation which has been dealt with by the precedent. So I am not convinced either by the precedent against or by the precedent in favour.

If anything will tip the scale in favour of the motion, it is the Standing Order itself. I have great reservations about the Standing Order, whether it really means what it is purported to mean. Hon. members know that they have to refer to the French translation to interpret it the way they want. In my view it is just as legitimate to interpret the French version of our rules as the English, but it produces a new concept that hon. members have to refer to one side of the page of the Standing Order to interpret the rule one way

or another. However, I do not quarrel with this approach. There is nothing wrong with it at all, and if we go to the French text of Standing Order 42 (1) it seems clear to me that—

[*Translation*]

If a motion concerns the sitting times of the house, it can be made without previous notice and, in this sense, the motion of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) should be accepted by the Chair.

Here again, from a strictly logical point of view, I find it difficult to accept this motion, because under our parliamentary tradition and long established practice in the house, the only motion which is always in order and which is not subject to debate, is the motion demanding that the house do now adjourn. It seems that we are about to accept another kind of motion which proposes not only that the house do now adjourn, but at a fixed hour. The danger of course, is that such an application of the rules of the house may lend itself to abuses, but I am not here to make a decision on that point. I can only come to the conclusion that the only possible interpretation of the provisions of Standing Order 42 (1) is that the motion of the hon. member should be put to the house.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) moves that the house adjourn at four o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the motion, and I have an amendment to it which I should like to move as well. First may I impress as strongly as I can, in spite of the tension and in spite of the feeling in the house at this time, that the reason for asking that this motion be agreed to, the stated desire of the hon. member for Calgary North, and I state it as well, is that at this point we should not close off discussion on the question of our rules and submit it to the kind of confrontation that has been proposed.

Last Thursday when I suggested that the house adjourn so that the house leaders might meet, it looked hopeless. We were in positions that were irreconcilable, but we did make some progress at those meetings. I submit that the fact that we made some progress is now in black and white on the records of this house, in what was said yesterday. It was made clear yesterday by the four of us who had participated in these discussions that we all moved to some extent. We did not move sufficiently to reach agreement, but I submit that there was a sufficient narrowing of the difference among us that it would be worth while to have further meetings of the house leaders to see if we cannot come to some agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I realize how important it is to allow hon. members all possible freedom in the discussion which we are having this afternoon, but at the same time the hon. member knows that there is a very specific motion before the house that the house adjourn at four o'clock. I wonder whether the hon. member would not agree that he should limit his contribution to the motion itself. If the motion is used simply for the purpose of re-opening the whole debate, I think that this would not be correct procedurally. I am sure that the hon. member will limit his remarks to the very narrow confines of the motion now before the house.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Of course I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But I felt that it was my right to state as briefly as I can my reasons for supporting the proposition that the house should adjourn this afternoon. I quite agree that if we get only the two hours that would come from adjourning at four o'clock, or if we get only the smaller amount of time that would come from the amendment which I propose to move, we cannot necessarily do the job of reconciling our differences in that period of time, but it is a gesture. If we do adjourn rather than proceeding with the debate on the closure motion until one o'clock tonight, at least it is a gesture which says to all members of parliament, and to the country, that we are still trying to get somewhere. Talking and discussing is better than ending it at this point on the basis of confrontation. That is my reason for supporting this motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think this motion is just as valid as was my motion last Thursday, perhaps even more valid. Last Thursday we were at loggerheads. We had not been speaking to each other on this issue for a number of weeks. However, we got together and held meetings. I submit that if the house accepts this motion, we could again meet together and we might move sufficiently on both sides to reach an agreement instead of settling on the basis of

the majority deciding against the minority. Therefore, so as not to have this motion become a nullity, so we can reach a decision on it, I move seconded by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett):

That the motion be amended by deleting therefrom the words "four o'clock p.m." and by substituting therefor the words "five thirty o'clock p.m.".

In presenting that amendment may I repeat what I said a moment ago. I admit that it is only a half hour this side of the normal time of adjournment, but it is a gesture that calls for that half hour and further time this evening to be spent in discussing this issue rather than meeting in a head-on collision. I hope the house will accept my amendment, and then accept the motion as amended.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), seconded by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett), has moved:

That the motion be amended by deleting therefrom the words "4 o'clock p.m." and by substituting therefor the words "5.30 o'clock p.m.".

Again I am not expressing an opinion as to whether the motion is in order, but I think hon. members would want me to put the amendment at this time. Therefore I will now proceed to put the amendment. The house has heard the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment to the motion—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I heard correctly but I presume you have agreed that the amendment to the motion is in order?

Mr. McIlraith: No; His Honour specifically said he had not.

Mr. Speaker: I am prepared to put the amendment now, with the reservation that I am not too sure whether I could put the amendment to the motion if the debate on the amendment goes beyond four o'clock. We would then be getting into the realm of procedural "never-ever", and I am not sure what would happen at that point. We are close to four o'clock, and if the hon. member did not want to speak to the amendment we might escape this position if I put the question now. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre), which was negatived on the following division:

• (4:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Lambert (Bellechasse)
Alexander	Laprise
Alkenbrack	La Salle
Asselin	Lewis
Baldwin	MacEwan
Barnett	MacInnis
Beaudoin	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Bell	MacLean
Bigg	Macquarrie
Brewin	McCleave
Broadbent	McCutcheon
Burton	McGrath
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Mather
Caouette	Mazankowski
Coates	Monteith
Code	Moore
Comeau	Moores
Crouse	Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Danforth	Nesbitt
Dinsdale	Noble
Dionne	Nowlan
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Nystrom
Downey	Paproski
Fairweather	Peddle
Flemming	Peters
Forrestall	Ricard
Fortin	Ritchie
Gauthier	Rodrigue
Gilbert	Rynard
Gleave	Saltsman
Godin	Schumacher
Grills	Scott
Gundlock	Simpson
Harding	Skoberg
Harkness	Stanfield
Hees	Stewart (Marquette)
Horner	Tétrault
Howard (Skeena)	Thomas (Moncton)
Howe	Thompson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Winch
Korchinski	Woolliams
	Yewchuk—83.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand	Barrett
Anderson	Basford
Andras	Béchard

Beer	Loiselle
Benson	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Blair	MacEachen
Blouin	MacGuigan
Borrie	Mackasey
Breau	McBride
Brown	McIlraith
Buchanan	McNulty
Cadieux (Labelle)	Mahoney
Cafik	Major
Clermont	Marceau
Cobbe	Marchand (Langelier)
Corbin	Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Côté (Richelieu)	Morison
Côté (Longueuil)	Munro
Cullen	Murphy
Cyr	Noël
Danson	O'Connell
Davis	Orange
Deachman	Osler
Deakon	Otto
De Bané	Ouellet
Douglas (Assiniboia)	Pelletier
Drury	Penner
Dubé	Pepin
Éthier	Perrault
Forest	Pilon
Forget	Portelance
Foster	Pringle
Francis	Prud'homme
Gendron	Reid
Gibson	Richardson
Givens	Roberts
Goode	Rochon
Goyer	Rock
Gray	Roy (Timmins)
Groos	Roy (Laval)
Guay (St. Boniface)	Serré
Guay (Lévis)	Sharp
Guilbault	Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Haidasz	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Hogarth	Stafford
Honey	Stanbury
Hopkins	Stewart (Cochrane)
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)	Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
Hymmen	St. Pierre
Isabelle	Sullivan
Jamieson	Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Jerome	Tolmie
Kaplan	Trudeau
Kierans	Trudel
Lachance	Turner (London East)
Laflamme	Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Laing	Wahn
Lang	Walker
Langlois	Watson
Laniel	Weatherhead
Leblanc (Laurier)	Whelan
Lefebvre	Whiting
Legault	Yanakis—128.
Lessard (LaSalle)	
Lind	

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

As I indicated to hon. members earlier, it would not be in order to put the main motion to the house since it has now, by the lapse of time, become a nullity.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is one point I would ask you to consider. If a motion is a nullity, how can there be an amendment to a motion that is a nullity?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should not have put the motion. However, the division on the amendment was called before four o'clock. That was my purpose in suggesting to hon. members that if they wanted to vote on the amendment to the motion the question should be put before four o'clock.

MOTION TO ADJOURN HOUSE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the motion I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members Standing Order 25. I have extremely serious doubts about the motion being put at this time. If hon. members feel that the motion can be put, I would like to hear their arguments, but to my mind it is clear that Standing Order 25, and particularly if we read in this instance the English text, makes this motion inadmissible. The Standing Order reads as follows:

> A motion to adjourn, unless otherwise prohibited in these standing orders, shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

In view of this I have some doubts as to whether the motion can be moved. Because of these reservations I would be pleased to hear hon. members on the point, but I think that it is only if there were an intermediate proceeding that the motion could be put.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour pointed out, this motion is made under the provisions of Standing Order 25, which reads as follows:

> A motion to adjourn, unless otherwise prohibited in these standing orders, shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

I submit that the effect of the motion now put by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) is not the same as the effect of either of the propositions put before the house earlier. The first proposition was that the house adjourn at four o'clock, the second proposition was that the house adjourn at 5.30 p.m. It is now 5.02 p.m., which is a different time.

Since this motion is not debatable its disposition will not be long delayed and we would adjourn very soon.

• (5:00 p.m.)

May I draw Your Honour's attention to citation 99 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, to be found at pages 88 and 89.

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I do not know why hon. members opposite cry "dispense" so often. I realize they want to dispense with debate, but let us not dispense with the rules. Citation 99 (2) provides:

> The term "intermediate proceeding" used in Standing Order 25—

That is the one that has just been read, which provides that a motion to adjourn cannot be to the same effect as a previous motion unless there be some intermediate proceeding.

> —means a proceeding that can properly be entered on the *Journals*. The true test is that if any parliamentary proceeding takes place, the second motion is regular, and the clerk ought to enter the proceedings to show that the motion in question is regular. It is usual to alternate motions for adjournment of House and debate when a question is under consideration.

That citation clearly provides that although you cannot move the same motion immediately afterwards, motions that are different in effect can be moved; they can be alternated. I do not want to say it, but the process could go on all day, though it could not take place at this point because there is no debate to adjourn. If we were in the course of a debate then it would be in order, according to this citation, for someone to get the floor and move the adjournment of the debate. Then following that another member could move the adjournment of the house, and then another the adjournment of the debate, and so on.

Hon. members on the other side of the house found it amusing when I indicated that the time was 5.02. It is now 5.05, not four o'clock or 5.30. However, my point is that there is a difference in character and in nature between the two motions. The motion now before the house is the standard motion to adjourn, which by our rules is always in order. The other motion was a substantive motion fixing the time of debate at some time other than the point at which the motion was being debated. That motion is provided for under the terms of Standing Order 32(1) (p); it is debatable and it was debated.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

The present motion is moved under Standing Order 32(2) which provides:

> All other motions, unless otherwise provided in these standing orders, shall be decided without debate or amendment.

On that ground too this motion is a different kettle of fish. Both motions include the word "adjourn" in their terms, but the other motion is a substantive one that seeks to fix a point in time for a debate. The present motion is not debatable and calls for the adjournment of the house at this very moment.

In the same way, Mr. Speaker, we sometimes move motions to amend our rules, to change our hours of sitting, motions that are debatable but are different from motions to adjourn. Motions are sometimes moved—there is one on *Votes and Proceedings* now that we will come to in a few days—in connection with adjourning for the summer recess. There have frequently been occasions when this kind of motion has been moved, namely, that when the house adjourns this day it shall stand adjourned until a certain specified time. That is a substantive motion that is debatable, yet immediately after it is put and debated there is a motion moved that the house do now adjourn. As I say, both motions include the word "adjourn", but they are allowed to be moved one after the other because they are different.

I submit that the motion now being made falls within Standing Order 25. It is the ordinary motion to adjourn that is in order at any time. The motion presented by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was a motion moved pursuant to Standing Order 42(1) and can be moved without notice. It is debatable under Standing Order 32(1)(p) and is a substantive motion. If the motion had carried as I sought to amend it, then the house would not adjourn now but would continue in session until 5.30.

I submit that this present motion is a different proposition. It is a basic, fundamental rule in every deliberative assembly that a motion to adjourn can be moved at any time. A motion to adjourn the house has not yet been moved during the course of today's sitting, and therefore I submit that the right of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) to move the motion at this time is unchallengeable and that the motion should be put to the house.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member does not contend that there

has been an intermediate proceeding here as referred to in citation 99 (2), and therefore I will not argue that point. I should emphasize that the important words of Standing Order 25 are the words "to the same effect". The hon. member used several different turns of phrase; he said that this was not the same motion, that there was no question of its being of the same nature or character. If any of those words had appeared in the Standing Order, then obviously they would apply to the motion.

I submit the Standing Order is clear in this regard. It refers to a motion that shall have the same result as a former motion, regardless of the words used to frame the former. For this reason I suggest that what we have here are two motions which, in effect, are identical, are back to back, and therefore in accordance with the terms of Standing Order 25 the second motion cannot be received.

May I just deal with the hon. member's reference to the last sentence of citation 99(2). He appears to be saying that there is no difference in effect between a motion to adjourn the house and a motion to adjourn the debate I think Your Honour will recognize that there is a very great difference between the two. If the house adjourns no further business can be conducted. If the debate adjourns then there can be further business on that day, though not on the same question. For these reasons I suggest the motion is out of order.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all reply to the argument of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) that the wording of the rule is that no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place. I admit that if this motion is put and carried, then at 5.30 it might have the same result in that the house will adjourn. But I submit the motion is not to the same effect.

It has been clearly pointed out that the previous motion moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was a motion to adjourn under Standing Order 42 (1) for a specific purpose, a purpose he explained, namely to try to negotiate further on the question of the closure rule. A time was set at which the house would adjourn so that the house leaders could get together.

The motion now before the house falls under Standing Order 25, which provides that a motion to adjourn may be made at any time. The one big difference, Mr. Speaker, is this. Your Honour was obliged to rule the main motion out of order because we had passed the hour of four o'clock. That ruling has been accepted and no second motion was put. But, Mr. Speaker, that same argument cannot apply to this particular motion because it may be put at any time at all. I think this shows the essential difference between the two motions. It is close to 5.30 p.m. and the house would adjourn if either motion were carried. I submit, nevertheless, that it cannot be said that this motion is "to the same effect", and I therefore think that it should be allowed.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, you have heard submissions by those who are professed experts on the rules. I do not profess to be an expert on the rules but I suggest to Your Honour that rule 25 which we are considering here is very clear in its meaning. The question that faces you is one of extreme simplicity, namely, the simple English meaning of the words, "to the same effect".

I submit it is quite impossible to say that the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—or indeed, if it comes to that, the motion introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which Your Honour ruled out of order—and the motion we are presently considering can be said to be "to the same effect". If anyone were to say they are to the same effect I submit he would be torturing the English language. How can a motion calling on the house to adjourn at five o'clock, or 5.30, be to the same effect as a motion calling on the house to adjourn forthwith, or immediately upon the taking of the vote?

I do not think I need to elaborate my argument by saying that we are not dealing with the same *corpus*. The two motions are not to the same effect and I do not see why we should have this great difficulty on this particular point. The wording of the rule is crystal clear.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one point in addition to those which have been made by my colleagues on this side of the house. I am sorry that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government house leader seem to have been driven from the chamber by my rising to speak.

An hon. Member: King Canute is not here.

Mr. McCleave: I submit that we should not really be saying that we are substituting one motion for another, that we are substituting a motion which asks the house to adjourn at an unspecified time for a previous motion saying that the house shall adjourn at a specified time. The argument that no second motion "to the same effect" shall be put is really irrelevant because there never was a motion in the first place which was decided by this chamber. I think this is an important distinction we ought to consider.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise with great trepidation, having hoped that the irrefutable logic of the sweetly reasoned arguments of hon. gentlemen who preceded me would be accepted. In any event, one might argue that there ought to be unanimous willingness on the part of all concerned to accept the motion on the basis that the mood of the house at this time is not conducive to the transacting of further business. However, since I do not see the dawning light of acceptance in the eyes of hon. members opposite I hope to make my argument to Your Honour in support of the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I do so in the hope that this on-the-job training for the government which is now taking place may be of benefit.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: My authorities for making this argument are the two standing orders in question. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) moved a motion and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre moved an amendment to it under Standing Order 42(1). But the motion the house is now considering is the one that has been moved under Standing Order 25. That in itself is significant. If the original motion of the hon. and learned member for Calgary North which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre sought to amend had been accepted, it would have meant that debate would have continued until a specified time. That was the intent of the motion.

The hon. member's reason for moving the motion is plain. It frequently happens that if there is debate up to a specified time the house may arrive at a conclusion with respect to the matter then before it. Bearing that in mind the hon. member moved that the house do adjourn at a certain time. If the motion had been accepted right away it would have meant that we could have further debated the issues before the house for approximately another hour and a half.

The motion proposed by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) is the type that comes before the house most frequently, and I think Your Honour is entitled to take judicial notice of the way motions are moved under Standing Order 25. For instance, when the house is discussing clauses of a bill and a motion has been put to adjourn debate on one clause, another similar motion following that one cannot be properly put until there has been an intermediate stage. Normally that means that we must move from one clause to the discussion of another clause. With great deference I suggest that a neat distinction must be drawn between the two motions which have come before the house. Consequently, the motion offered by the hon. member for Lotbinière should be put. In any event I point out to Your Honour that we have had an intermediary stage and it might well meet the convenience of the house if the motion were put at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether there is much point in having hon. members pursue the matter further. Of course, I have indicated to hon. members that I do not wish to restrict their rights to speak on this important point of order. Is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) rising on the point of order?

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to draw to your attention, and this is quite apart from any reference to intermediate proceedings and entries in the *Journals*, that a distinction must be drawn between any motion which asks the house to adjourn at a specified time, say at 5.30, and the motion proposed by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). Since Standing Order 42(1) says that a motion under the Standing Order to adjourn the house may be put, it is necessary to establish a time for adjournment when one moves a motion under that Standing Order because there are references in it to times of meeting and adjournment of the house. With respect, Standing Order 25 makes no reference to the time of adjournment. It merely speaks of a motion to adjourn.

I submit that because there is this distinction, Standing Order 42(1) in effect saying that there must be a specified time for adjournment and Standing Order 25 saying that you do not need a specified time, Your Honour can make the determination that the two motions the house is considering are different and not "to the same effect", and

that it is permissible for us to proceed to deal with the matter.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank first of all all the hon. members who expressed their views on the acceptability of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is this: My purpose in proposing this motion was very specific and very different from the previous motions. That is why—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order. I remind the hon. member that even if the motions for adjournment of the house submitted earlier this afternoon were subject to debate, this one is not. Accordingly, the hon. member is not allowed to state an argument similar to those put forward when the previous amendments were put before the house.

What we have to consider at the present time is solely and exclusively a question of procedure, that is, whether the motion is acceptable or not. I am ready to listen to the hon. member in the hope that the arguments he may submit in support of his motion, of the acceptability of the motion, will add something new to the arguments submitted so far.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My object in rising after having submitted this motion was first of all to thank the hon. members for their kindness in supporting this motion and—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am ready to co-operate with the hon. members in so far as they are ready to co-operate with me. I took the liberty of calling the hon. member to order and he absolutely cannot disregard the Chair's warning and repeat what he had started to say a moment ago. He must, and I made this suggestion with all due respect and in a spirit of friendship restrict his remarks to the debate on procedure.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am quite ready to accept your ruling with the utmost humility. I was just coming to the point.

When I moved this motion, I did it according to the Beauchesne's citation, as pointed out previously and I would like to make it clear that it was my firm intention to move a motion totally different from the preceding motions, according to sub-clause (20) of Beauchesne's citation.

Such was the aim of my comments.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg). I hope if he has an argument to submit it will be different from those which have already been presented for the guidance of the Chair because at the moment some of them are not very helpful.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): I accede to the wish of the Chair, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his generous co-operation.

I have listened to hon. members who have taken part in this procedural debate. As I indicated when the motion was moved some few minutes ago by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), I had serious doubts about the motion. Hon. members have argued this motion should be receivable under the provisions of Standing Order 25 without the necessity of an intermediate proceeding because it is not the same motion. Certainly I recognize the motion to adjourn at 5.30 p.m. is not the same as a simple motion to adjourn the house, but I pointed out in the first instance that this is not what the Standing Order states.

The Standing Order is to the effect that:

> —no second motion to the same effect shall be made until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

I doubt that it is the intention of the Standing Order to allow a second motion of adjournment after one has already been considered without an intermediate proceeding, even though the first motion had a condition attached to it.

I realize that this is perhaps new law. I was tempted to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and other members who took part in the procedural debate, whether they had a precedent to support their views. I am sure they did not because I do not think we have ever had this type of motion following a motion of the kind moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

All this having been said, I would say that the real test we now have to apply is: had the first motion carried, would this motion be in order? The answer is obvious. To my mind the only conclusion I can reach is that the

second motion is to the same effect as the first. It can be in order later on in our proceedings provided there is an intermediate proceeding as required by the provisions of Standing Order 25.

[*Translation*]

As I interpret standing order 25, I must come to the conclusion that this motion to adjourn cannot be put to the house at this time until some intermediate proceeding has taken place.

I must therefore regretfully refuse to put to the house the motion made by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

APPOINTMENTS, PORTFOLIOS AND REMUNERATION OF CERTAIN MINISTERS

Question No. 2,247—**Mr. Burton:**

1. On what date or dates were the Honourable Robert K. Andras, the Honourable Otto E. Lang and the Honourable James A. Richardson appointed to the Cabinet?

2. What ministerial appointments has each held since entering the Cabinet and on what date was each such appointment made?

3. What has been the annual rate of remuneration for salary and motor car allowance for each since first appointed, together with effective dates?

4. What is the annual rate of remuneration for salary and motor car allowance for other Cabinet Ministers except the Prime Minister?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. July 6, 1968.

2. On July 6, 1968, all three were appointed Ministers Without Portfolio. Subsequently, on May 5, 1969, the Hon. James A. Richardson was appointed Minister of Supply and Services.

3 and 4. In addition to their sessional indemnity and expense allowance as a member of parliament, or of the Senate, cabinet ministers with Portfolio receive $15,000 plus $2,000 motor car allowance; ministers without portfolio receive $7,500 plus $2,000 motor car allowance.

STUDENT ATTITUDES TO INDIAN PROBLEMS

Question No. 2,466—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development received a report on student attitudes to Indian problems pursuant to a service contract dated August 9, 1968?

2. What monies were paid, and to whom, with respect to work done in the preparation of the said report whether or not it is completed?

3. By what name is the said report known?

4. To whom has the report been distributed?

5. Is the government prepared to make the said report available to (a) all Indian Bands and (b) Parliament and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): A search of the records has been made and no contract dated August 9, 1968 for the purpose of studying student attitudes to Indian problems was found.

REDUCTION OF TOLLS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS FREEWAY, CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE

Question No. 2,506—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. To the federal government's knowledge, does the Government of Quebec intend to reduce the tolls on the eastern townships freeway starting July 1, 1969?

2. Does the federal government intend to reduce the tolls on the Champlain Bridge and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. This is a matter which concerns the Government of the Province of Quebec and the Department of Transport has no knowledge of any such intention.

2. The federal government does not feel that a change in the present policy is warranted at this time.

PUBLIC RELATIONS, NATIONAL DEFENCE

Question No. 2,531—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence): 1. The Department of National Defence does not have a public relations staff but a Directorate of Information Services provides information on the activities of the Department, the Canadian Armed Forces, Defence Research Board and Canada Emergency Measures Organization. Thirty eight military officers with a support staff of nine military non-commissioned officers and 25 civilians serve the Directorate of Information Services at ten locations in

Canada, No. 1 Air Division and 4th Mechanized Brigade Group in Germany, the U.N. Contingent in Cyprus, and with the integrated Canada-United States NORAD information offices at North Bay and Colorado Springs.

2. Costs prior to 1965-66 were not maintained in a manner which would permit this data to be readily identified. Since 1965 the total cost of information services is as follows: 1965-66, $462,519.68; 1966-67, $674,707.31; 1967-68, $821,316.17; 1968-69, $872,176.00.

C.B.C. PROGRAMS FEATURING JOHN LENNON, YOKO ONO

Question No. 2,570—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. During the period May 20 to June 10, 1969 what radio programs of the CBC featured John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono?

2. During the same period what television programs of the CBC featured John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono?

3. In respect of part 1, which programs were local and which were network?

4. In respect of part 2, which programs were local and which were network?

5. How much money was paid to (a) John Lennon (b) Yoko Ono in respect of the programs mentioned in parts 1 and 2?

6. What were the total production costs of the programs mentioned in parts 1 and 2?

7. Did the CBC contribute in any financial way by the payment of performance fees or otherwise to the trip by John Lennon and Yoko Ono from Montreal to Ottawa during the period mentioned?

8. What was the immigration status in Canada of John Lennon and Yoko Ono during the period in question?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. "As It Happens", May 26 (network); "Radio Free Friday", May 30 (network); "Sunday Supplement", June 1 (network); "Action Set", May 31; June 7 (network).

2. "The Way It Is", June 1 & 8 (network); "The Day It Is", May 27 (local).

3. See part 1.

4. See part 2.

5. None.

6. All production costs fell within the normal budgets for these programs. No accurate breakdown is available.

7. No.

8. John Lennon and his wife, Yoko Ono, were in Canada as applicants for admission. As Mr. Lennon's ability to meet admission requirements was in doubt, a special inquiry under the Immigration Act was ordered to determine whether he should be admitted. Pending the hearing of this inquiry, the original date of which was adjourned at Mr. Lennon's request so that he could obtain legal counsel, Mr. Lennon was conditionally released from immigration custody. Before the rescheduled inquiry was held, Mr. Lennon withdrew his application and left Canada voluntarily.

UNION OF ONTARIO INDIANS—DENIAL OF STATUS AS CHARITABLE ORGANIZATION

Question No. 2,589—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Was the Union of Ontario Indians denied status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes on the grounds that its objects include activities "promoting a closer relationship and better understanding" which has been held not to be a charitable purpose?

2. Have other organizations been denied status as charitable organizations for income tax purposes for the same or similar reasons and, if so, which organizations?

3. Was the Union of Ontario Indians denied status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes on the grounds that it included among its purposes "obtaining a political object by agitating for legislation", which has been held not to be a charitable purpose?

4. Have other organizations been denied status as charitable organizations for income tax purposes for the same or similar reasons and, if so, which organizations?

5. Is the Minister considering changes in the standards for determining status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes, to accommodate organizations like the Union of Ontario Indians?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes.

2. This information is not available.

3. Yes.

4. This information is not available.

5. No. This would require an amendment to the law and would be a matter of government policy.

AIRPORTS—LOCATION OF INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS

Question No. 2,598—**Mr. McCleave:**

What are the locations of the 29 airports to receive the instrument landing systems announced by the Minister of Transport June 30?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): It is currently planned to install

the new instrument landing system equipment during the next five years at the following locations: Vancouver International (4 systems); Calgary International (2 systems); Winnipeg International; Toronto International (3 systems); Montreal International (2 systems); Halifax International; Torbay; Edmonton International; Charlottetown; North Bay; Quebec; New Montreal Airport (2 systems); Deer Lake or Stephenville; Peace River; Fort Chimo; Resolute; Mont Joli; Ottawa International; Waterloo-Wellington; Kelowna; Kamloops.

CANADIAN FORCES—FLIGHT PAY WITHOUT FLIGHT DUTY

Question No. 2,600—**Mr. Robinson:**

Are any of the 689 officers, formerly RCAF Aircrew, without university degrees and serving in the Canadian Forces, not on flying duty *per se*, receiving flying pay and, if so, how many and how much do they each receive according to rank?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence): Without conducting a survey of the personnel records of all serving aircrew officers, sorting out the files of the 689 officers concerned, and examining their pay records, it is not possible to provide an accurate answer to this question, and the necessary expert staff are not available to undertake the large amount of work which would be required to gather this information.

However, the following table reflects the standard rates of pay for officers of the Canadian Armed Forces, as well as the rates for pilots and navigators.

Monthly Rates (in dollars)

Rank	Basic	Incentive Pay Category										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
LGEN	2307											
MGEN	2110											
BGEN	1787	1837	1887									
COL	1501	1546	1591									
COL (PILOT)	1579	1624	1669									
COL (NAVIGATOR)	1579	1624	1669									
LCOL	1199	1239	1279	1319	1359							
LCOL (PILOT)	1355	1395	1435	1475	1515							
LCOL (NAVIGATOR)	1277	1317	1357	1397	1437							
MAJ	996	1028	1060	1092	1124	1156						
MAJ (PILOT)	1182	1214	1246	1278	1310	1342						
MAJ (NAVIGATOR)	1074	1106	1138	1170	1202	1234						
CAPT	779	804	829	854	879	904	929					
CAPT (PILOT)	944	974	1014	1054	1094	1134	1174	1194	1214			
CAPT (NAVIGATOR)	855	915	955	995	1035	1075	1115	1135	1155			
LT (CFR)	720	740	760	780	800							
LT (CFR) (PILOT)	890	915	950	985	1020							
LT (CFR) (NAVIGATOR)	827	852	887	922	957							
LT	593	608	623	638	653	668	683	698	713	728	743	758
LT (PILOT)	746	761	776	816	831	846	861	876	891	906	921	
LT (NAVIGATOR)	724	739	754	794	809	824	839	854	869			

Your attention is directed to the reply to part 2 of your question 1554, page 6388 of *Hansard*, dated March 10, 1969.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD—DOCUMENTARY ON POSTAL SERVICES

Question No. 2,601—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has the National Film Board recently made a documentary about Canada's postal services?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

2. If so, at what cost?

3. Under what circumstances will the film be shown?

4. Did the Post Office Department or the Department of Communications pay part or all of the costs and, if so, how much?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Film Board as follows: 1. Yes—a documentary "A Tale of

Mail", a history of the postal services in Canada, was produced in 1967 by the National Film Board.

2. $53,872.

3. Distribution in Canada: theatrically by Columbia Pictures of Canada Ltd.; non-theatrically by the National Film Board. Distribution Abroad: efforts are being made to distribute theatrically and on television; non-theatrical distribution is being conducted by Canadian Embassies and posts abroad.

4. The Post Office Department paid $45,413. The National Film Board paid $8,459.

PORTUGUESE USE OF MILITARY SUPPLIES OBTAINED FROM NATO COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,603—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Is the Government of Canada aware of reports that military supplies obtained through NATO agreements are being used by the Portugese in Mozambique and Angola?

2. If so, have steps been taken to confirm or deny these reports?

3. If the truth of these reports has been established, has the Government of Canada made representations to Portugal or the other NATO allies that are supplying the Portugese with arms?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The Canadian Government is not aware that military supplies obtained through NATO agreements are being used by the Portuguese authorities in Mozambique and Angola.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

EFFECT OF POSTAL RATE INCREASE ON "CANADIAN BOY"

Question No. 2,605—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Has the Post Office Department been advised that as a result of the recent increase in postal rates the magazine *Canadian Boy* has had to reduce the weight of its publication to two ounces in order to qualify for a postal rate somewhat higher than that prevailing heretofore?

2. Have protests or representations been received concerning the consequent reduction in the size of this magazine?

3. From what individuals or organizations were such protests or representations received?

4. What was the nature of the reply given to such representations?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. No.

2. No.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

AVERAGE INCREASE IN SALARY, DEPARTMENT HEADS AND DEPUTIES

Question No. 2,609—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the average increase in salaries given to department heads and deputies in the civil service in each of the years 1960-69 inclusive?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): The average increase in salaries of deputy ministers in the federal public service in each of the years 1960-69 inclusive was as follows: 1960, Nil; 1961, 5 per cent; 1962, Nil; 1963, 13 per cent; 1964, Nil; 1965, 8 per cent; 1966, Nil; 1967, 6.5 per cent; 1968, Nil; 1969, Nil (as of 18 July, 1969).

BANKING—PREFERENCE TO SMALL BORROWERS

Question No. 2,610—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is the federal government considering a policy to regulate banking so that small borrowers receive preference over large borrowers when credit is limited?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No. The federal government does not have statutory power to regulate banking so that small borrowers would receive preference over large borrowers. Moreover I consider any such legal regulation would be impractical. However, in his appearance before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, the Governor of the Bank of Canada indicated that he has expressed the view to the executives of the banks that they should have special regard for borrowers in less prosperous areas of the country and for small businesses that do not have alternative sources of credit.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS TO PUBLISHERS

Question No. 2,614—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Is it the policy of the federal government to ensure that grants given by the Canada Council to publishers are used for the purpose of producing specific publications?

2. What are the terms of reference for awarding Canada Council grants for the production of periodicals?

Questions

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. The Canada Council is constituted by the federal government as an independent organization responsible for setting its own policies within the terms of the Canada Council Act. I am informed by the Canada Council that the Council ensures that its grants to publishers are used for the purpose of producing specific publications.

2. Answered in reply to Question No. 2,526 —Mr. Yewchuk—June 13.

SUPERSONIC PLANES—PLACING OF ORDER BY AIR CANADA

Question No. 2,616—**Mr. Skoberg:**

Was Air Canada allowed to place an order for six Boeing Supersonic planes in view of the answer given by the Minister of Transport to Question No. 2,289, to the effect that no approval has been given to the flying or landing of Supersonic planes in Canada by the Department of Transport or the Canadian Transport Commissioners and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Management of Air Canada advises as follows: No airline, including Air Canada, has placed an order for Boeing Supersonic aircraft. As in the case of approximately 25 airlines of the world, for competitive reasons, Air Canada has reserved Line Positions for the Boeing Supersonic transport.

GRANT TO SEMINAR ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,617—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How much money was given by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to the organizers of the Seminar on Economic Development held at Chicoutimi, Quebec on March 21, 1969?

2. Is it the policy of the federal government to offer similar assistance to other groups wishing to hold regional development seminars?

3. If so, what are the conditions under which such assistance will be offered?

4. To what person must applications for such assistance be made?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. A grant of $3,400 (50 per cent of cost of organization and presentation of Seminar) was made to the Université de Québec, Chicoutimi.

2. Yes.

3. Such assistance will be offered under the following conditions: (a) The subject matter must be related to regional economic development; (b) The cost of the project must be shared equally between the sponsoring organization and the federal government; (c) Grants are given, in most cases, in designated areas, where there is a specific need to review and study the problems of regional economic development.

4. ADM Incentives, Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

CALGARY AIRPORT—TENDERS FOR OPERATION OF PARKING FACILITIES

Question No. 2,626—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. In what publications and on what dates were tenders called for the operation of parking facilities at the Calgary International Airport?

2. What are the full names and addresses of the Directors and principal shareholders of the company chosen for the operation of parking facilities at the Calgary International Airport?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. (a) October 8 and 9, 1968, in *The Albertan,* Calgary; *The Calgary Herald,* Calgary; *Edmonton Journal,* Edmonton; *Daily Commercial News and Building Records,* Toronto; (b) On October 8 only in the *Journal of Commerce,* Vancouver, B.C.

2. Walter Crinchic, President, 55 Isabella St., Toronto 5, Ont. John G. Crinchic, Vice-President, 59 Laurelwood Crescent, Toronto, Ont. Mrs. Dorothy Crinchic, Secretary, 55 Isabella St., Toronto 5, Ont.

SCIENTIFIC REPORTS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Question No. 2,639—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources provide scientific and semi-technical reports for the public at nominal cost and, if not, for what reason and is the information contained in these scientific and semi-technical reports available to the public generally and, if so, in what manner is it made available?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Yes. Scientific, technical and semi-technical reports of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources are available to the public at nominal cost through the Queen's Printer and the Queen's Printer Book Shops across Canada.

REFERENCE OF INDIAN RIGHTS TO TRIBUNAL

Question No. 2,643—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Will the aboriginal and treaty rights of Canadian Indians be referred to an impartial tribunal

following the study and recommendations of the government appointed Commissioner and, if so, what will be the nature of the tribunal?

2. Will the Indians be given legal assistance in presenting their case and, if so, what will be the nature of this legal assistance?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. The course of action to be followed in this matter will not be decided upon until after the report of the Commissioner has been received.

2. In view of the reply to Part 1, it follows that the question as to legal assistance cannot be answered at this time. It will be noted, however, that it is expected the Commissioner will be authorized to recommend appropriate support to the National Indian Committee on Indian Rights and Treaties, so that it may conduct research on the Indians' behalf concurrently with the Commissioner's inquiry, as indicated in the recent statement on Indian Policy.

FARM CREDIT ACT—LOANS TO INDIANS

Question No. 2,646—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Since the Farm Credit Act was amended to provide loans to Indian people on Reserve lands (a) how many loans have been made and in what amounts (b) what Reservations have received the loans and in what amounts?

2. How many applications for loans are pending and from what Reservations?

3. How many applications for loans have been refused and from what Reservations?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): The Farm Credit Corporation advises as follows: 1. (a) As at July 15, 1969, nineteen loans amounting to $385,000 had been approved for Indians farming on Reserves; (b) The Indians for whom these loans had been approved resided on the following Reserves: Neskainlith, Sahhaltkum, Okanagan, Cookes Ferry, Cowness, Pepeekesis, Muskeg, Mistawasis, Assiniboine, Chitek Lake, Rousseau River, Valley River, Long Plain, Peguis, Lake St. Martin, Tyendinaga. The amount of the loans approved on each Reserve has not been shown because on some Reserves only one farmer applied for the loan. To list the amount of loan to a Reserve in such instances would disclose the amount borrowed by the individual farmer and such information, whether on or off Reserves, is treated as confidential by the Corporation.

2. As at July 15, 1969, a total of six applications were pending from Indians farming on the following Reserves: Ashnole, Cumberland, Piapot, Peguis, Lake St. Martin, Fairford.

3. One application had been declined during the same period.

*HIGHWAYS THROUGH NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,647—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is the government continuing the program of reconstruction and upgrading of major highways through Canada's National Parks?

2. Since 1958, what highway projects have been carried out under the program (a) at what cost (b) and, in what parks?

3. When will reconstruction of No. 10 Highway through Riding Mountain National Park be carried out under this program?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the reply to that question is rather long and I wonder whether the house would agree to having it printed in *Hansard* and taken as read.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Forest: 1. Yes.

2. Projects	Park
Banff Windermere	Banff National Park
Banff Jasper	Banff and Jasper National Parks
Jasper Edmonton	Jasper National Park
Jasper Yellowhead	Jasper National Park
Maligne Lake	Jasper National Park
Chief Mountain	Waterton Lakes National Park
Waskesiu	Prince Albert National Park
Cabot Trail	Cape Breton Highlands National Park
Gulf Shore	P.E.I. National Park
Elk Island	Elk Island National Park
Eastport Road	Terra Nova National Park
David Thompson	Banff National Park

(a) Total cost since 1958—$60,890,000.

(b) Answered in preceding project listing.

3. Detailed planning for replacement of the Highway will commence in 1970. Construction could start within 3 years.

Questions

EMPLOYMENT, BONNE BAY PARK AREA

Question No. 2,656—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How many are employed by the federal government in the proposed Bonne Bay Park area in Western Newfoundland?

2. What type of work is being carried out?

3. Are the boundaries for the proposed area defined and is there agreement on these boundaries between the federal and provincial governments?

4. When is it expected that the land for the proposed park will be handed over to the federal government?

5. Has an agreement been signed between the federal and provincial governments for the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay Park?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1 and 2. The Department of Public Works now has one man on the site preparing for camps and facilities. On July 28, D.P.W. will have eleven more men doing road location work.

Consultants have been retained by the National and Historic Parks Branch, Planning Division, to work on the preparation of the Park Master Plan.

3. A boundary proposal has been made to the Province of Newfoundland and is under consideration by them.

4. A start in handing over the land should be made within one year of an agreement, and all land should be in federal hands within 2 to 3 years of the agreement.

5. No.

DEVELOPMENT PLANS, DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Question No. 2,666—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion presently negotiating co-operative development plans with any provinces similar to that recently concluded with Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, which provinces?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1 and 2. No. Discussions are underway with Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Manitoba for the purpose of formulating economic development plans for each province on the basis of the new programs of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. It is expected that similar discussions will commence shortly with other provinces.

[Mr. Forest.]

OTTO BORG—COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE

Question No. 2,673—**Mr. Latulippe:**

Did the government take into account federal legislation on capital punishment when a police officer or prison guard has been murdered in arriving at its decision of commutation in the Borg case?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): The government acted under federal legislation in arriving at its decision of commutation in the Borg case.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION ACT—ADDITION OF CORN AND POTATOES

Question No. 2,686—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider adding (a) corn (b) potatoes, as mandatory commodities under the Agricultural Stabilization Act?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No revision is presently contemplated for the Agricultural Stabilization Act.

Under Section 2 (1) (a) (ii) of the Act as it exists, Corn and Potatoes can quite adequately be looked after as designated commodities.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

EASING OF REGIONAL TARIFF STRUCTURES

Question No. 2,416—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Have representations been received on the easing of regional tariff structures between the Atlantic Provinces and the Eastern Seaboard of the United States as well as the United Kingdom with regard to the improvement of markets and the development of trade between those areas?

2. What has been the response of the government in this regard?

3. Is serious consideration being given to the implementation of that program or what steps are being taken to increase trade between these areas?

Return tabled.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, since we are likely to be here for a few days, I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would try to do something about question No. 1,917 which has been on the order paper for three and a half months and question No. 2,171 which has been on the order paper for two and a half months? Will the minister look into this?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, if possible I will be glad to report to the hon. member about these matters on Monday.

Mr. Dinsdale: I rise in regard to the same matter. I refer to starred question No. 2,108 which has been on the order paper since April 25. As Your Honour knows, starred questions are supposed to be promptly answered.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will add that to the list, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burton: On Monday last, Mr. Speaker, I inquired regarding question 2,349 which was asked on May 23. I think it is quite important that this information be made available at the earliest possible date. I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would make further inquiries regarding this question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We answered one of the two questions the hon. member inquired about and we hope to have the answer to the other available shortly.

Mr. Coates: I have a simple matter, Mr. Speaker. Question No. 2,153 asks for the name and salary of the Chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board. I do not think we should have to wait almost three months for a reply to that question.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 223, 265 and 267 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motion No. 223, 265 and 267 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PORT ALBERNI, B.C.—CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF

Motion No. 223—**Mr. Barnett:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence received by the Minister of Transport and/or the Department, since August 22, 1967, and of replies thereto on the subject-matter of the construction of additional deep-sea wharf and berthing facilities in Port Alberni Harbour.

Motion agreed to.

EXCEEDING OF MAXIMUM HOURS OF WORK

Motion No. 265—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Order-in-Council passed during June 1969, amending the Fair Wages and Hours of Labour Regulations to allow the maximum hours of work to be exceeded in emergency situations which would otherwise constitute a violation of the Act.

Motion agreed to.

ARMED FORCES PENSION STRUCTURE

Motion No. 267—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence and reports between the Minister of National Defence and the Naval Officer's Association of Canada in relation to updating the Armed Forces pension structure.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 209 and 210 are acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the governmental authorities concerned.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motion Nos. 209 and 210 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH B.C. HYDRO RESPECTING INDIAN PROPERTY

Motion No. 209—**Mr. Rose:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, agreements or arrangements between the Government of Canada and the British Columbia Hydro & Power Authority regarding the acquisition of certain property and/or rights from the Tsawwassen Indian Band of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH TSAWWASSEN INDIANS RESPECTING PROPERTY ACQUISITION

Motion No. 210—**Mr. Rose:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, agreements or arrangements between the Government of Canada and the Tsawwassen Indian Band of British Columbia regarding the acquisition of its property and/or rights to the British Columbia Hydro & Power Authority.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Nystrom: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I should like to inquire of the President of the Privy Council when I may expect an answer to notice of motion 255

which I presented on July 16. The reason I ask is that this is an important document which I think would be of interest to all hon. members who are concerned about the situation in Nigeria and Biafra at this time. When may we expect the production of these papers?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will have to make inquiries, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask either the President of the Privy Council or the President of the Treasury Board whether something might be done to expedite the handling of my notice of motion for production of papers No. 189, having to do with a study of the pensions of retired public servants?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would be glad to have a presidential conference about this. If I might, I should like to point out to the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville that his motion was called last week and transferred for debate.

An hon. Member: He was absent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was notified by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Fisheries that notices of motions numbered 197 and 200 would be called. I wonder when they intend to bring these forward.

Mr. Whelan: Next sitting of the house, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—REPLY TO CANADIAN OFFER TO PROVIDE NEUTRAL RELIEF FLIGHT OBSERVERS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has he as yet received any word from the government of Nigeria with regard to the proposal made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on behalf of the government of Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had no direct response from the Nigerian government but our proposal, among others, is being considered by the various bodies which are supplying relief and is being discussed. It seems to be a useful contribution to the discussions going on, but unfortunately this has not resulted in the kind of action we want.

Mr. Stanfield: Does the Secretary of State for External Affairs have in mind any further initiative on the part of Canada to bring matters to a successful conclusion in view of the reported imminence of the continuation of mass starvation? I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs the other day whether he had any further measures in mind and his short answer was yes. Would he elaborate on what measures he proposes to take?

Mr. Sharp: We are engaged in discussion with all bodies concerned such as the United States government, the British government, the Nigerian government, the Red Cross and the other various agencies in a search for some means to break the deadlock.

Mr. Stanfield: Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs considered asking the government of Great Britain directly whether it would consider imposing an arms embargo unless some satisfactory solution is worked out promptly to bring relief in both Nigeria and Biafra?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman would agree that the cessation of arms shipments by all sides is what is most desirable.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether any further consideration has been given to the suggestion that Canada use its good offices and initiative in getting the parties together, along with the representatives of the International Red Cross and the church organizations, in order to discuss this matter in view of the tremendous emergency?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Very careful and continuus discussion is going on in respect of this matter but as yet we have not been able to get agreement among the parties most concerned as to the most useful way to pursue this initiative.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

A.B.M. SYSTEM—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON CANADIAN POLICY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, might I direct this question to the Prime Minister. It is based on his statement in the house on March 19 as recorded at page 6853 of *Hansard*. With reference to the A.B.M. system he said:

> If, Mr. Speaker, after receiving all the information, we are led to the view that the A.B.M. system constitutes escalation and is conducive to greater peril for mankind, then we shall condemn it. We shall tell the United States that we disapprove. If, on the other hand, we are convinced that the A.B.M. system is necessary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat. May I point out to the hon. member that I do not think it is in order for him to read at length from a previous answer.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I think I have read sufficient of the statement to indicate that the Prime Minister said to the house on March 19 that when the government had studied the whole question of the A.B.M. system he would be prepared to make a statement either condemning the construction of the Safeguard System or indicating that he would co-operate in its construction. In view of the fact that the majority leader in the United States Senate has now stated—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I realize how important the matter is about which the hon. member is asking a question, but the length of the question should not be based on its importance. I would hope that the hon. member might ask the question.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I shall certainly obey your ruling, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the majority leader of the United States Senate has said that a decision will probably be made in the next few days in favour of the construction of the Safeguard System, has the Prime Minister made any decision concerning whether or not the Canadian government is going to condemn its construction, and what will the policy of the Canadian government be in respect of this matter which affects all mankind?

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

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister can give the house and the country any idea when the government will reach a decision? This matter has been hanging fire since March. It is one of the many matters which have been hanging fire. When does the government intend to make a decision or does it intend to make a decision at all?

Mr. Trudeau: The government is anxious to get back on the job and consider this and other items which are before it. As soon as we get back to the roster system we may have a bit more time to do so.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister is anxious to get back to the job, will he explain to the house why he is waiting until October 22 to resume the session, particularly if there is so much work to be done?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the question as asked by the hon. member is in order. In any event I suggest the question is argumentative.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF BOX CARS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there are only a few more days remaining in the present crop year and many elevator points are holding orders for box cars which are not available, will the Minister of Transport take it upon himself to call the management of the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. to see whether or not within the remaining few days it may be possible to direct extra box cars to these points in order to pick up the bulk of the five-bushel quota that is in effect? I have in mind the reluctance of the Canadian Wheat Board in this regard.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with officials of both railway companies. They are aware of this situation. I will make sure that they know the situation as reflected by the hon. member's question. I will also consult with the Ministers of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Agriculture with the hope of making these extra facilities available.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

B.C. TELEPHONE STRIKE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a question asked of the Minister of Labour last Monday suggesting the possibility that he might have something to relate to the house today in respect of the British Columbia telephone dispute. Is he in fact able to report any change in the situation as of today?

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, instructions went out today to the mediator in British Columbia to take the necessary steps to resume talks between the B.C. Telephone Company and its employees. I hope I will be in a position to make a report on Friday, or certainly next week.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR INCREASED GRANTS FOR FACILITIES TO TRAIN DOCTORS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the need for construction plans to be initiated before parliament reconvenes in the fall, I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether there will be an increase next year in the funds so urgently needed which are available to the provinces? Will funds be made available in order that they may construct additional training facilities to provide the doctors that are sorely needed as a result of medicare?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the amount which is available during this current year will be available during the next current year.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker I should like to ask the minister whether the government is going to keep on putting the cart before the horse?

CRIMINAL CODE

BINGO AND RAFFLE PROVISIONS—NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the concern of veterans, religious and fraternal organizations regarding the bingo and raffle provisions of the amended Criminal Code, will he tell the house about his negotiations with the provinces and any progress or results

[Mr. Jamieson.]

which have been achieved regarding this and ancillary legislation?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubts about the urgency of the matter but perhaps—

Mr. Winch: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this question is urgent to the veterans, religious and fraternal organizations.

Mr. Speaker: On the assurance of the hon. member that the question is of urgency, perhaps I should invite the minister to answer.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, officials of my department have been conducting negotiations with the Deputy Attorneys General of the provinces. As hon. members know, the provinces will have the responsibility for licensing and certain other provisions under the new Criminal Code. I expect to make an announcement soon regarding the duties involved in respect of which the proclamation of the new amendments will be made. The basis of the new provisions will be proclaimed soon, but I expect that in some cases there may be a delay in regard to provisions involving provincial administration.

INFORMATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister table today the secret report on the proposed new information services?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): There is no secret report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Speaker, are we to assume that the Prime Minister has decided it is not in the interests of parliament to make the report available?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should think that question is argumentative.

POLLUTION

PRINCE RUPERT—COLUMBIA CELLULOSE PULP MILL

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry of which I have given notice. On two previous occasions breaks in the hot liquor discharge from the Columbia Cellulose pulp mill at Prince Rupert have caused considerable damage to fish stocks in the strait. With these incidents in mind, will the minister provide members of the house with information as to what the

government is doing about the destructive and urgent pollution problem caused by a new break in that vicinity?

Mr. Speaker: Again I have some doubts about the hon. member's question, but in view of the fact I have been generous this afternoon perhaps I should allow the minister to reply.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we have officers in that area studying the various and serious pollution problems which exist there. The company is doing its utmost to correct the problem. However, if fish are killed we will have to take action under our present legislation.

Mr. Borrie: Mr. Speaker, will the minister also advise what steps will be taken by the government to prevent a recurrence of such a break?

Mr. Davis: I cannot say more on that point, Mr. Speaker. Until the problem is resolved or another incident occurs, which is unlikely, I hesitate to answer in further detail.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, would the minister also relate to the house what steps his government is taking to implement pollution control measures at Prince George?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we are keeping the situation there under close surveillance.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REASON FOR REDUCED ADVERTISING RATES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he will inform the house during this part of the session why advertising rates charged by the C.B.C. have fallen in spite of rising production costs, and will he tell us particularly whether the government is in effect subsidizing companies who advertise with the C.B.C.?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suspect that this question might be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might rephrase the question by putting it on a policy basis, thus making it acceptable. Is it the policy of the C.B.C. to offer advertising rates below cost as a means of undercutting private broadcasters who cannot depend on subsidies?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Even with the change I believe that the latter question should be placed on the order paper. If there is some urgency the hon. member can give notice of his intention to debate the matter at the adjournment hour.

Mr. Dinsdale: I assure you it is of interest to the private broadcasting industry.

NATIONAL REVENUE

SYSTEM OF COLLECTING DUTIES FROM CAR MANUFACTURERS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue whether he can assure the house, in view of the heavy taxes that Canadians have to pay, that the Department of National Revenue has improved its system of collecting duties from car manufacturers who import from the United States under the United States-Canada car pact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to appear to be too restrictive in respect of questions, but it appears to me this is a question of a very general nature. If there is urgency, and the hon. member seems to be anxious to tell me that there is, perhaps it would be easier to allow the minister to reply.

Mr. Hales: I would like to ask whether any changes have been made in the system of collecting these duties.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker, but I will verify this.

TRADE

WHEAT—DIFFERENCE IN PRICES TO JAPAN

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, because of the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce I wonder whether the Prime Minister or the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt would endeavour to answer this question. In view of the fact that the Japanese food agency is reported to have stated that the United States and Canada have maintained a different scale of prices for wheat for Japan than for European countries, could we be informed whether the Canadian Wheat Board is no longer following the practice of establishing a uniform offering price to all markets?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister of that department hopes to be in the house tomorrow to answer questions. Perhaps the hon. member would ask his question then.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

DISCUSSIONS WITH AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY REGARDING 1970 PRICES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the prices and incomes commission had discussion and negotiation with the automobile industry regarding the retail price of 1970 models which are soon to be on the market?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that they have had any discussion on that matter. They do not keep me informed on a daily basis. It might be premature for them to do so until the 1970 models are on the market. The concern of the hon. member's question supports a great number of letters my department has received protesting the high price of cars. I am sure the house would like the car manufacturers to take these protests into account in arriving at prices for the 1970 models.

TAXATION

CAPITAL GAINS—INCLUSION IN WHITE PAPER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask our happy-looking Minister of Finance a question arising out of his recent statement about the scope of the white paper on taxation. He said the white paper would be devoted to the question of personal and corporate income taxes. Does this mean the question of a capital gains tax is not to be considered in the white paper?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my hon. friend will have to wait and see.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can we rely upon the minister's statement being complete when he said the white paper would be concerned only with corporate and personal income taxes? Is that an accurate statement of what the minister has in mind?

Mr. Benson: I think it is fairly close, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Gleave.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT WHY HOUSE NOT RESUMING UNTIL OCTOBER

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the pressing need for legislation on taxation and other matters, will the Prime Minister consider making a statement on motions tomorrow as to why the government intends the house to reconvene in October rather than September as most of us thought was to be the case?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the hon. member's party will ever be in a position to know this, but part of the business of government is prepared and transacted outside parliament.

LABOUR RELATIONS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—POSSIBILITY OF LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Glad to see you back, Jack.

Mr. Horner: Can the minister inform the house what steps are being taken to avert a strike of Pacific coast longshoremen? The threat of a strike is severely hampering the sale of wheat because it may not be possible to deliver wheat in August. The longshoremen's contract will expire July 31.

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the latest information, which I received at noon today, is that talks between the unions and management will be resuming this Friday, since they have had an opportunity for a week to review the report of the conciliation board which was handed down the other day. My information does not indicate that there has been any loss of wheat sales because of the threat of a strike. If the hon. member has anything more tangible to offer in this respect, I will be glad to turn it over to the appropriate minister for investigation.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's answer, would he discuss this matter with the chairman of the Wheat Board and with the

Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who stated there had been a loss of sales of wheat to Japan? Is the minister doing anything to assist the negotiations which are taking place and to make sure there will be no disruption of shipping in Vancouver harbour, with the consequent loss of further wheat sales?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions been in communication with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce about the possibility of the port of Vancouver closing down during the month of August. This is always a possibility, as I have said on many occasions, in the type of democratic country that we have. Under our democratic system strikes are legal. Despite our best efforts there is a possibility that management may not feel it appropriate to pay the unions the sum of money for which they are asking and, conversely, the unions may not be prepared to accept the offer of management. In a democratic country, such as Canada, there is no legislation that prevents anybody exercising their legal right to go on strike or to lock out when and if they have complied with the law as it now exists. In the meantime we are doing everything possible to afford the maximum degree of mediation between both parties to avert such a catastrophe.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Labour use his good offices to persuade the President of the Privy Council, to continue his negotiations with the opposition?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I have found in the few cases in which I have been involved that it requires good will on both sides to bring about a settlement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mackasey: The only evidence of good will that I have seen has been on this side of the house and not the other. The problem of the President of the Privy Council is to find good will on the part of all parties in attempting to negotiate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DRUGS

ALLEGED INEFFECTIVENESS OF PRESCRIPTION PRODUCT

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On July 10 the hon. member for Winnipeg North asked the minister whether he would make a statement on motions regarding the study released on July 9, prepared for the United States Food and Drug Directorate, which showed that large numbers of prescription drugs are ineffective. The minister replied that he would be glad to consider making a statement. Is he now prepared to make such a statement and, if not, can he indicate on which day it will be made?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I still have that matter under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL REVENUE

INGERSOLL, ONT.—STEPS TO RESTORE CUSTOMS SERVICES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. About two weeks ago I asked the minister a question concerning the closing of the customs port of Ingersoll, Ontario, and the matter was discussed during an adjournment debate. At that time the minister indicated he would be able to reply a little later. Is he now in a position to do so?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I gave a reply in the adjournment debate. I said I was waiting for more information from the hon. member, which I have received. However, I am not in a position to give a final answer now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to advise hon. members that it is six o'clock. I apologize to hon. members who have important questions to ask. We may have a longer question period tomorrow. For the moment I have to inform the house that it being six o'clock I do now leave the chair. This house stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 24, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD (SKEENA)—CONFLICT IN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given Your Honour notice. The question of privilege relates to answers given to two questions, one of which was provided yesterday, and a return made pursuant to an order passed by the house in February relating to certain correspondence between the government and a public relations firm.

I should like first to refer to the order for return for correspondence between the public relations firm of Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Limited and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. There is within that return, under the heading of "Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Indian Affairs Branch", a payment voucher which says in part:

> Pay to: Glendon College Forum
> Cheque to be sent to:
> J. Shelton, Room 790 by August 28, 1968.

The payment voucher also contains the following information:

> Date: 22/8/68
> Interim payment to prepare a report on student attitudes to Indian problems as per attached service contract dated 9/8/68.
> Amount: $500.

One of the questions I asked was whether the report referred to had been completed. I was not sure whether the date "9/8/68" referred to September 8, 1968 or August 9, 1968, so in the earlier instance I inquired with respect to September 8, 1968. The answer I received was:

> This department has no knowledge of any service contract dated September 8, 1968 or any subsequent report on student attitudes to Indian problems pursuant to that service contract.

Thinking I had the wrong date, I rephrased the question and asked again for the information relating to the report on student attitudes to Indian problems pursuant to a service contract dated August 9, 1968. This appeared to be the correct date of the payment voucher. The answer I received was:

> A search of the records has been made and no contract dated August 9, 1968 for the purpose of studying student attitudes to Indian problems was found.

In consequence of the two answers provided, each of which said there was no contract or none could be found, and the information provided in the order for return in the form of a photostatic copy of a payment voucher in the amount of $500 to prepare a report on student attitudes to Indian problems as per attached service contract dated that day, I submit that the privileges of the house have been offended and incorrect information has been provided to the house in the answers to the questions or the answer provided in the order for return. Therefore I believe there is a question of privilege. I wish to make a motion. It is perhaps not written as legibly as Your Honour would like it to be but I move, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

> That the answers to question Nos. 2,096 and 2,466, and a return provided pursuant to the motion for production of papers No. 77, and the apparent conflict between these documents be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena gave the Chair notice of the question of privilege he proposes to bring to the attention of the house at this time. I have given the matter consideration and I have listened with interest to the submissions of the hon. member.

On past occasions we have had the suggestion made to the house that this type of complaint against answers given by ministers legitimately gives rise to a question of privilege. I have very serious doubts about this. Hon. members know there are many precedents to indicate that the failure of a minister or a department to give a reply, or the fact that a member may not be satisfied with an answer given by a minister, or that a member may think that two answers are contradictory, or that the answer given is contrary to the facts, does not do so. All this in my estimation is debatable, and in any event, according to our precedents, has never been a legitimate foundation for questions of privilege and, as far as I can judge such cases have never been

the subject of referrals to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I hesitate to suggest that to the hon. member. I think perhaps his remedy at this time might be to ask the question a third time or seek to have the matter debated. Perhaps there might be some way to clarify the difficulty. But I do not think it would be in order to send this kind of question to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It seems to me there should be a more effective way to clear up the very legitimate and evident difficulties which the hon. member has met. Perhaps we could have a conversation about it within the next few days and we might be able to find some way in which the matter might be cleared up other than by having this grievance referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

• (2:10 p.m.)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

FURTHER NOTICE OF IMPOSITION OF CLOSURE ON DEBATE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, once again, out of an abundance of caution and in the event the motion of which I gave notice yesterday under the provisions of Standing Order 33 is not disposed of in this sitting, I hereby give notice that at the next sitting of the house, immediately before the order of the day is called for resuming the debate on the motion "that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be concurred in", and on any amendment or amendment in amendment proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate not be further adjourned.

Mr. Baldwin: Why do you not put it on a perpetual basis?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

WATER RESOURCES

CANADA-ONTARIO JOINT COMMITTEE—EXTENSION TO OTHER PROVINCES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for water and energy. Arising from the press release issued by the minister today stating that the governments of Canada and Ontario have agreed to establish a joint committee of senior officials to advise on water management policies and operations including pollution, will the minister advise whether similar arrangements are being made with other provinces and, if not, why not?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Yes, Mr. Speaker. It will be our hope to work out similar arrangements with other provinces. I met with the minister from Ontario yesterday and we agreed that this kind of committee should allow for a maximum amount of information and consultation, to ensure that efficient use is made of all our resources in such fields as pollution.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, has the minister entered into any definite discussions with other provinces or has he any firm intentions of entering into such discussions across the country on any regular basis?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to enter into such discussions as soon as reasonably possible in this connection and expressly in connection with the proposed new Canada Water Act.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the minister say whether this joint committee is supposed to consider a proposal for diversion of waters in the James Bay area into the Great Lakes?

Mr. Lang: It certainly is not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say at this time whether the study of water diversion from north-western Ontario into Lake Superior and the six progress reports which have followed from that study will be tabled in the house before we recess?

Mr. Lang: I cannot give a definite answer to that question. We are looking into the possibility of the publication of these documents but a firm decision has not yet been reached.

POLLUTION

WATER—SIGNING OF AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio whether he can announce a date in respect of the signing of an agreement between the federal government and the province of British Columbia on a water pollution policy?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I cannot announce the date, but I can inform the house that satisfactory progress is being made.

TRADE

WHEAT—DIFFERENCE IN PRICES TO JAPAN

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce related to one I asked yesterday. In view of reports that the Japanese are refusing to buy Canadian wheat because they claim there is an adverse price differential between the prices quoted to Japan and those quoted to European markets, will the minister say whether wheat is being offered at different price levels in the European and Japanese markets?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, debate on this subject is normal. It is customary for buyers to believe that the price is too high. It is very seldom that sellers believe that the price is too high. Consultation is taking place between the Canadian Wheat Board and the Japanese buyers in respect of this matter. If the hon. member wants a copy of the price schedule of the Wheat Board I will be glad to give him one.

Mr. Gleave: Is the Wheat Board departing from its standard practice of quoting each day the same prices to customers?

Mr. Pepin: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Is it true that one of the reasons Japan is not placing orders for Canadian wheat is the expected labour trouble in the Vancouver area next month?

Mr. Pepin: There is no strike yet but businesses are usually affected by even the threat of a strike like this one.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF REDUCED WHEAT BOARD PRICES

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether the recent decrease in the quoted prices of our wheat has put Canada in competition with the United States, particularly in view of the large decrease of 12 cents a bushel they put into effect?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): That is debatable, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the drop in wheat prices during the last week, and in view of the fact that the International Grains Arrangement is regarded by the government as representing a commitment on the part of Canada, is the government now considering implementing a price guarantee to farmers based on the International Grains Arrangement minimum price?

Mr. Pepin: The answer is the same as on previous occasions, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL PARKS

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO SECOND PARK

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Could he tell us whether negotiations have begun with the Quebec government with regard to the establishment of a second national park in the Eastern Townships, more exactly in the Mauricie?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I met with Mr. Loubier yesterday and we discussed the matter of national parks in the province of Quebec in general.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC EXCHANGE WITH THE VATICAN

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister said a few months ago that he was particularly enthusiastic about the idea of establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican. We have heard no news about this matter during the intervening months. Is it his intention to proceed with this plan, or has it been abandoned.

An hon. Member: Do you want to go, George?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure this is an urgent matter, but perhaps the right hon. Prime Minister might want to reply.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No final decision has been taken as yet in this regard, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: Is the reason for the delay that the Vatican is showing the same kind of enthusiasm to being recognized by Canada as Red China is at the present time?

COMBINES

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN C.N.-C.P. TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTER SCIENCES CANADA LIMITED

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether he and his department are considering an investigation in respect of the relationship between C.N.-C.P. Telecommunications and Computer Sciences Canada Limited to ascertain whether it is in the nature of a monopoly and whether continued development may not be in the best interests of the Canadian public?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member is inviting a very general statement which normally should be made on motions. I will not suggest to the hon. member that his question be placed on the order paper because this would show a lack of confidence in respect of what may happen in the next few days. But I do not think the question can be asked at this time.

FINANCE

INCREASE IN FINANCE COMPANY INTEREST RATES—EXTENSION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday the minister said he was pleased that the banks had so far resisted any temptation to raise interest rates. Three of the major finance companies yesterday raised their interest rates, which may have an effect upon the decision of the banks. Has the minister had conversation with the near-banks with respect to holding interest rates at their present level, as he has with the chartered banks?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister intend to hold conversations with the major finance companies in view of the fact that if they continue to raise interest rates it will create problems for the minister in holding the level of interest rates generally?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I hope that lenders will contain their interest rates as much as possible. My hon. friend knows there is a difference in the relationship between the government of Canada and the banks, and the government of Canada and finance companies which may be incorporated provincially or federally.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a final supplementary question? I am, of course, aware of the situation the minister has outlined. In view of the fact that the government refused to implement the recommendation of the Porter Commission to bring near-banks under the control of the Bank Act, is the minister prepared to announce to the finance companies that he will, if necessary, implement the recommendation of the Porter Commission which would bring near-banks under federal jurisdiction?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, this would of course be a major policy decision which would be made only after consultation with my colleagues and announced in the normal fashion.

CHARTERED BANKS—ASSURANCE RESPECTING INTEREST RATES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance whether, in view of his communications with the banks through the Governor of the Bank of Canada, he has received any assurance from the banks that they will avoid further increasing their interest rates?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Not really, Mr. Speaker. All I see are the actions that have been taken. As my hon. friend knows, I am not in continuous contact with the banks; my contact with them is generally through the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.—REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING POSSIBLE CLOSING OF BASE—ASSISTANCE TO DISPLACED

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can he assure the house that no irrevocable decision will be taken regarding the future of the Canadian forces base at Summerside until the submissions of a delegation from Prince Edward Island, led by the premier of that province, are received on Monday, I believe

it is, and given full weight in the making of any decision?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can make the commitment that I will very gladly receive the premier of the province and discuss this problem with him whenever it is feasible for both of us to do so.

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for that assurance. Will similar arrangements be made in respect of other provincial governments that wish to take similar action?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, the case of each base is different and I do not think calls for the same kind of treatment.

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask one more supplementary question on this very important matter. I address it to the Prime Minister. Will the Right Honourable Prime Minister assure the house that before any closure takes place the government will implement measures to compensate as far as humanly possible for any economic hardship that may be caused to the people and communities concerned?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would not give that undertaking in respect of any closure, because it is conceivable that in some areas closure would not have the significant consequences about which the hon. member is concerned. But in cases where there would be significant hardship, as the hon. member says, I can give an undertaking that the government would not proceed with the closure without having considered alternative ways of alleviating that hardship.

Mr. MacLean: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Prime Minister for his assurance and say, by way of clarification, that I had in mind areas that are heavily dependent economically on the existence of defence bases.

Mr. Trudeau: If that is the case, we would give the type of consideration which the hon. member is suggesting before making any announcement of such closures. We do realize that some bases are not economic units and if any such bases were closed in less developed parts of Canada we hope that they would be linked to some other action by the government to ensure that growth centres spring up in the areas where closure is contemplated.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact he stated that in cases where bases are closed down the government will do everything it possibly can to ease the situation imposed on those who are affected, would he initiate this policy with regard to Camp Picton which is practically closed down now and where nothing whatsoever has been done to ease the situation of the 1500 people who are affected?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will recognize that we are now getting involved in the field of individual stations. I wonder whether this is what hon. members want to do. Now that the hon. member has made his representation I think we should go on to another subject.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Can he tell us whether or not he is still able to adhere to the August 1 deadline for the announcement of the reported 15 or up to 15 bases that are going to be closed? While he is on his feet, could he also give some indication as to the progress achieved by him and his colleagues in the formulation of an interim program of financial assistance where the economic impact will be quite severe?

Mr. Speaker: The minister should be allowed to answer the first part of the question. However, it seems to me that the second part is too wide in scope and would require a statement on motions.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, may I say with your permission, first that we have never contemplated closing 15 bases. This is an exaggeration. I should like to say in reply to the first part of the question that there is not much hope that I can meet the August 1 deadline. There is a possibility, but it is rather remote. However, this is not a bad indication.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The purport of the second part of my question was not to ask for an explanation but rather for a yes or no reply on whether or not the minister and his colleagues have arrived at a workable formula, and not necessarily to explain the formula.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I could say that we are pretty close to it, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INFORMATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a question asked me yesterday by the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington in which he referred to a secret report of the task force on information. I answered that I knew of no such secret report. I do want to make it clear to the house that I told the house a couple of weeks ago there was a task force on information which had reported to me, and of course I am not denying the existence of that particular report. However, if the hon. member had something else in mind in terms of a secret report, I do not know of it.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Prime Minister arising out of his answer with respect to the task force on information. Is it the government's intention to make that report public in view of the importance of the subject matter?

Mr. Trudeau: We do intend to have parliament discuss this subject. Whether it will be by discussing the task force report or some other government decision has not yet been decided by the government.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EFFORTS TO COMBAT RISING COST OF LIVING

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Having in mind the most recently announced increase in the cost of living index, is consideration being given to increasing the efforts of his department to combat this situation?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): We are always considering ways of making my effective department more effective.

Mr. Hees: Don't strain your wrist patting yourself on the back.

Mr. Basford: The government recently appointed the Prices and Incomes Commission which is now at work in Ottawa. I shall be meeting with them this afternoon, for example, to consider how their work can be carried out most effectively.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Now that the hon. gentleman's colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, has accepted a lower price for wheat on behalf of the western farmer, will the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs see that this lower price is passed to the consumer by having the price of bread reduced?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

DRUGS

SALES TAX REMOVAL—PASSING ON OF BENEFIT TO CONSUMERS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, this question is addressed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and it relates to the rise in the cost of living. In the light of the minister's reply to my question the other day, when he told the house that pharmaceutical prices fell only 5¼ per cent after the 12 per cent sales tax was dropped, does he intend to institute an investigation to discover why the full sales tax reduction was not passed on to the consumer?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The progressive action taken by the government involved the removal of the sales tax at the manufacturers' level, and 11 per cent at the manufacturers' level is not 11 per cent at the retail level.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): In view of the seriousness of this question, would the minister consider bringing forward government order 91 which would at least have the effect of setting up the joint committee of this house and the other place on price stability, incomes and employment so that the committee could commence its work early in September?

Mr. Basford: I believe the President of the Privy Council dealt with that question the other day.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary to the question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I take the liberty of reminding hon. members that we shall soon be running out of time. Many members did not have a chance to ask questions yesterday and perhaps we should try to give them an opportunity today.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the question asked—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We might return to this question after we have allowed other members an opportunity to take part.

TRADE

VENEZUELA—REFUSAL TO GRANT IMPORT LICENCE FOR PETROLEUM TANK WAGONS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Venezuelan government's decision not to grant an import licence for the delivery of petroleum tank wagons manufactured at a Regina, Saskatchewan plant, and inasmuch Canadian imports from that country are some $255 million higher than our exports to it, can the minister say whether any representations have been made to the government of Venezuela in connection with this incident?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): We are trying not to look at trade in bilateral terms; we are defenders of a mutilateral trade system. However in view of the wide imbalance in trade between the two countries, Venezuela has been made aware on a number of occasions that we are looking toward a strengthening of imports by Venezuela from Canada.

Mr. Skoberg: Has any assurance been received from that government that further consideration will be given to Canadian imports?

Mr. Pepin: The Venezuelan minister for mines and hydrocarbons was here three or four weeks ago. The minister without portfolio from Saskatchewan and I met with him; I had a list of items which we believed could be exported from Canada to Venezuela, profitably for both countries, and I can give the hon. member a copy of that list if he is interested.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TAIWAN—INQUIRY AS TO PERMANENT TRADE COMMISSIONER

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Speaker. I want to know whether Canada has a permanent trade commissioner in Taiwan.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. There is no Canadian representative in Taiwan.

Mr. Yewchuk: In view of the fact that the Taiwan minister of economic affairs has indicated that Taiwan is interested in buying Canadian wheat, would the minister consider sending a permanent trade commissioner there?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Sharp: The Canadian Wheat Board is very successful in selling wheat to countries in which we do not have trade commissioners and I am sure it will be equally successful this time, if business can be done.

[*Translation*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REPRESENTATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AT PROVINCIAL PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

I would like to know if the provincial premiers have forwarded an invitation to the federal government in order that it may be represented by observers at the next provincial conference which will be held in Quebec soon? If so, will the government send observers and does the Prime Minister know what the agenda will be?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when provincial premiers meet they do it, of course, without any official representation from the federal government. However, they have the courtesy and the good sense to ask us to send observers. Actually, we have selected some observers who will attend the conference to be held in Quebec.

[*English*]

ELECTIONS

REQUEST FOR EQUAL VOTING PRIVILEGES FOR IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): I have a question for the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that all immigrants contribute equally to Canadian welfare, would the government consider bringing in legislation to give equal voting privileges to all Canadian immigrants?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I realize that the hon. member is referring to an important matter, but I wonder if it is urgent. I do not suppose he is referring to new legislation during the present term of the current session. I hope not.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—CANADIAN POSITION RESPECTING BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL WARFARE

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Last

Monday, I think it was, I asked the hon. gentleman a question with regard to the position of the Canadian representative at the disarmament conference with regard to biological and chemical warfare weaponry. The minister said the matter was of such importance that he would like to be able to give a precise answer. Accordingly, he took the question as notice. Can he be precise, or general, but informative today?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I thank the hon. gentleman for asking this question. I was about to rise and endeavour to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, so that I might answer it. The Canadian position will be outlined in more detail at the conference which is now proceeding in Geneva, but I can assure the hon. member that we welcome the British initiative in the search for supplementary measures which will strengthen existing agreements and preclude the use of chemical and biological agents in warfare.

Mr. Lewis: In view of reports, which had not reached my notice when I first asked this question, that the British proposal relates only to biological warfare and does not concern chemical warfare weaponry, will the minister instruct our representative in Geneva to insist that chemical warfare be included as part of the agenda for discussion and in the eventual protocol?

Mr. Sharp: One of the reasons I did not go further in supporting the British initiative is that in our opinion it does not go far enough. It would be our intention to press for even stronger measures in both the chemical and biological fields.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister make certain that members of this house obtain as quickly as possible a copy of the statement to be made by Mr. Ignatieff, I imagine, at the conference on this subject?

Mr. Sharp: To the extent that it is not a confidential document, I shall endeavour to do so.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR WRITE-OFF OF PAN-AMERICAN GAMES DEFICIT

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that during the past five months the federal government has approved capital expenditures in Quebec totalling some $1¼ billion, including a $125 million write-off in connection with Expo, would the right hon. gentleman seriously consider writing off the deficit on the Pan-American Games in Winnipeg amounting to some $600,000?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked seems to be argumentative in intent and I do not think it can be accepted. The hon. member for Hillsborough.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hillsborough.

INDUSTRY

IRISH MOSS—ASSISTANCE IN ESTABLISHING EXTRACTING PLANT

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I apologize to him for my late notice and for sending that notice in long hand. That may be a grievous error. The question is about the Irish moss industry and arises from an encouraging answer to a question on the order paper the other day. Can he advise whether he and his department are co-operating with the Prince Edward Island government in efforts toward encouraging the establishment of an extracting plant in Prince Edward Island?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I am vaguely aware of this but I think I should ask for a more precise report. The hon. member may be sure that we will co-operate to the fullest extent if this man is serious.

GRAIN

WHEAT—CLOSING OF CROP YEAR, PRODUCER DELIVERIES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is it still the intention of the Wheat Board to close the present crop year at the end of the month? At that time will the new prices for the fall be available? Also, may I ask whether any plan has been worked out with the Wheat Board so that the full five-bushel quota may be delivered by producers?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, no statement has been made with respect to the

extension of the crop year by the Wheat Board or the government.

Mr. Korchinski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister please answer the second part of my question as to the initial prices that will be available for next year, because I do not think any price has been announced for next year?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, as far back as 1962, if my memory serves me correctly, initial payments were not announced until about August 6. I hope to be able to do as well this year.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Canadian Wheat Board received representations from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to allow farmers to receive the cash equivalent of a five-bushel delivery quota, whether or not it is delivered by July 31? If so, does the government or the Wheat Board intend to adopt this proposal?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, if that suggestion has been made to me by the pool the hon. member mentioned or another organization I do not remember. In any event, no decision has yet been made upon that subject.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have the government or the Wheat Board any plans to take care of those many farmers who will definitely not be able to deliver the promised five-bushel quota by the end of August?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, suggestions are being studied. The hon. member has made five at least, and the Wheat Board has been considering every one of them. I have a study outlining the advantages and disadvantages of many of these suggestions. The Wheat Board will make an announcement in due course.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us what steps Canada has taken within the past two or three months to sell wheat to Nationalist China?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

POLLUTION

REQUEST FOR TASK FORCE TO STUDY PROBLEM

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the increasingly grave problems facing many sections of Canada because of the widespread pollution of our environment, will he consider setting up a task force to examine every aspect of the problem so that it may report to the house its findings and make recommendations for action?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The government is not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the setting up of another task force will be the answer to this problem. Too often the setting up of a task force is criticized by the opposition.

Mr. Lewis: Why stop now?

Mr. Trudeau: Because we are looking at the alternatives at our disposal to solve this problem. It is our intention, during the life of the present parliament, to grapple with this problem in a thorough way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS—POSITION IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Some days ago I asked him to report about the matter of students from outside western Canada seeking summer employment in the west, thus displacing western students from potential jobs. Twenty per cent of the students attending the University of Saskatchewan have not been able to find summer work this year. That is a high percentage for that university and the same thing is true of other western universities. Has the minister a statement to make about students from other parts of Canada coming to the west and taking jobs which might be filled by western students?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The answer to that question ought to be given by way of a statement on motions. Perhaps the question might be asked in that way, with that in mind.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into an argument with anyone but the minister said he would look into the matter and answer. Perhaps he might be allowed to do so.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend asked a question the other day about the movement of large numbers of students from other parts of Canada to the west. I have checked and I do not find that there has been any government sponsored movement of students from other parts into the west. I know that students from the Atlantic provinces have been placed on farms in the west, but relatively small numbers are involved. As my hon. friend no doubt realizes, we have freedom of movement in this country and students may go from one part of the country to another. For example, there are certain hotel resorts in the west to which many students from all parts of Canada have customarily gone for summer jobs, and that seems to me a highly desirable state of affairs. We should like to take more westerners on in the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since in many cases persons under 18 years of age are not covered by workmen's compensation, has the minister made sure that these students working in various provinces are covered by workmen's compensation?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. The question of workmen's compensation is not a responsibility of my department.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED HARASSMENT OF CANADIANS OF GREEK ORIGIN

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What are the results of the investigation into allegations that Canadians of Greek origin are being harassed by agents of the military government of Greece?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have been investigating this matter for some time. The information we have on the subject is certainly not very conclusive. It does not support the charges which have been made. We are inclined to the view that the information we have is inadequate and therefore I would hesitate to give more of an answer on this occasion.

TORTURING OF GREEK POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said he would look into allegations, contained in the report of the Salzburg committee on human rights, that 15 Greek women political prisoners have been tortured. Has he done so? If so, could he give us an explanation of this matter?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the European Commission on Human Rights is currently seized of these and other similar charges brought before its investigating committee, which will no doubt make a judgment on the allegations of torture of the 15 women prisoners. In the meantime the Canadian government is not in a position to make any useful comment. Indeed, the matter is in a sense sub judice. It will wish to consider its own attitude in the light of the report of the commission, which is expected to be made public this fall.

CRIMINAL CODE

RECORD OF ABORTIONS PERFORMED

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Justice. As he will be making his announcement about the omnibus Criminal Code bill after the house has recessed, will he assure the house that the Department of National Health and Welfare will have available a record of all abortions performed pursuant to the provisions of Bill C-150?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think a question of that sort should be put. It might be interpreted as being argumentative. The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Simcoe North rising on a supplementary question?

Mr. Rynard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Justice if records will be kept?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): They will be, Mr. Speaker, in so far as we can keep them.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NORTHERN ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF DESIGNATED REGIONS

Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to the

Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, concerning his new program of industrial incentives.

Since anxiety prevails in northern Ontario, where people have been awaiting for a long time some assistance that would encourage secondary industries to settle in the area, is the minister in a position to tell the house what regions will be designated, particularly in northern Ontario?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am not yet in a position to make an announcement, but I hope I can do it very shortly.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a question for the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. Because of resignations at the National Arts Centre, I ask the Secretary of State whether Mademoiselle Madeleine Gobeil is still a director of the National Arts Centre and have other personal friends of the Prime Minister been appointed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview.

Mr. MacInnis: Possibly I could put a supplementary to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CRIMINAL LAW REFORM

REPORT OF OUIMET COMMISSION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Has the minister received a copy of the report of the Ouimet Commission on criminal law reform? If so, is it his intention to table same?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I think under its particular terms of reference that report would be directed to the Solicitor General in the first instance.

Mr. Gilbert: May I direct the same question to the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker? Has the minister received a copy of the Ouimet Commission report on criminal law reform and will he table the same?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I received copies of the report in English. When it is translated and available, the question of tabling will be decided. I anticipate it will not be tabled in this part of the session.

HUMAN RIGHTS

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND ONTARIO COMMISSION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): My question is for the Minister of Labour. Is his department co-operating with and/or having discussions with the Ontario Human Rights Commission in the province of Ontario which is at present investigating charges of discrimination in the national capital area? If so, to what extent? I ask this question notwithstanding the fact there may be some constitutional grounds on which this government feels it should not be involved.

Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has quite aptly pointed out the constitutional problem. I am sure he will be pleased to know there is the maximum degree of communication between my department and the various agencies charged with this responsibility in the provincial field. There is the maximum degree of co-operation and communication despite constitutional barriers.

Mr. Alexander: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have just about reached the end of the question period. I hoped the Chair might have the opportunity of recognizing two or three other members quickly.

Mr. Alexander: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, because I have been so quiet for the past three or four days I thought I would have the opportunity to ask a supplementary. Am I to take it from the minister's answer that at the present time during these investigations his department is in dialogue and having consultations with representatives of the Ontario Human Rights Commission?

Mr. Mackasey: I am sure the hon. member will agree with me that no responsible department, federal or provincial, would want to hide behind the constitution in an area as important as discrimination. We are not trying to evade our responsibility. We feel we have a moral obligation to communicate and co-operate with all provinces in this sensitive area.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and it is a perfectly innocent one. It is the usual Thursday afternoon question. I wanted to ask the President of the Privy Council, who I congratulate for feeling free to wear the white flower of innocence, what the nature of the business will be for the rest of this week and next week. I understand some government members are having problems with their travel plans.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am very hopeful we might in fact be able to dispose of all the remaining business for this part of the session, if not at the close of this sitting day—

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. gentleman give some indication possibly later today or tomorrow of the means he will use to acquaint hon. members with the nature of the business to be discussed when we come back—on the assumption there will be an adjournment rather than prorogation, so that members will be fully prepared for the business which will face them when the session resumes next fall?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I can assure the house there will be an adjournment. It is proposed that the final day of this session will be used for the purpose of completing committee reports and other business and we will then go right into adjournment. The contemplated day of resumption, subject to any contingencies that might arise, would be October 22 as indicated in the motion for adjournment.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 33 I move, seconded by Mr. McIlraith:

That the debate on the motion that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—I was waiting for Your Honour to call orders of the day—

[Mr. Speaker.]

An hon. Member: He did it.

Mr. Aiken: With all due respect they have been called for the last 40 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had called orders of the day because the question period had expired two and a half minutes before that time. I had allowed the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) to ask a supplementary question. In any event I will certainly recognize the hon. member on a point of order.

Mr. Aiken: I have a point of order to raise, Mr. Speaker, of which I have given Your Honour notice. It is in connection with the notice given by the President of the Privy Council as it appears in *Votes and Proceedings* for July 22, that is, the notice that he will move under Standing Order 33.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, my argument is that the minister cannot give notice of two motions at the same time under the Standing Order. I contend that he has given notice of closure of the debate that we are now engaged in, that is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), and also on the main motion which is the committee report.

The reason I raise this at this time is twofold. First, I contend the notice given by the minister was invalid because it attempted to do something he could not legally do. Second, even if it is not considered invalid by Your Honour, it can apply only to the amendment which is being considered and upon which the debate is being resumed, and cannot apply to the main motion. I wish to point out that closure is a procedure by which the basic and fundamental right of free speech is restricted. It must therefore be interpreted very strictly. If there is any doubt, it should not be applied against freedom of speech.

I present the proposition that there is considerable doubt in our rules about whether this motion can be moved to cover both the amendment and the main motion. I wish to read Rule 33 as it relates to a debate being held while the house is sitting with the Speaker in the Chair. It reads as follows:

Immediately before the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the house be in committee of the whole, any Minister of the Crown who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting of his intention so to do may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned,—

That is the part of the rule which relates to the sitting while the Speaker is in the Chair. There is a second part to Rule 33 which relates to closure while the house is in committee of the whole, which does not apply in this case. I point this out because the rule goes on to refer to:

—further consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles,—

• (3:00 p.m.)

This applies only when the house is in committee. Therefore, in the first place, Standing Order 33 applies only, as I read it, to the debate when the Speaker is in the Chair. The adjourned debate which we are considering at this time is a debate on the amendment and not on the main motion. I am contending that is all that can be affected at this time by closure.

I should like to make a reference to the British practice because our rule 33 does not cover the situation where two motions are being considered. In cases where our rule does not cover a situation we are entitled to look at the British practice, which is set out in Standing Order No. 1. The British practice is that on a closure motion only the amendment can be moved for closure under one motion. I am referring to May's sixteenth edition. I refer to that because all the seventeenth editions are out, but the reference is the same in both editions. It is referred to at page 479.

In the British practice there is a special provision, subsection (2) of the closure rule, which is called closure of contingent questions. The British practice assumed there could only be closure on the amendment, but a subclause of that rule states that under certain circumstances the Speaker could permit a second closure to be moved upon the main motion. I am pointing out that there had to be a special rule to that effect under the British practice. Therefore the rule as it stands in the British practice, and as we have adopted it in this house, is that closure can apply only to the one amendment on which debate is being considered, and if further closure is required it would have to be under a second notice and second motion. I am mentioning this only because our own rule does not cover the situation. It merely says "an adjourned debate". This is what we are considering now. The adjourned debate is the debate on the amendment.

Finally I should like to refer to the flag debate because I am anticipating someone may say that the practice adopted there covers our present situation. In the flag debate we were considering a committee report and we were considering an amendment. Closure was moved on both the amendment and the main motion, and it was so put.

I want to point out two distinctions between the flag debate and this debate. The first is there was no ruling whatever made by Mr. Speaker in that instance, or requested by anyone when the procedure was followed. In other words the matter was not raised. It proceeded at that time by acquiescence of the house to a vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may have been a little doubtful about my ground yesterday but Your Honour's decision in connection with the motion moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has strengthened my case very much. I should like to read Your Honour's ruling of yesterday in connection with the hon. member's motion under another rule. The hon. member for Calgary North referred to an adjournment which was made on a previous occasion on which no ruling had been made by the Chair. At page 11510 of *Hansard* in the second column, Your Honour, in referring to this debate, said:

—no ruling whatsoever was made by the Chair when this matter first came up when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre first proposed his motion. As he knows, this is a very new type of motion; it was new to the extent of having been difficult for the Chair alone, or with the assistance of the Table officials, to accept or refuse the motion, but in view of the fact that no objection had been made to it the motion was put to the house. So I do not feel bound by anything because actually there was no ruling. A question was simply put to the house, and this is my view, one which I hold very strongly.

So I suggest that the flag debate could not be considered a precedent in this particular instance because a question was not raised at that time. It was a procedure which was followed apparently by acquiescence.

The second distinction is that Standing Order 33 has been amended since the flag debate was ended by closure. The amendments are not extensive but they do, I suggest, clarify the situation.

At the time of the flag debate Standing Order 33 included closure in committee of the whole as it related to supply and ways and means. There was a very long and complicated section. When these rules were revised last December rule 33 was altered in such a way

as to make it very clear there are two procedures to be followed, one when the Speaker is in the chair and the other when the house is in committee of the whole. The clause which might have been difficult to interpret at the time of the flag debate is much more clear now. It is clear to the point where it includes only the debate on the matter which we are now considering. So, therefore, I would say if there was any sort of a precedent established at the time of the flag debate that precedent does not necessarily apply at all now.

That is the burden of my point of order. I think it is an extremely important one because if the government can now move closure on amendments without any limit—and that is the effect of the notice the President of the Privy Council has given—then there would be a much broader application of Standing Order 33 than I feel is justified. It is a very heavy handed rule, to be used only in very extreme circumstances which, incidentally, we do not think apply at this time; but nevertheless it is a very extreme rule and I suggest that it should be applied with extreme caution. In this particular case it is quite clear that the debate we are considering is not a debate on the main motion but merely a debate on the amendment, and my contention is that that is as far as the closure rule should apply at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I do not want to cut off debate and I tried to establish the practice yesterday of allowing all hon. members, who feel they have a constructive and positive contribution to make to these debates on points of order, to make their contributions, and I am prepared to hear such contributions at the present time. However, as the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) indicated he was generous enough, as usual, to advise the Chair in advance of the very important point he was going to raise today. I have given the matter extremely careful consideration. With the assistance of the advisers to the Chair many hours have been spent poring over procedents, and I am inclined in the light of the arguments of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, to give a ruling now. However, I am also inclined to wait for a moment to see whether hon. members have a contribution to make in respect of the point of order.

[Mr. Aiken.]

• (3:10 p.m.)

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). I do not do so on technical grounds, but on the broader ground of the intention of this rule, and general grounds of logic and reason.

If a motion can be moved imposing closure on a main motion, such as the one under consideration, and also on the amendment which has been moved to that main motion, what this means is that no members, except the member who moved the amendment and the minister, will have an opportunity to speak on the motion itself. In other words all the discussion we have had so far has been on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). There has been no discussion on the main motion itself.

If this application of closure is applied today on the motion and the amendment itself, this means that every member of this house, except the hon. member for Peace River who introduced the amendment, will be precluded from speaking on the main motion. I do not think there ever was any intention, as far as the rule of closure was concerned, to create a situation in which members were to be precluded from speaking on a motion before the house.

I submit to Your Honour that on the general grounds of reason and logic it would be inappropriate and contrary to the general rules of debate in this chamber to allow a motion of closure covering both the main motion and the amendment, the amendment being the only matter which has been discussed.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I intend only to add one point which I think Your Honour must consider and take into account. This concerns the effect of your interpretation of Standing Order 33. At the present report stage we must consider that the motion is to adopt the said report. There may be a number of amendments put forward to Your Honour, some of which are on the order paper. If the debate on the first items becomes protracted the first notice of closure is put forward, and then the minister conceivably closes off the consideration of every other amendment. This is why I feel the suggestion made the other day by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in respect of this whole question relating to Standing Order 33 should be given much closer attention, in order to bring it more in keeping

with our procedures of today. This should not limit debate merely to the proposals put forward by the government in respect of a particular debate. It is for that reason I share the difficulties of my colleague, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). To me Rule 33 is very questionable and imprecise at the present time.

I put this additional argument to Your Honour in order that your ruling, whatever it might be, will not exclude or settle the question which I feel has not been investigated or considered. I refer to Standing Order 33 which has to do with stages other than the report stage. I put to Your Honour that this rule is fraught with pitfalls, particularly as to the extent set forth.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in reply to the three points raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). First, with regard to his interpretation based on the British rule, I think it is fair to note that the British Standing Order 33 expressly talks about a question in the singular, while Standing Order 33 here in its final three lines refers to all such questions as may be decided. So, it is quite clear this rule is intended to cover all possible questions included in the order.

Secondly in respect of the amendment to Standing Order 33, since 1964 as I see it the amendment is really an amendment to delete the reference to the committee of supply and the committee of ways and means, committees which were abolished in 1968 under our new rules. Those amendments were made in that part of the rule which the member indicates does not apply here. Therefore the amendment does not in any way affect the substance of the motion made here.

Finally it seems to me that it would be difficult to have a case more on all fours with this situation than the case which was decided in this house on December 14, 1964, in connection with the flag debate resolution. At that time the amendment outstanding was in the name of the former member for Middlesex West, Mr. Thomas. The Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), who at that time was the President of the Privy Council, gave notice and moved a motion of closure in these terms and in identical circumstances. The Chair having the opportunity, and indeed the obligation, to decide on the question of order at that time found it to be in order.

For those reasons I submit that the motion made here in the terms of Standing Order 33 is equally in order.

Mr. Speaker: I am grateful to hon. members for the comments they have made as guidance to the Chair. The objections that have been made by hon. members have been logical and I have given very serious thought to them. At the same time I have given very serious consideration to the arguments advanced by the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in support of his rejection of the point put forward by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), of which he gave notice of his intention to bring forward procedural objection at this time.

I also recognize the difficulty referred to by the hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness). It is obvious that we may some day want to resolve the difficulties to which he has referred. That relates also to one of the difficulties referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

There is no question that Standing Order 33 as it now reads is not without uncertainty and pitfalls. As has been suggested it might well be that early consideration should be given to that Standing Order in relation to a consideration of other Standing Orders.

It has been my pleasure, good fortune and privilege to hear all the contributions which have been made to this debate during the last two weeks. I have had the impression that at times the discussion has not related to the amendment before the house. At the same time I thought some of the speeches which referred to the motion initially presented by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) had greater relevancy to the motion proposed by the hon. President of the Privy Council.

Let me now go to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, who has suggested that in view of the fact there may be some point at issue in the interpretation of Standing Order 33, we might be further ahead to consider the similar standing order in the British parliament, and how it has been interpreted. I would be in full agreement with this suggestion if there were not considerable Canadian precedent and practice in the interpretation of our Standing Order 33, as this Standing Order has been in effect in the House of Commons over 50 years.

There are many precedents, and more than those which have been quoted and referred to

by hon. members when this point of order was raised. These precedents have been studied very closely, the *Journals* have been looked into and the debates have been read.

I should like to assume the dubious honour of taking the time of the house to go through these precedents. I think that after referring to a lot of these precedents the conclusion will be clear.

On August 30 of 1917, and I begin this review of precedents with this particular one, a motion was proposed and adopted in the following terms:

That the debate on the third reading of Bill No. 125, providing for the acquisition by His Majesty of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company shall not be further adjourned.

At that time an amendment to the motion for the third reading of Bill No. 125 was also under consideration. Both the amendment and the main motion were subsequently disposed of under the provisions of what is now Standing Order 33. I refer hon. members to *Journals* of August 30 1917, pages 606 to 608 inclusive.

• (3:20 p.m.)

On September 10, 1917, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the debate upon the second reading of Bill No. 133, the War-time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned.

It should be noted that in this case there was no amendment before the house when the motion to close debate was adopted. Later in the sitting of September 10, 1917, in the course of the debate following the submission of the motion under what is now Standing Order 33, an amendment was proposed and disposed of by a division. Subsequently in the same sitting a further amendment was proposed and debated. The latter amendment and the main motion were both disposed of by the operation of the provisions of the closure rule. In this connection I refer hon. members to *Journals* of September 10, 1917, pages 643 to 645 inclusive.

On September 14, 1917, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the debate on the third reading of Bill No. 133, the War-time Elections Act, shall not be further adjourned.

Again, it should be noted that when the motion to close debate was adopted there was no amendment before the house. Later in the same sitting an amendment was proposed and debated. Both the amendment and the main motion were disposed of by the operation of the provisions of what is now Standing Order 33. This is to be found in *Journals* of September 14, 1917, pages 659 to 661 inclusive.

On March 2, 1926, when the house was considering the Address in Reply a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Elliott, for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to His Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of Mr. Bird: "That this question be now put", shall not be further adjourned.

Once more, it should be noted that the motion to close debate related to more than one question, namely, the Address in Reply and also to a motion "That the question be now put". I refer hon. members to *Journals* of March 2, 1926, pages 123 to 126 inclusive.

On March 29, 1932, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the present debate, namely the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a bill to amend chapter 58 of the Statutes of Canada, 1931, striking out the word "March" in section 8, and substituting the word "May" therefor; and the proposed motion of Mr. Weir (Melfort): "That this question be now put", shall not be further adjourned.

Here again it is suggested that the motion to close debate referred to two debatable motions. I refer hon. members to *Journals* of March 29, 1932, pages 177 to 181 inclusive.

On May 22, 1956, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, and on any amendments thereto, shall not be further adjourned.

On that occasion, in addition to the main motion there was an amendment and also a subamendment under consideration by the house. The reference here is to *Journals* of May 22, 1956, pages 587 to 594 inclusive.

On June 5, 1956, a motion was proposed and adopted as follows:

That the debate on the motion for the third reading of Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, and on any amendments thereto, shall not be further adjourned.

On that occasion in addition to the main motion there was also an amendment under consideration by the house. Hon, members will find the reference in the *Journals* for June 5, 1956, pages 699 to 705 inclusive. The latest precedent for the use of Standing Order

33 on a proceeding with Mr. Speaker in the chair is to be found at pages 996 to 1002 inclusive of the *Journals* for December 14, 1964, when a motion to concur in the sixth report of the Special Committee on a Canadian flag was being debated.

On that occasion when the motion to clusive of the *Journals* for December 14, 1964, when a motion to concur in the sixth report of the Special Committee on a Canadian flag impose the provisions of Standing Order 33 was adopted, an amendment to the main motion was also under consideration. However, that amendment was disposed of prior to the cut-off time specified in Standing Order 33. To that extent I agree with the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka that this precedent is not of particular assistance in the present circumstances.

In summary, it is suggested that all precedents support the viewpoint that any amendment, or other motion that may be proposed to a main motion, comes under the provisions of the cut-off time set out in Standing Order 33. No precedent has been found to support the suggestion that each amendment is a separate debate that must be covered by a motion in each case.

The hon. member has suggested that the adjourned debate is the debate on the amendment. If he will look at the proceedings of the house he will see that the adjourned debate is not only on the amendment but on the main motion. This is what is before the house at the present time. He would have a very serious point and one which would have to be given extremely close consideration if, in fact, it were agreed that what is before the house at the present time is the adjourned debate exclusively on the amendment. But that is not the procedural position. In fact the procedural position is that the adjourned debate is on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

In this light I do not think the additional argument put forward for the consideration of the house by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka can be accepted. As I have said, no precedent has been found to support the suggestion advanced by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. Indeed, the concluding sentence of Standing Order 33 reads in part:

—but all such questions as must be decided in order to conclude such adjourned debate or postponed consideration, shall be decided forthwith.

That is, of course, the point which has been made by the President of the Privy Council indicating the distinction between our Standing Order 33 and the corresponding standing order in the British house. In view of the precedents my interpretation of Standing Order 33 would lead me to believe that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka cannot be accepted by the Chair.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon between five and six o'clock I indicated to the house that at an appropriate time I would raise a point of order under Standing Order 51. May I say that if I had my choice, if I were sure I would be permitted to do it at that time, I would raise this point of order at one o'clock tonight, assuming things go as they probably will go, after the vote has been taken on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting, but I thought it might be better to interrupt him before he is fully launched into his submission with regard to the point of order. As the hon. member indicated a moment ago, he gave notice in the house of his intention to raise this very important point of order.

My understanding is that the discussion on the point of order would be raised not in connection with the motion under Standing Order 33 but in connection with the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). I want to make it clear that the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) should be disposed of by the house before the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) can raise his point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Fair enough.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 33, I move, seconded by Mr. McIlraith:

That the debate on the motion, "That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in", and on any amendment or amendment in amendment proposed thereto, shall not be further adjourned.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: I will not interrupt the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr.

Division

Knowles). First I will read the motion, and then we may perhaps have a debate as to whether we should hear the hon. member's point of order at this time.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) moved:

That the debate on the motion, "That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in", and on any amendment or amendment in amendment proposed thereto, shall not be further adjourned.

My understanding of the procedure is that this motion should now be put to the house and disposed of, following which we will resume the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), at which time the hon. member's point of order could be raised. Does the hon. member agree with this interpretation of the proceedings?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that now was the time to do it, but it does not make that much difference so long as it is clear that I have the right to raise the point of order. Your Honour is perfectly right in saying that my point of order is not against the procedural validity of the motion just now made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) but rather that Your Honour should take certain action under Standing Order 51 with respect to the main motion, namely the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). If I do not raise my point of order at a moment when it is possible for me to do so, I might find myself denied the floor by Standing Order 33 tonight at one o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think it would be necessary for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to wait until tonight at one o'clock to make his point. I think he could make it on a point of order when we resume the consideration of the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). If the hon. member were to raise the point of order of which he has given notice at this time, I would have to tell him that it should not be raised now. If I understand his point of order correctly, his objection is not against the motion of the President of the Privy Council but against the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am not against it procedurally but, I am against it in substance.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those against the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (3:40 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël

O'Connell
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Caouette
Carter
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moores
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Rynard
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—83.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Procedure and Organization

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, July 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to Your Honour's attention the point of order, notice of which I gave on Tuesday and which I tried to raise a few minutes ago. I do not in my experience recall a point of order being raised under Standing Order 51. I recognize that it is a very serious matter to ask Mr. Speaker to make a ruling under this Standing Order. Nevertheless I feel the importance of the matter so deeply and seriously that I believe Your Honour should be called upon to act under Standing Order 51. This Standing Order reads as follows:

> Whenever Mr. Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, he shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the standing order or authority applicable to the case.

• (4:10 p.m.)

As I indicated earlier my point of order is against the main motion which is before the house in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). If it were possible I would have preferred to wait until the house had voted on the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) so that I might then raise my point of order against the main motion, but in view of what has just happened it is likely that point will not be reached until after one o'clock tomorrow morning, and having had some experience with this device in the past I recognize it might be difficult to get the floor at that time.

We are back on the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and on the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River and it is my contention that before we proceed further I should call on Your Honour to face up to the fact, as I see it, that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. Because of that

I believe you should apprise the house of that fact before you put the question, which, as I say, may be some time after one o'clock tomorrow morning, and I think you should go further and refuse to put the question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But in any case if Your Honour will apprise the house of the fact that this motion is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament, I am confident that the house will govern itself accordingly. In fact, despite the non-confidence I have in the government I believe even the government would be guided by your opinion in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, since I seem to be taking a position which involves Your Honour in making a decision, may I make it clear now—and I shall do so again at the end of my remarks—that I am not trying to involve Your Honour in the details or in the substance of a motion; I am not trying to involve Your Honour in the question as to whether the time limitation should be two days, one day or many days; I am not trying to involve Your Honour in the question of any of the terms of proposed Standing Order 75c. But I am trying to involve Your Honour in the more fundamental and more basic question of whether any government has the right to seek to amend the rules of parliament in the way that is being sought on this occasion. That applies in any case, but it applies even more seriously now that we are under the closure motion of Standing Order 33. The statements I have just made of course must be more than just assertions of mine; they must be backed up by statements from the authorities. I should like to read a few of them.

First of all may I draw Your Honour's attention to citation 4 of Beauchesne's fourth edition which is found at page 8, quite early in this book which I trust members have read from cover to cover:

> The principles that lie at the basis of English parliamentary law, as Bourinot so aptly says, are: "to protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority;

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I submit that an attempt to change the rules in a way that is contrary to that basic principle should not be allowed by the impartial occupant of the Chair. Let me go on:

> —to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner;

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):

> —to enable every member to express his opinion within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time; to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure, and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):

> In a close contest when the House is considering a highly controversial measure, the positions of parties are equalized:

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let me emphasize that. There is nothing in here about one side being master of the other. The basic rule of parliamentary procedure is that in a close contest when the house is considering a highly controversial measure the positions of parties are equalized. The quotation continues:

> —the Government side may rely on its majority but the Opposition is strengthened by the rules of procedure which both are bound to observe and which the Speaker must enforce.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if any attempt is made to change the rules of this house and to do it in a manner which destroys that equality and gives the government not only the force of its majority but the force of the rules, we have gone completely contrary to the basic principles of parliamentary procedure on which this house relies.

I regard that citation 4 in Beauchesne's fourth edition as one which every member of this house should read very carefully before he decides what to do in the remaining part of this debate. I submit that because the attempt to change the rules by government majority, in a way that will destroy the quality between the parties, is wrong, Your Honour, under Standing Order 51 should so apprise the house before you put the question tonight, and indeed in my view you should refuse to put the question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Now let me draw your attention to citation 7(1). Again I am looking at Beauchesne's fourth edition. I wish to emphasize this sentence and one word in it as strongly as I possibly can:

> Another collective right of the House is to settle its own procedure.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is right.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, that one word, the word "collective", is the word that this government is defying throughout this whole debate. That one word is something they do not understand over there at all. They think that because they may have a majority of seats in this house they have the right by majority decision to change the rules of parliament. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of parliamentary procedure that is not the way it is done. We settle our own rules on a collective basis. Mr. Speaker, collectivity includes us all. I submit that what is being done now under closure is so contrary to the terms of Standing Order 51 that Your Honour should so apprise the house.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I go on with citation 7, paragraph (1), and perhaps I might read the first sentence again to connect it with the following sentence:

Another collective right of the house is to settle its own procedure. This is such an obvious right—

I wish it were.

—it has never been directly disputed—

It is being disputed now by the government opposite, and I think Your Honour should so find. The citation continues:

—that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon it except to say that the house is not responsible to any external authority for following the rules it lays down for itself, but may depart from them at its own discretion.

Your Honour has been apprised of the fact, which has been recorded several times, that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) is dealing with a recommendation by a committee which all of the opposition members on the committee opposed. It has been made clear that proposal 75c—they seem to think this comes from the committee and is before us in the normal way—is a proposal or direction from the government, which is an external authority so far as the House of Commons is concerned.

This attempt to change the rules of this house on the basis of an external authority is again contrary to the privileges, practices and rules of this house. Let me quote citation 8, paragraph (1):

The proceedings of the houses (Senate and Commons) are governed by statutes, by rules and orders adopted by themselves—

It does not say adopted by the majority, it says adopted by themselves. It states that immediately after the citation which says we do this thing collectively. There is no authority, despite all the alleged authority there may be, for a majority to pass rules, and there is no authority for a majority to alter the rules of this house to meet the desire of an external authority, namely, the government. I submit what is happening now under closure is striking at the very fundamental proposition that the rules of parliament are parliament's rules, that they are the rules we arrived at collectively, and that they cannot be altered in this way.

Let me go on with the sentence in the citation:

—and by those usages which have grown up in the course of time and consequently become a part of their own practice or are derived from the common law of parliament by which they have consented to be guided in all matters of doubt.

Let me emphasize that word "consented". If I can zero in on the two words I have now quoted, the most important two words to this debate are the words "collective" and "consented", one which appears in citation 7 and the other in citation 8.

This the way the rules of parliament are made, and this is the way the rules of parliament are altered, by collective action and consent, not by dictation from an outside source, and not by the will of the majority being pushed roughshod over the minority, especially under a closure motion.

Citation 8(2) states:

The usages of parliament are to be collected from the entries in the journals, from the history of parliamentary procedure, from the treatises on parliamentary practice that have been published from time to time; and from the observations of experienced members, and the remarks of the Speakers in the House of Commons, with relation to the forms and methods of proceedings, as contained in the published debates.

It is difficult in this debate to single out individuals and put them in any special category. We are all equal in the debate as we are in freedom of speech, but I think it is significant that there have been no reasoned statements in defence of 75c from experienced members of this House of Commons. The older and experienced members—the ones who are steeped in the parliamentary way of doing things—know for a fact that we do not change the rules by the will of the majority, but that we change them collectively and by consent.

Perhaps I should read paragraph (3) of citation 8:

"In the interpretation of the rules or standing orders the house is generally guided, not so much

by the literal construction of the orders themselves as by the consideration of what has been the practice of the house with respect to them."

The practice of the house, with a few exceptions, has been to make our rules collectively and by consent. Experience has taught us that they are the only rules that work. Rules imposed upon us do not work, and rule 75c imposed in this way will simply take this house into trouble.

Let me quote from citation 11 in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which I believe is still issued to every member of the house. It states:

An amendment to the standing order which is only intended to settle a small detail in the procedure and on which there seems to be general agreement may be passed on a simple motion after notice has been given under Standing Order 41. But if it is desired to make a general revision or to adopt some important rule—

Surely this is important or we would not have given it this much time.

—a special committee is appointed "to assist Mr. Speaker" for that purpose. The Speaker acts as chairman and the Clerk of the House acts as clerk of that committee.

Has that happened in this case? Has Mr. Speaker been given a committee to assist him to revise the rules of the house? That was the way it was done in most previous instances, and Mr. Speaker was chairman and the Clerk of the House was the clerk of the committee. In this instance it was decided that there would be a committee without Mr. Speaker, and without the Clerk of the House, but with a government member being the chairman of the committee.

I submit, when we are called upon to make such an important change as is proposed in 75c that the house should not be asked to act contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. That is what is being done by bringing in this report, which is a report of the majority of the committee, representing nothing more or less than the will, dictation or intent of the government.

I draw your attention to another quotation from Beauchesne's, only this time it is from the third edition. I have them all upstairs; editions one, two, three and four, but I brought down extracts from only two pages from the third edition. They are pages with roman numerals lvii and lviii.

An hon. Member: Aye, aye, aye.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Olé.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am glad to hear the Liberals say "Aye, aye". I invite them to read this bit of Beauchesne's third edition:

"The government of the day, says Sir Guthbert Headlam, M.P., whatever may be its political complexion, must always regard itself, during its tenure of office, as the trustee of the whole nation and not as representing only the views of its own party or of a section of the community". Mr. Hugh Sellon, in "Democracy and Dictatorship", p. 40, says: 'To hasten drastic and contentious legislation through parliament—

Under 75c we have been told that this may be done during the next session of parliament because there are half a dozen tough decisions that have to be taken, so the government needs this rule to get them through quickly. I continue the quotation:

• (4:30 p.m.)

"To hasten drastic and contentious legislation through parliament, except on the basis of the clear and unmistakable approval of the majority of the electorate, might, strictly speaking, be legal. But it would be unconstitutional in the sense that it would offend against one of the foundations of parliamentary government, the principle that no party in office shall act so drastically along party lines as to cause grave apprehension among large numbers of citizens or as to be regarded as action designed solely to protect one class of the community, and not the community as a whole.

I commend to Your Honour, and to hon. members of the house in all parties, the principle that the role of the government of the day is only that of trustee; that it has no right, especially under the use of closure, to bring in rules that would make it possible to put legislation through in a hurry without the proper consideration that is constitutionally required.

The whole attempt to violate this basic concept, and to do it by putting through rules that have not been agreed to collectively, rules to which we have not consented, is, I submit, contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. In my view, under Standing Order 51 Your Honour should so advise the house. I hope Your Honour feels as strongly about this as I do, and will say that in view of this action being so contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament the motion ought not to be put to the house at all.

Let me read one or two more quotations. Listen, please to this one:

I would like to conclude by emphasizing that the opposition, whatever its policies and tactics may be, shares with the government and, of course, with the electorate, the responsibility of making our form of democracy, based on parliamentary institutions, work for the welfare of all the citizens.

This is by an important personage—I shall give his name in a moment—saying that the opposition shares equally with the government the responsibility of making parliament work. I ask: how can the opposition share equally with the government that responsibility if it is hog-tied by rules that the government insists on imposing on the house, and that under closure? I quote further from the document I have in my hand:

> One of the tests of good and strong democracy is the acceptance without qualification of the role of the opposition as an indispensable element in its processes, with rights to be safeguarded and with responsibilities to be discharged.
>
> That test has not been met, and democracy has been lost, when opposition has degenerated into faction or when authority has become tyranny.

That is a quotation from the right hon. Lester B. Pearson.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am glad to see a few Liberals applauding him.

An hon. Member: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) didn't.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The role of the opposition is equal to that of the government. This is the same theory, the same philosophy that I read from Beauchesne's. I submit that when, in the making of the rules of the house, the government says, "We will give you no part; we are deciding what the rules are to be", that is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. Let me quote one more authority:

> Notwithstanding these increasing demands, the time available to this house each week for the conduct of its business is not significantly greater than it was a century ago, nor have the traditional and proper roles of government and opposition changed.

They are still the same.

> It is the government's function to propose legislative solutions. It is the opposition's task to question these solutions and attempt to improve them or propose alternatives.

Then this sentence, short, to the point, and I support every syllable of it:

> Neither role can be subordinate to the other.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I submit that it is Your Honour's responsibility to see that this dictum is observed, that the role of neither side in this house is made subordinate to the other. That should be the case in every aspect of our work, but when it comes to the fundamental matter of our rules, if ever that dictum applied, it applies there. We are not called upon to sit here in a subordinate position, to be told by the other side what our rules shall be. I continue this quotation:

> It goes without saying that any proposal for procedural reform must assist both sides of this house to function more efficiently. Anything less would diminish the very institution which we seek to assist.

That is a clear statement of the equality of the two sides, an equality that is being violated. Never mind the details of rule 75c; I am not concerned about that at the moment, but I am concerned about a government proposal being brought in the way it has, being put through this house by a government majority, and under closure. This same authority went on to refer to certain discussions which had taken place, and he said:

> Nor should they—

Referring to the discussions.

> —be permitted to lead, either by agreement or in the absence of it, to procedural changes which will upset the delicate and essential balance between government and opposition so necessary to the proper functioning of parliament.

That is a quotation from the right hon. Piere Elliott Trudeau. See *Hansard,* September 16, 1968, pages 72 and 73.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I note that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is applauding himself.

Mr. McCleave: He didn't know they were his own words.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hope he will pay attention to what he said—

Mr. Dinsdale: He is schizophrenic.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —namely, that there is a delicate and essential balance between government and opposition which is necessary to the proper functioning of parliament. This ties in to a matter that is basic to our whole operation, namely, our rules. We are being put in a subordinate position. We are being denied operating under collective action. We are being denied the right to consent. This is being done on the basis of an external authority, namely, the government.

I contend, therefore, that this whole way of doing things, bringing in rules in this way, is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament, and that Your Honour should so find under Standing Order 51. Doing this takes the rules of debate out of the hands of members of parliament. It takes the rules of debate out of the rule book and puts them in the pocket of the government, in the pocket of the government house leader. It leaves all decision as to what time will be spent in debate to the caprice of the government. There is no more the matter of consent, no more the matter of collective action. This is being done in a manner which I submit is completely contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament.

I come back to what I said earlier because I think it needs to be emphasized. I have strong feelings about the details of 75c. With a few others I have been involved in seemingly endless discussion on these matters; in fact I said in a lighter vein to the President of the Privy Council in his office the other day that we started these discussions in his office last August and that we were getting pretty close to a full year of it.

I am concerned about the details of 75c, but that is not the issue. The issue is not the number of days to be spent at this or that stage of a bill. The issue is not the limitation of time for debate.

Indeed, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tries to make out that we want to talk endlessly and never want to reach a decision, he knows he is just saying that. He knows that our rules are full of time limitations, limitations on the length of time a member can speak and limitations on this and that debate, and he knows there has never been a debate in the House of Commons in which every member has taken part. He knows that in point of fact we do reach decisions, and that the number of debates we have had in this session that have been lengthy have not done parliament any damage, they have done it credit. The fact of the matter is that these details are not the issue before us now, not the major issue in this whole debate of two or three weeks and certainly not the issue in this point of order.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The issue before us now is: how do we make our rules? Do we make them by collective action, do we make them by consent, or are they made for us by government majority? Because this motion denies collectivity, denies consent, because it is an attempt to make the rules by action of the government majority, I call on Your Honour to apprise the house under Standing Order 51 that this is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting him at this time. I was not too sure whether the hon. member was going to speak on the point of order, which allows for 20 minutes under Standing Order 33, or whether he should have the usual 40 minutes. I would be inclined to think that he is entitled to 20 minutes, but I assume that in view of the fact that he is discussing such an important point of order hon. members will allow him to continue. It is on this assumption that he has been invited to continue and to complete his remarks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you, Sir. My concluding remarks will be brief.

I know that there have been occasions when rules have been changed in other than the normal way. I know that in 1913 the closure rule itself, which has come back to haunt us again today, was put through not by having a committee with the Speaker as chairman but on a motion of the government. I know that under Mr. Pearson's government, after we had changed some rules by committee action, the present Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), who was then house leader, piloted through the house a government motion regarding the change of certain rules. It has been done on some occasions, but most of the times rules have been changed, as Beauchesne says, by a committee which assisted Mr. Speaker, with the Clerk of the House as clerk of that committee.

You may say, Sir, that because it has been done sometimes the way it is now being done, and because no Speaker interfered, you should not do so now. But I point out to you, Sir, that we are under a different régime. On all of these other occasions the Speaker who was in the chair was a member of the government party. Impartial though each of them may have tried to be, that was a fact.

You, Sir, to your credit and to the credit of parliament, are the first Speaker who does not belong to a political party. You are a Speaker who is completely independent, and in my view you have to give consideration to your responsibility to both sides of the house.

You have to look at what have been the rules and privileges of parliament with respect to our rules and our Standing Orders. I

submit, therefore, that in that light you should find that the attempt to change the rules in this way is contrary to all of our best traditions and contrary to the principles of collectivity and consent, and you should advise the house, before you put the question tonight, that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is contrary to the provisions of Standing Order 51.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take some time to support the views put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I make no apology for taking a little time because I believe it is the most important question that we have had to face in this parliament since I first came here, and that we are likely to have to face for a very long time.

Standing Order 51 requires you, Mr. Speaker, to say whenever Your Honour is of the opinion that a motion offered to the house is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament. The rules and privileges of parliament consist not only of the written rules, not only of the decisions of the Speaker from time to time, but also of the customs and usages of parliament referred to explicitly in the rules of the British house of 1867 in so far as applicable, to our own customs and traditions.

In view of the fact that closure is being imposed I suggest that it is essential that Your Honour interpret even more generously—or to put it in another way, more cautiously—the rules and privileges of the house. I suggest that in view of the fact that closure is being imposed it is Your Honour's duty to ensure that the rules and privileges of this house are not trampled upon in the process.

Certainly it is the tradition here that changes in the rules are brought about on a broad basis of agreement in all quarters of the house. This is a tradition of long standing and, as has been pointed out, it is the only effective way in which changes in the rules can be made. The house can operate only if the rules have a broad basis of support, but in addition to the functional aspect of rule changes it is certainly equally true that the customs and usages of this house require a broad basis of support. This has been violated in the manner in which the government party is proceeding at this time.

The use of closure to force through rule changes, which are opposed by every member of the opposition, is of course an aggravation, and the use of this method of forcing through rules that do not carry the approval of a single member of the opposition is so completely foreign to the traditions of this house as to constitute a breach of privilege. If the rules can be changed in these circumstances, and if closure can be resorted to in order to implement these rule changes, and can be used so as to alter fundamentally the very nature and role of the House of Commons, then we are in a very sorry state indeed in so far as democracy and freedom are concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: If Your Honour permits this motion to be put, particularly with the background of closure, then Your Honour will have established the precedent that the majority in this house can change the rules so as to permit, if it chooses, only the most nominal consideration of legislation by this house. Backed by closure the majority could put through changes in rules which would eliminate all stages of discussion except one, and, of course, at the same time require the house to vote prescribed amounts of money within a prescribed time.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not the true concept of parliament. Surely, it is not the true concept of the privileges and rights of this house. I suggest there is a striking parallel between the struggle we are facing now and the old struggle of the House of Commons to resist the dictates of Stuart Kings—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield:—and the subsequent efforts of the Crown to control the House of Commons. It is true the government is not sending in armed forces to impose its will on the House of Commons. But clearly the government is telling the House of Commons what it must do. The purpose of this motion, enforced by closure, is obviously to reduce the powers and the privileges of the House of Commons in order that the government can in future so control the house as to ensure that it passes within a specified time all legislation listed by the government, and, of course, that it votes X number of dollars in a specified length of time.

I am not trying to involve you in the substance of this motion, Mr. Speaker, but I would point out that if the motion is put, particularly by means of closure, it becomes a precedent so ugly, so full of foreboding for the

future of parliament as to be tantamount to an attempt to subvert and destroy parliament as we know it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: If this motion can be put, sir, how far do we go before we become a chamber of deputies comparable to the kind of chamber established by General de Gaulle? How far are we from authoritarian institutions? If Your Honour puts this question tonight, supported by closure, then this house can step by step be stripped of every privilege and every authority which remains to it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: It might be said this could only be done upon the authority of a majority of members of this house. Mr. Speaker, the government, the external authority referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), controls the members who constitute the majority in this house much more effectively and much more firmly than George III was able to do with members of the British house, no matter how hard he tried.

It is true the methods are different. I am not casting any reflection on members who support the government opposite, and I say this quite earnestly, but I would point out that members of this house who support the government, as conditions have evolved, are not interested in preserving the powers or the privileges of the House of Commons. It has been said they have been silenced by the government. I do not make this charge today but I do say they are given very little by way of a role to play in the house by the government. What private members who support the government are seeking is not authority or privilege in this house, particularly. What they are seeking is a share in the power of government; they are seeking to take some part in the formulation of decisions by the government. This is what motivates them, principally; they are interested in sharing the power of government but they have not the slightest interest in trying to control the operations of the government or in exercising the powers and privileges of the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: So it really means nothing to say in these circumstances that the government has the support of a majority in the house, since the majority upon which it relies is, in the nature of things, not interested in preserving the powers and privileges of the House of Commons. Thus we have a government, with the help of its friends in the house, using a gag not simply to get a measuse through the chamber but to reduce severely the privileges of the house by compelling the adoption of some new form of closure. I do not know whether this is a new aspect of big "L" Liberalism, or what it is. I think it is a new form of betrayal, a new form of treason on the part of the intellectuals opposite. Regardless of this, sir, I say to you, as you have been reminded already today, that it is your duty to protect the minorities in this house. I should like to make a reference to a description of a great Speaker in the British house, Speaker Onslow.

> Onslows show of independence at the outset of his career as Speaker did not belie his subsequent conduct . . . The forms of proceedings, he held, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the action of ministers and they were in many instances a shelter and a protection to the minority against the attempts of power.

In view of what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, I do not need to expand upon Your Honour's role as a protector of minorities, nor does Your Honour—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is five o'clock and according to the standing order we would normally bring it to the attention of hon. members that we have to go on to private members' business. Hon. members may wish to allow the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) to complete his presentation. Is that the wish of the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the nature and the seriousness of the point which is being argued, and since Your Honour should be apprised of all the arguments pro and con—the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) obviously intends to participate—perhaps there would be willingness on the part of the house to dispense with private members' hour and continue until six o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That would be our wish, too.

Mr. Lind: I agree to dispense with private members' hour and to carry on with the business of the house now before us.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I was simply reminding you, even though it might scarcely be necessary, of your duty to protect minorities in the house. This is the issue we are discussing today. The protection of minorities

involves the very preservation of responsible parliamentary government as we have known it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Once the Chair recognizes the right of a majority to change the rules of the house without the support or approval of a single member of the opposition, and to do so by the use of closure, then we are on the slippery slope which will enable any government to destroy parliament simply by changing the rules of this house, using a simple majority controlled by itself alone. Therefore I say that a motion like this, which is put forward to change the rules without having the support of a single member of the opposition, violates the privileges and rules of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: This is not a mere technical argument. We must consider it in the light of the authoritarian tendencies displayed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and some hon. members of the government. It was a very unpleasant experience for me to sit here and watch hon. members opposite when the government house leader announced that closure would be imposed. I do not intend to use words like "fascist" and "nazi"—they are not proper and I do not intend to use them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: Watching the glee on the faces of hon. members opposite, and the obvious enjoyment they derived from the use of what I call arbitrary power, was an unsettling experience for me, and I am filled with foreboding about what may lie ahead for us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not accuse my hon. friends opposite of anything ugly, but I say it is apparent they are prepared to exercise their power to achieve any objective they wish to achieve. That has been demonstrated here. I ask, how far away are we from the kind of Gaullist government under which this house would have no real power, under which we would have government by television interview, with an election every four or six years? If this motion is put tonight, how far away will we be from that sort of government?

An hon. Member: There might even be no elections.

Mr. Stanfield: That is one question we must consider earnestly. There is an additional reason for saying this motion ought not to be put and that it violates the privileges of the house. It is admitted on all sides that this is a bad rule. I believe there are few, even on the other side of the house—and this includes even the Prime Minister's most loyal followers—who will defend the proposed rule in its present form. The government house leader has even stated that changes to it are necessary and desirable. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker. The great majority of hon. members opposite admit quite freely that the rule is unnecessarily harsh and unnecessarily restrictive.

The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) agreed that it should go back to the committee; the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) moved a subamendment saying it should go back to the committee. In all corners of the house it is admitted to be an unsatisfactory rule, and it is attributed to hon. gentlemen opposite that they realize this. They realize it is unsatisfactory. Yet they are asking the house to adopt it on the basis that at some future time it can be made satisfactory. Mr. Speaker, for the government to ask this house to adopt a rule which it admits to be bad and in need of correction is an imposition on and violation of the privileges of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Thirdly, sir, the rule is ambiguous. I argue, and I think I am right, that as it reads rule 75c cannot be invoked if all opposition representatives agree under rule 75B. I have been told hon. members opposite dispute this, that they will argue, if the point should arise, that this is not so and that they will try to convince you that rule 75c can be used if the representative of the government is not party to an agreement under 75B.

Ordinarily Your Honour leaves it to the judgment of the house to determine whether any piece of legislation or matter coming before it is clear or ambiguous. Ordinarily you would leave the whole question to the house. But, Sir, now we are talking about the rules of the house; we are talking about the rules under which this house will operate, and I say it is a violation of the privileges of this house for the government to move the adoption of rules which are admitted to be

ambiguous and which it must leave to Your Honour's interpretation. It is a violation of the privileges of this house for the government to impose this question on the house, and more so particularly, because it is backed by closure.

Only you, Sir, can now stop this violation of the privileges of the House of Commons. You, Sir, as have been your predecessors through the centuries, are the guardian of the rights of the House of Commons. When you go to the Senate, Sir, there is a ceremony in which you re-enact the assertion of your authority and parliament's authority over the Crown. It is to you, sir, that we must look for protection.

We have discussed this motion and this proposed new rule. We have negotiated, but there has been no evidence that representatives of the government had any serious intention to reach a settlement. There was no discussion until debate had gone on for more than a week. There was no discussion until the government became convinced we meant business and that debate would be sustained. When the government house leader realized this, he began discussions. May I put it this way, Sir: when Caesar returned from the west word went out that all talk must stop.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: There is nothing more that we in the opposition can do to prevent this violation of parliament—unless we are prepared to so disrupt the business of parliament that it cannot proceed. And we do not intend to do that. I did not come to parliament to destroy it. I would like to be helpful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: The rule which has been invoked is not often used. It is difficult to interpret and I regret, sir, that you have been placed in this difficult position. As a matter of fact if circumstances in the house had been different, I would have suggested that you might consider resigning as Speaker as a means of protesting against the exercise of arbitrary authority by this government. But I say to Your Honour that I believe your continuance as Speaker is essential to the continuation of this parliament. Your Honour enjoys the respect of every member of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Stanfield: Your Honour's role has not been easy in recent days. It is not easy today, and it may not be easy in the coming sessions because this house has taken on an ugly complexion. There is no doubt that feelings are running deep and strong. The tragedy is that there was no need for it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: It is only Your Honour who can save this parliament and make it constructive. It is the respect that we all have for Your Honour that will hold this parliament together. I am sorry to add to your responsibility today, but the responsibility is there.

The decision on this point is vital to the future of parliament. I believe it will determine future responsible parliamentary government in this country. I call upon Your Honour not only to declare that this motion contravenes the privileges of this house, not merely to call this to the attention of the house, but that under this rule, in Your Honour's capacity as Speaker, Your Honour should refuse to put this motion to the house because it violates the privileges of this house.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to 40 minutes of pure tribute to the rules of parliament. It surprises me that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) should exploit a point of order to secure the floor today, which they could not secure normally under the rules of this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a rule in this house against the imputing of motives. That applies not only to the remark of the minister but to the laughter from the other side. I raised this point of order this afternoon out of genuine concern for the rules and procedures of this House of Commons and for no other reason.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. minister was not imputing motives.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Surely if the minister is not imputing motives to the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) he is imputing that Your Honour is permitting something improper in this house. He is imputing something to Your Honour on which Your Honour cannot rule. That is what a Minister of the Crown is doing.

Mr. Speaker: It may be difficult to recognize that we are still dealing with a point of order relating to Standing Order 51. I invite hon. members to remember that. I reminded the hon. minister a moment ago that he could not impute motives. I am sure he will give that indication to the Chair.

Mr. MacEachen: I have not been imputing motives. I have been stating a simple fact. I am stating that under the rules of this house the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Leader of the Opposition had no entitlement to the floor to take part in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Some hon. Members: Stupid, stupid!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will recognize that it is the responsibility of the Chair to determine whether—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) sought and were given the floor for the purpose of raising a point of order. In my view much of what was said by those hon. members, was specifically to the point of order, and I would think the hope that the minister will also relate his remarks to the point of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the point of order, as it emerged from the tortuous language of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, it is that Your Honour should not permit the motion moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) to be put before this house. Your Honour was asked to take an unprecedented responsibility which no Speaker, in this or in the British house, has ever been asked to assume.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is saying today that the motion for concurrence in the report of the standing committee, having been moved already, should not be further proceeded with. The hon. member is asking Your Honour, under a Standing Order, to assume that responsibility, and he is asking Your Honour to assume that responsibility in the name of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: I just want to put this in context, Mr. Speaker. Today the member for Winnipeg North Centre is telling us that to proceed with this motion is a breach of parliamentary privilege. Last week he and the Leader of the Opposition told us if we did not proceed with it that it would be a breach of parliamentary privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: The government house leader put a motion on the order paper that might have had the effect of superceding the motion moved by the chairman of the committee. The member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Leader of the Opposition were in their places shouting that we must respect the committee system and that we must have this report from the committee.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition in his speech on the motion said that by moving concurrence in the motion parliament had scored a victory. Today the same gentleman is telling us that to proceed with the motion is unparliamentary.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: No wonder the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition and of the member for Winnipeg North Centre is wearing thin.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: No wonder there is disillusionment and cynicism about parliament when two leading members will take a position such as they took last week, and reverse it this week.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: No wonder the young people and the young members are fed up with double standards.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: No wonder they are fed up with double standards and double talk. This

motion today asks that we do not proceed with the motion they begged us last week to proceed with, in respect of which they said if we did not proceed with it it would be a breach of parliamentary principle. That is the issue. They do not read their former speeches. They are so busy with television and the press that they cannot remember what they said last week or the week before.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order—

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) on a point of order.

Mr. Baldwin: Let it be correctly known that the point raised by myself, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was not that this motion should be proceeded with but the other motion, the infamous motion put by the President of the Privy Council, should not be put. That was our position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I should remind hon. members again that we are supposedly on a point of order. The point of order has reference to Standing Order 51, and I feel abandoned in that the hon. minister is not even referring to the Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that there is in my mind nothing but the highest respect for the Chair

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEachen: In reply to the point made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), Mr. Speaker, may I read from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition which has reference to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and to this motion. The hon. member for Peace River just stated that they were fighting to oppose the motion of the President of the Privy Council. This is what the Leader of the Opposition had to say as recorded at page 11075 of *Hansard:*

> What changed his mind was that there was a motion coming from this side of the house concerning the failure of the committee chairman to move concurrence in his report as he had been instructed to do.

An hon. Member: So what?

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Baldwin: The rule of anticipation.

Mr. MacEachen: The plain conclusion is that the purpose of members opposite was to have the motion for concurrence moved—

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. MacEachen: —otherwise it would be unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the minister might be allowed to continue. It is very difficult for the Chair to hear what is being said at the present time.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I was delighted that today for the first time the British House of Commons has been reinstated in the minds of members of the opposition. We have listened to this debate for many days and for the first time today was there a reference made by the member for Winnipeg North Centre to the British House of Commons. We have heard the Reichstag mentioned more often in this house in this debate than the British house. Why is that? Because no member of the opposition can make a respectable argument about the procedures that we are proposing if they take a moment to compare them with those of the British house. So they have swept that under the rug.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre followed his point of privilege by quoting Bourinot on the principles which laid the basis for English parliamentary law. He went on to argue that it was unparliamentary and unconstitutional for a government, acting as a government, to propose a motion to change the rules of parliament. As I understand it that was the basic constitutional argument. Well, of course, strictly speaking what is before us is not a motion of the government. It is a motion from a standing committee, moved by the chairman, seeking concurrence in it. That is what is before the house, not a government motion. We could have had a government motion if hon. members had not opposed that idea. But the suggestion that it is unparliamentary, undemocratic and strikes at the basis of English parliamentary law for a government even to move a motion to change the rules drastically, is nothing but an invention from the mind of the member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we know that one of the great objectives of the new Labour government of Great Britain was to

make drastic changes in the rules of the British house. We know that Richard Crossman, who was former house leader, had as one of his objectives, when he became a member of the Wilson ministry, the drastic changing of the rules of the British house. Why are we getting points of order based on British parliamentary law? In December, 1967, Mr. Speaker, the Labour government of Britain, acting in the British parliament under English parliamentary law, brought in the timetable motion, the very heart of the proposals that are before the house now. They tightened up the guillotine that had been in operation for a long time, and which had been used by Harold MacMillan to put through one bill in all its stages in a single motion. It had also been used by Arthur Greenwood, the Lord Privy Seal, to put two bills, all three stages wrapped up in a single motion, through the house by guillotine in one day after a debate. That is the rule of the house.

But when the Labour party came in they decided a day's debate on the guillotine was too much and not necessary. They said that instead of having a full day's debate on the guillotine motion,—which in the case I cited covered two bills and all stages in one motion—"Let us make it two hours." They had their rules passed by a majority of the British House of Commons, not by consent and not by a consensus, but by a majority—a government majority which took its responsibility and put the changes into effect.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: Look at the mess they are in now.

Mr. MacEachen: Then it was apparent, and it is apparent today, that the government has to have its will. The opposition in Britain did not go crying to the Speaker to bail it out. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the impartial Speaker of the British house had very much more history to call on to safeguard independence, which is only commencing in this institution, but the British Speaker was not asked to say no, and he was not asked to take the responsibility of government.

An hon. Member: Did they use closure?

Mr. MacEachen: He was not asked to take on the responsibility of bailing out the frustrated and defeated opposition. The man who put forward the rules motion in Britain, and spoke to it, is no has been. He is still the foreign minister in the British government, the Right Hon. Michael Stewart.

An hon. Member: Let's come back to Canada.

Mr. MacEachen: He was a friend and an intimate of our N.D.P. colleagues. When the Wilson government was elected—

An hon. Member: You can have him.

Mr. MacEachen: —the gentlemen of the N.D.P. came in with their chests stuck out. They took more pleasure out of the election of Wilson than they did out of the election of Schreyer.

Is it unparliamentary to put this motion and you should not, Mr. Speaker, withdraw it? I say that on the basis of this motion you are in the same position as the Speaker of the British house, and there the motion was decided by the government, supported by a majority. They voted on the rules change proposed by the Right Hon. Michael Stewart and they debated it. That gentleman had this to say:

> Mr. Speaker, one can not run a parliament without an ultimate sanction to prevent a minority preventing the majority from getting their way.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know, after the minister finishes making such a rousing speech, whether he would like to answer a question.

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I asked the hon. member whether he was rising on a point of order, and if he is he should state what it is.

Mr. Nowlan: It was not a point of order, I rose to ask—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Nowlan: I rose in order to catch your eye and to ask for your indulgence in order to direct a question to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member of course can ask a question if the minister will entertain one, as I understand his time has not yet expired. Does the minister consent to the entertaining of a question from

the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan)?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will entertain it, but I do not know whether I will answer it.

Mr. Nowlan: I am sure he will not answer the question, but I should like to ask it. He made a rousing speech during which he referred to the Labour government in Britain which made rule changes in relation to one day and two hours. Did that government use closure?

Mr. MacEachen: In reference to closure both parties understood the inevitability of parliamentary progress in Britain. They fought and they had a vote. They did not have to apply closure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacEachen: Just to clarify that point, I do not know if there is any way in the British house to apply closure as it is applied in the Canadian house. I do not know if this is provided for there.

Mr. Baldwin: Perhaps the minister would entertain another question. Is it not a fact that the parties reached an agreement to fix the time they were to use in that debate through "the usual channels?"

Mr. MacEachen: If they went through the usual channels why would they have a debate in the house? My hon. friend remembers that last December he put a similar motion which was decided on by a majority. The opposition in Britain would not accept the proposed rules and the motion went to a vote. That is what we ought to be doing now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: You are avoiding the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hope the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) does not mind me reminding him that we are, in theory, supposed to be considering at the present time a point of order under Standing Order 51. I have the impression, which becomes stronger and stronger after listening to speech after speech, that the point of order has been lost in the shuffle.

Mr. Stanfield: Something has certainly been lost.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to support both the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in their appeal to you under Standing Order 51. I want to congratulate the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) for making a 20 minute harangue without ever mentioning that point of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Whenever this government is in trouble it brings the Minister of Manpower and Immigration out of mothballs to be its hatchet man.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Now the government can put him back in cotton wool until it is in trouble again, which will not be long.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a matter of fact it is fortunate for the minister that the government gets into trouble periodically, because then the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) notices him, and that is something he has not been doing for some time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I find it difficult to relate the hon. member's remarks to Standing Order 51.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I can understand your concern, but I would point out that the minister in his remarks, allegedly on the point of order, demonstrated the arrogance of this government. He began his speech by saying that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Leader of the Opposition had no right to speak. I took this to be not only a reflection on those two hon. members but, literally, in respect of you, Sir after all, you are still conducting the affairs of the house in spite of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if you need any direction on how to conduct the deliberations of this assembly you will be

able to get it from someone more competent than the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. This was demonstrated by his speech.

The second thing he did was to say that we have no right to be making an appeal to you, Sir, with reference to the impropriety of seeking a change in the rules of the house by closure, and a change in the rules of the house unilaterally. This government is not only changing the rules of the house by closure but the minister now gets up and tells us that although Standing Order 51 is there we cannot use it because he has decided we ought not use it. The government is not only changing the written rules, it is now changing the rules as the debate goes on.

The minister knows perfectly well that this hocus-pocus about the opposition calling for the report of the Committee on Procedure and—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —and Organization is the sheerest of nonsense. All the opposition groups opposed both the motion and the report. They opposed the report in the committee, they opposed it when it came to the house, and they are still opposing the report as is shown by the fact that the government has been forced to use closure.

We on this side of the house are not seeking to embarrass Your Honour or to place you in an invidious position. We recognize that the basic principle of parliament is that the Speaker does not offer any opinion on the substance of legislation or of a motion; that the Speaker is the arbiter of the house in dealing with matters of procedure. If this were a closure motion dealing with a bill or a resolution, as was the case with the Canadian flag, of course the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) would be quite right: we ought not to make an appeal to Your Honour under those circumstances.

We on this side of the house contend that changing the rules of the house is in a totally different category. We contend that the rules of the house are not the sole property of the government; that the rules of the house are the property of the entire House of Commons with Your Honour presiding.

An hon. Member: We are the majority.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): One hon. member on the other side has said they belong to the majority. That is exactly what we are objecting to.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Those are the members with six months' experience.

Mr. Comeau: That interjection was the maiden speech of the hon. member.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In any democratic, deliberative assembly the minority, sent there by the people of the country, has only two kinds of protection. One is the protection provided by the rules of the house, rules that set forth clearly and succinctly a member's rights, prerogatives and privileges. That is the only thing that protects a minority against an arrogant majority drunk with power. That is the only protection a minority has against a majority that seeks to impose its will. If the majority can change the rules of the house unilaterally, the rights of the minority are automatically eroded.

In this instance there has been no consensus. In this instance the rule which is before the house was brought in, supported solely by the government members on the Committee on Procedure and Organization. In the House of Commons that report has been supported solely by government members, and it is now to be railroaded through, if the government has its way, entirely by the support of government members.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If a majority can at any time use its weight of numbers in the House of Commons to change the rules, how long will the rights of the minority in parliament continue to exist? If the government unilaterally can change the rules, as it is seeking to do now, what can it do next session and the session after that?

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration said that all these fears were inventions from the mind of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). If the government can change the rules to limit debate to one day on any stage of a bill, is there anything to prevent it next session limiting the time to two hours, or limiting debate to one speaker for each party in the house? Is there any end to what can happen to the rights of private members and the rights of minorities in this house? I think we have a right to appeal to Your Honour, as we shall

eventually appeal to the conscience of the people of Canada—

Mr. Lessard (LaSalle): Be careful. You know what happened once before.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —that a democratic assembly cannot continue to function efficiently and effectively if at any time a government of its own volition can change the rules of the house, particularly if those rule changes reduce, erode and restrict the rights of members of opposition parties.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I need hardly point out to Your Honour that the real tragedy of what is happening is that no one in any part of the house wants the rules the government is now trying to ram through the house. The government does not want them. The government itself recognizes that the rules are poorly drafted, that they are unsatisfactory. It is quite possible that if a proper interpretation is put on 75B, then 75C will prove to be completely inoperable.

The government is not satisfied with this report. The opposition parties are not satisfied with it. But here is a government that is going to do violence to the whole spirit of parliamentary procedure in order to get itself a series of rules that nobody really wants, and with which nobody will be satisfied. And this did not have to happen. Continued consultation would have worked out a rapprochement. The parties were coming closer and closer together.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I shall not repeat the various statements that have been made by the house leaders. Concessions have been made by all the parties in the house, which brought them closer together. The government would have been wise to have used the methods that were used in days gone by to seek a solution. Instead the government proposes to muzzle parliament and to railroad through rule changes by closure, thus setting a precedent that can have disastrous consequences in the years ahead.

Cromwell walked into the parliament at Westminster with his soldiers and said, pointing to the mace, "Take away that bauble". This government is chipping it away bit by bit, but the consequences might eventually be the same. I heard Aneurin Bevan once say that "in Germany democracy died by the headsman's axe; we must be careful that here it does not die of pernicious anaemia."

• (5:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is the danger, not the sudden, cataclysmic destruction of our democratic rights in one fell swoop like burning the Reichstag, but step by step eroding, restricting and constricting the rights of members of parliament, until what we have come to know as a democratic parliament is completely changed and altered.

I said we had two sources of defence: The first is the rules of the house which are now under attack and the second is Your Honour, who is the custodian of the rights and privileges of members of parliament. I should like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have had the privilege over a good many years of sitting under many speakers, both in this parliament and in the provincial legislature, but I have never sat under a speaker whom I enjoyed more, for whom I had greater admiration, both for his fairness and for his skillfull handling of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Irrespective of the decision which Your Honour may make today, I can assure you that that respect and affection will continue to be held by us all. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only final recourse we have, confronted by this unprecedented action, is to appeal to you under Standing Order 51, asking you to apprise the house that the matter before us is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament.

We would not ask this on any question of substance. We would not ask this if the government were using closure to pass a motion dealing with something else, or to force through legislation. But we are contending that when the matter before the house has to do with something as critical, as fundamental, and as essential as the democratic rights of this House of Commons, we have a right to appeal to you.

In the final analysis opposition parties have only two rights of appeal; one is to you, Mr. Speaker, as the guardian and custodian of the rights of all members irrespective of party,

and we make that appeal now. The other right of appeal is to the electorate, and we are prepared at any time to make that appeal and to ask the Canadian people what they think of this dictatorial action of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, and at the risk of being unfashionable in this debate I will address myself to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He said in his argument that the issue before us now is how we make our rules, by collective action, by consent or by governmental majority. I think that was the central point of his argument. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is an experienced member of the house. He has been here a long time, since 1942, I believe.

An hon. Member: Too long.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, not necessarily too long. Of course he has had a lot of experience with the rules in the past. He knows, and Mr. Speaker you even had the opportunity to point out to the house last December, that there has been in the past more than one way of amending the rules of the house. As he suggested, there has been the decision by a committee of which Mr. Speaker was chairman. Equally, there have been decisions in the past by committees in which Mr. Speaker did not participate, and on motions by the Minister of the Crown.

The hon. member appeared to make something of the fact that in recent years we have been studying and changing the rules of the house using a committee of which Mr. Speaker is not a member. It seems to me that one should consider that if this is a bad principle now, it must have been a bad principle back in 1967 in the last session of the last parliament when, with the support of the hon. member, a special committee was set up of which Mr. Speaker was not chairman.

It must have been wrong in 1968 when the hon. member supported the setting up of the special committee in the earlier part of this session, and indeed it must have been wrong when the hon. member, as well as all members of the house, gave consent to Standing Order 65 under which the present Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization was set up.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it was not wrong on those occasions, and it is not wrong now. Parliament decided last December 20 that we should change our rules by this system.

There is one other point, Mr. Speaker. As I said, the hon. member is very experienced. He will recall that back in 1965 he was interested in and followed the deliberations of the house when it considered changes in the procedure at that time. The changes were to introduce provisional Standing Order 15A, the allocation of time rule. Was it introduced in a report by a committee of which Mr. Speaker, was chairman? No, it was introduced by the prime minister of the day with the support of my colleague and predecessor as president of the privy council.

The fact of the matter was that there are precedents both ways in this regard. If you look back to the 1965 debate you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre with his procedural agility appeared time and time again in the pages of *Hansard*, commenting on this and that, as to what was being done, and on the procedure being followed, but at no time then did he make any suggestion that because the government had introduced a motion to change the rules of the house to bring into effect the allocation of time procedure it was contrary to Standing Order 51.

I suggest that if it was not contrary to Standing Order 51 then, it is not contrary to Standing Order 51 now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we call it six o'clock and the house rises until eight o'clock, may I say that I have some doubts as to whether the debate should be continued under the provisions of the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), that is under the guise of Standing Order 51. I must say in all candour that I have the impression that if this debate is continued it will be at the expense of the Chair, and I have very serious reservations as to whether this should be allowed. I hope that hon. members will allow the Chair as to make a ruling on the point of order soon as possible.

Some hon. Members: Make it now.

Mr. Speaker: A moment ago I noticed that two or three hon. members wanted to rise. They are rising allegedly, but I am sure honestly, for the purpose of discussing the

point of order. However, at the same time, whether we like it or not, it is extremely difficult to limit contributions in this kind of debate to the strictly procedural aspects of the matter. It is perhaps natural for hon. members, without wanting to do so, to touch on the substance of the matter. This is what I am afraid of, and I really feel somewhat embarrassed by the thought that this debate might continue until one o'clock tonight always inviting the Chair to make a ruling ultimately at one o'clock. If it is the wish of hon. members I can make a ruling immediately, after which the debate will continue on the motion before the house.

• (6:00 p.m.)

A few days ago the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was kind enough to say that he intended to raise this particular point of order and since then, as I try to do in every such circumstance, I have given serious thought to the points he has raised. I came to the chair armed with many books and precedents from this parliament, from the British parliament, and even from other parliaments. I have Beauchesne, Bourinot, May and the Standing Orders with me, as well as a long prepared opinion which I reached as a result of my studies in the quiet of the Speaker's chambers.

I wonder whether it is necessary to go over the details, the procedural details of the situation. I say, perhaps with a bit of sadness in my heart, that the debate we are having now is, as I said a moment ago, at the expense of the Chair, though no hon. member wants that, neither the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), nor the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) nor any of the others who have taken part in the discussion. But in a situation such as this, which is so close to a partisan situation, I do not see how we could have a debate of this kind without the Speaker being in some way involved in partisan considerations.

What we have, according to my limited comprehension of such matters, is the report of a committee. Some hon. members have said, and no one doubts it, that the report is the report of the majority. At the same time, we do not have in our parliamentary system minority or majority reports; we have the report of a committee which is before the house for adoption or rejection.

What hon. members would like the Chair to do under the provisions of Standing Order 51 is to substitute his judgment for the judgment of certain hon. members. Can I do this in accordance with the traditions of Canada, of Britain and in all parliamentary systems where the Speaker is not the master of the house, in spite of what Standing Order 51 says? The Speaker is a servant of the house. Hon. members may want me to be the master of the house today but tomorrow, when, perhaps in other circumstances I might claim this privilege, they might have a different opinion.

It would make me a hero, I suppose, if I were to adopt the attitude that I could judge political situations such as this and substitute my judgment for that of certain hon. members, either a majority or, perhaps, sometimes a minority. But I do not believe that this is the role of a Speaker under our system. I am not prepared at this time to take this responsibility on my shoulders. I think it is my duty to rule on such matters in accordance with the rules, regulations and Standing Orders which hon. members themselves have turned over to the Speaker to administer.

I have a set of rules, and precedents by which I am guided. I recognize it is my duty to protect the privileges of hon. members and to protect minorities. I have always tried to do this, and I shall continue to do so. But I do not think that in the circumstances I can go so far in abandoning my responsibility as a servant of the house as to be its master and to give a ruling or judgment along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I am not saying I accept in any way the procedures which have been followed, though I do not think it is for me to express at this time an opinion in this regard. I would only say that after sincere thoughts on the matter in accordance with my way of looking at the situation I cannot accept the suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre under the terms of Standing Order 51.

I hope hon. members will realise that this is not an easy decision for the Chair to reach. I hope I shall never be placed in a position again in which I have to make this kind of decision. I count on hon. members on both sides to ensure that the Chair is not again placed in such a position.

It being five minutes past six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Speaker.]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the good will evident in the house at this moment. I have a few minutes left. Your Honour will recall that last Tuesday evening I mentioned that you might have an increasingly difficult time in controlling this house in future because of the breakdown in rapport and confidence between the two sides of the house which has been brought on by the government's closure action and because of the Prime Minister's negative attitude and disdain for the house. Little did I think that today, less than 48 hours later, I should see a minister of the Crown, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen), actually call Your Honour's actions in question and thus challenge your office.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Thompson: He not only questioned your judgment, Mr. Speaker, but he had the audacity to imply that Your Honour actually went beyond your authority in allowing the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member had been here at six o'clock he would recall my suggestion that this debate should be conducted in a way that will keep the Chair out of it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might keep that in mind.

An hon. Member: Rewrite your speech now.

Mr. Thompson: I respect your position, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, it was not a pleasant experience this afternoon for one who listened to the minister and realized what was taking place.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Thompson: I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned about what is taking place in parliament as the result of the government's unilateral and arbitrary decision to limit the length of debate at its own will. Again, I emphasize that parliament cannot be subservient to government, no matter what party forms the government. That is where hon. members opposite have gone off the track. Rules governing this parliament are not the prerogative of the government. They are the responsibility of parliament itself. The rules of this House of Commons belong to this House of Commons and the government uses these rules to obtain the consent of the house for the legislation it wishes to introduce. If the rules are to be satisfactory, and be of general benefit, they must be arrived at as a result of consensus. We must all consent to them, especially if parliament is to remain the voice of the people and free.

By utilizing these rules the government is able to function and carry out its specific responsibilities. I only wish that the Prime Minister and hon. members opposite had this thought more clearly in focus. The house leader and others on the government side say that because their party forms the government, they must control the house. They say that they have the majority in this house. The government may have the majority of seats in this house but it does not represent the majority of electors in this country. It represents about 45 per cent of our people and those who sit on the opposition side collectively represent about 55 per cent. That shows why the rules of the house must be arrived at as a result of agreement in the house, because we must safeguard not only the minority but also the majority.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think that the majority of government supporters are behind this measure, Mr. Speaker. In today's Toronto *Telegram* I read that Ontario Liberals have protested against the government's closure. The article reads in part—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired unless he has the unanimous consent of the house to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I gather from the negative response in the house that we shall be deprived of the pleasure of hearing the rest of the hon. member's speech.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you will no doubt recall that it was agreed last Tuesday that I be given an extra few minutes to make up for the constant interruptions from the government side. I wonder if I might have those few minutes to enable me to finish my remarks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am now taking that into account and I am sure that all hon. members will agree to allow the hon. member an extra minute.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I quote a few sentences from the article to which I referred?

> A mass demonstration was planned for today outside the Provincial Liberal headquarters—
>
> More than 3,000 pamphlets were being handed out to the public, protesting "the threats which now seem to be posed to parliamentary and participatory democracy—"
>
> Rule 75c in its current form is extremist and we believe it does not reflect the views of any political party in Canada, including the Liberals.

I conclude by saying that this is indeed a dark day for parliament and participatory democracy.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): This debate, Mr. Speaker, is no longer concerned with the subject with which it commenced some two weeks ago. It has strayed considerably. At the outset of this debate, the issue before you, Mr. Speaker, was the desirability or otherwise of adopting a technique for the allocation of time to legislative debate. That, however, is no longer the issue. The issue has been changed by the opposition parties who allege that more is involved than mere procedural reform, that at stake in this debate is nothing less than the role of parliament itself.

The opposition parties contend, and they have repeated this contention again and again, inside the house and out, that the opposition possesses the right to debate, and by debating indefinitely delay passage of any legislative proposal for as long as the opposition desires;—

Mr. Monteith: That is completely wrong.

Mr. Trudeau: —that if this so-called "right" is impaired—

Mr. Monteith: Again, that is completely wrong.

Mr. Trudeau: —parliament itself will be injured. Parliament will be destroyed. This is an important, if novel, contention, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the opposition's efforts to publicize it have been successful. I hope that all concerned Canadians are acquainted with such a theory. For what has been put forward, and claimed by the opposition as non-negotiable principle, is a series of propositions for which no precedent exists elsewhere and for which no need has been shown here.

Parliamentary democracy, as defined so far in this debate by hon. members opposite, becomes something other than a system which gives to the majority party in the House of Commons the right to ask parliament for some decision upon the legislation the government deems necessary in order to carry out its mandate to the people.

Parliamentary democracy is not, according to this opposition definition, a system which permits the majority party to demand a vote on the proposals it seeks to incorporate into statute as solutions to the needs of the nation.

These views, Mr. Speaker, are, if nothing more, highly original, and if accepted by the government would revolutionize political theory. I should hesitate to accept them, however, without knowing more about them. Where in this scheme, for example, lies the responsibility for legislating, Mr. Speaker? Apparently nowhere. In its place we are told that parliamentary democracy no longer means government by the majority, with adequate protections for the rights of the minority. Instead, it seems to mean that a minority of the members of the house have the right to block for indefinite periods the wishes of the majority of Canadians as expressed in general elections.

• (8:10 p.m.)

If this be the opposition's view of what democracy is all about, it is fortunate that the people of Canada have been given this opportunity to learn of it. If the opposition accords so little respect to parliament that it defines governing as evil, that getting on with the job is regarded as tyranny, then I am happy to be given the chance to join issue. When the people of Canada returned this government to office they gave to it the responsibility of governing. We accepted that responsibility. We shall gladly leave to the electorate the assessment as to how that responsibility has been discharged during our term in office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We leave to the electorate as well the assessment of which side of this house respects parliament more, that which engages in repetitious speeches that serve to deny the passage of legislation indefinitely; perhaps that which chooses on occasion to play games with the rules or hide-and-seek in

the lobby curtains and then counts the result as a great tactical victory; or that which asks only to get on with the nation's business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: We have been told here, Mr. Speaker, that the government's view of parliament is wrong, that the possibility of endless debate is laudatory and that we are impatient and arrogant. Canadians are being told, in effect, that in the view of the opposition the world has stood still since 1867 and that the Canadian parliament should do the same.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: We do not accept that view, Mr. Speaker, nor do I suggest, do Canadians. At this point in time, with social structures in greater ferment than on any occasion in history, with scientific achievements of fantastic magnitude, with concepts and applications of concepts so complex and revealing as to stagger and refute previous economic and demographic truths, at this time in history legislative institutions which fail to reform themselves do so at peril of their own destruction.

[*Translation*]

What has this government done in this session of Parliament to lead the opposition to charge that we are guilty of emasculation, of garotting, of assassination, of all those colourful phrases that have been sprinkled through *Hansard* these past days? What indeed?

Here are some of the Parliamentary reforms which have been made this year.

First, we have participated fully, Mr. Speaker, in implementing the wise proposal that the office which you fill with such distinction be separated totally from party politics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: We have in addition provided, for the first time in the history of this country, large sums of money to the opposition parties to permit them to employ their own research staffs and so be better able to fulfill effectively their proper function of examining and considering government legislation, of pointing out weaknesses and proposing, if necessary, alternatives. But this is not all. This government has been the first to provide to the opposition adequate and regular opportunities to bring into this House matters of debate of its own choice. The importance of this latter provision cannot be over-emphasized.

Hitherto, apart from supply motions which were generally concentrated in one or two short periods each session, the opposition has been able to control totally the topics discussed during debate on only two occasions: during the Throne Speech debate and during the debate following the presentation of the budget. In short, the opposition had had few opportunities in the past to choose the subject of debate.

For these reasons the rule changes introduced and passed by Parliament this year are outstanding achievements of which we are proud.

We are told that we are bent on muzzling the opposition, Mr. Speaker, but from now on, under the reforms which we have proposed to the house, of approximately 160 or 170 sitting days in a reasonable parliamentary year, 8 days are to be occupied by the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, 6 by the Budget debate, and an additional 28 are earmarked for the business of Supply and are allocated as opposition days, to be distributed throughout the sitting year so as to permit the opposition at frequent and regular intervals to challenge government policy on points of its own choosing. This means that 42 days in each session—approximately 25 per cent of the session—are days controlled by the opposition.

I think it proper to observe, Mr. Speaker, that in the current procedural debate, the opposition has chosen either not to mention at all, or to pass very lightly over the introduction of this important parliamentary safeguard. Far from fettering parliament, this government has moved further than any in the history of Canada to assure to the opposition regular and adequate opportunities to attack the government's record, and we have given them the means, Mr. Speaker.

Are these the acts of a government which is seeking to destroy parliament, to muzzle the opposition? Are these the acts of a government which has no respect for the principle of debate? To ask the question, Mr. Speaker, is to give the answer. To ask the question puts into proper perspective as well the accusations of the opposition in this debate. It serves to emphasize the contrasting attitudes to Parliament assumed by the opposition and the government. It illustrates for all Canadians just what little respect is shown for Parliament by an opposition making such exaggerated charges.

It is normal in any legislature that bills must often be given priority by the government, not because of their importance, but because of their urgency. What happens in Canada but not elsewhere is that if unreasonable debate delays passage of such urgent bills, then the important ones may never be dealt with at all. The result is that a form of closure is introduced not by the government but by the opposition; closure of government business by exclusion of it from the Commons' order paper through the lack of time to deal properly with it; closure, Mr. Speaker, by frustration.

Every democratic assembly requires some procedure for turning discussion into decision. In the parliaments of the United Kingdom, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of India, there are procedures for bringing on decisions. It is simply non-responsive to this need to say, as hon. members opposite interject from time to time, that closure is available. Closure is indeed available. It is available as well at Westminster and available in most other parliaments. But it does not in these places stand alone. It does not stand alone because its very clumsiness, its time-consuming procedures, demand that it be used only infrequently.

For instance, what happened in the house yesterday and up until now shows how precarious a measure closure is and how inefficient it can be at times.

At the report stage of the Omnibus Criminal Code Bill, for example, closure would have had to be moved approximately 30 times, exhausting some 60 sitting days, almost 3 months, in order to deal with all amendments. We must not forget that the rule of closure cannot be applied to proceedings of standing committees which, therefore, can extend the debates over a very long period of time if not forever.

For this reason, closure is complemented elsewhere by other techniques, in the British House of Commons, for example.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Every democratic assembly recognizes that issues will arise from time to time which the minority in all conscience cannot accept, which the minority in order to be true to its values must oppose vigorously and never concede. This is right and proper. It is one of the bases on which rest our democratic institutions. No doubt the allocation of time rule which we are debating now is one example of such an issue which the opposition feels it must oppose vigorously and forever. But that base of having a right to speak is not the only base. It is complemented by periodic tests of the will of the electorate to give to the people at large the opportunity to pass judgment on the acts of the majority, and on the attitude of the minority. In a democracy the ballot box, not the filibuster, is the ultimate and appropriate technique of assessment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Recognizing this principle, Westminster, the so-called "Mother of Parliaments", has survived its own adoption years ago of a time-allocation rule. If that bastion of free debate continues to flourish, what weight should the people of Canada give to the present opposition cries that a rule be voted on in reasonable time. In addition, the opposition must be given reasonable opportunity at regular intervals to bring before the house those matters of complaint about government actions which it feels must be aired in public. Prior to this session, the rules of parliament did not offer adequate opportunity for either of these things to be done. The rules, as already changed by this government in the earlier part of this session, have given to the opposition the right which it should have had a long time ago. What the government now seeks is nothing more than a right which it needs equally as much and which has been recognized as deserving and reasonable by most parliamentary institutions in the world.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: There is yet another perspective to this debate, Mr. Speaker. In dozens of newly independent countries democratic legislatures are now being tested to determine whether the parliaments now in existence elsewhere are credible models. If we here hope to serve as evidence of the ability of a parliamentary system to adapt and to adjust, to serve better the needs of a changing society, better than any authoritarian structure, to be relevant to the demands made upon it, we must not deny the need for change, nor refuse to accommodate that need. Perhaps most important, we must not eschew techniques which have proved successfuly elsewhere.

In this case we propose the adoption of a procedural rule which has been in use in the Mother of Parliaments for many years, a rule which has proved useful and necessary in the British House of Commons during that period

and which no one here can say has in any sense circumscribed the democratic effectiveness of the opposition parties there; a rule which has been employed by both Conservative and Labour governments of Britain and which has been retained without repeal through several changes of government. Nevertheless and notwithstanding this need, notwithstanding this precedent, notwithstanding this evidence, we are still told by the opposition that this provision will destroy parliament.

Really now, Mr. Speaker! It is not this provision which endangers parliament, but rather such inaccurate talk as will lead Canadians and others elsewhere to doubt the ability of the parliamentary system to work honestly;—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: —such inflated accusations as will cause Canadians and others to lose faith in parliament as a means of conducting the legislative business of this and other countries.

The landing this week of a man on the moon is vivid evidence of the speed of change in men's lives. In a timeframe of less than seven decades in length, a period shorter than man's biblical life span, man has ceased to remain earthbound and has reached out into his universe with a skill and a success that promises future change at an even more bewildering a rate of acceleration. If this parliament, which is charged with the responsibility of assimilating these technological changes into legislation for the benefit of Canadians, cannot keep pace, then Canadians will seek other institutions which are capable of doing so. We have no choice. Parliament is not inviolate to rules of nature. It must be relevant. It will adapt or it will perish.

This government has revealed to the people of Canada how it chooses to be adjudged. I do not hesitate to declare again the confidence of my government in the future of Canada, in the future of Canadians, and in the future of this parliament of which we are all so justly proud. This proposed change will not weaken parliament, Mr. Speaker, it will strengthen it and permit it to accomplish the great tasks of nation building which devolve upon it and which now demand attention. These rules, Mr. Speaker, are needed now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I can tell hon. members in the house that I listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Far more than government members ever did.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not claim the status of the Prime Minister in this house but he was given a very careful and respectful hearing and I think other hon. members should be given the same careful and respectful hearing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: I was saying that, like all hon. members here in this house, I listened to the Prime Minister with great interest. It saddens me to say this, but I think in all honesty I must say I have seldom heard a speech which contained such a complete distortion of the position of the opposition.

The Prime Minister stated that the position of the opposition was to claim the right, and he used this word, to "indefinitely"—and he did use it a number of times—indefinitely delay the debate on legislation. That is an utter, complete, unfair and conscienceless distortion.

Even before this Prime Minister came into this house, and before he joined a political party, there were members in this house—I was one of them, and there were many others—who spoke in this house and all across Canada about the need to change the rules of parliament to make it more efficient.

The reason for that distortion was evident in some of the other things the Prime Minister said. In fact, there was a twofold reason. The first was that he knew the present rule which he has placed before the house is indefensible, autocratic and unworkable. The second reason is that he made such an extravagant distortion of the position of the opposition that he had to defend against the fact, and it is a fact to which I will come back in a minute or two, that all the parties in the house were beginning to move toward a position of accommodation when he, and it must have been he because he is the power in the Liberal party, said there would be no more negotiation, there would be closure—this is what they will take and nothing else.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I deny utterly, not only in the name of my colleagues, the members of this

party, but in the name of other members of the opposition as I am sure they agree, that we wanted unlimited or indefinite debate in this house. The Prime Minister said that if you have extravagant debate you will lead people into thinking that the parliamentary system cannot work honestly. I suggest that he has a duty to be honest in his statements in the same speech.

The Prime Minister has not been in the house for much of the debate, except in the last couple of days when he was apparently waiting to rise in his seat, but he must have learned, even though he was not here, that every spokesman for every opposition party declared himself on behalf of his party ready to arrive at a scheme of allocation of time and limitation on time for debate.

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Lewis: It is absolutely true and if the Minister of Economic Regional Expansion (Mr. Marchand) says it is a lie, I tell him the lie goes right back into his mouth where it belongs. I am not going to pursue that because that is not what this debate should be about.

Let me say briefly, because my time is limited, that members should recall, along with the people of Canada, that a committee worked, not only in the last few months but for a few years before this session began, to change the rules and improve the procedures of this house. As a result of that work by the committee of this house and as a result of its recommendations—not as a result of the Prime Minister and the Liberal party—it unanimously proposed to this parliament a new way of dealing with the estimates and allotted days. This was not a decision of the government or the Prime Minister, it was the result of the work of a parliamentary committee.

Furthermore, and the Prime Minister has probably forgotten this, there are now 28 allotted days, but immediately before this change there were 38 allotted days for the consideration of estimates and non-confidence motions. Two, three or four years before that, there was unlimited time for the consideration of the estimates in this parliament. Those changes, I repeat because of the arrogance of the Prime Minister, were not the result of action on the part of this government, but the result of recommendations of an all-party committee that unanimously decided on this action.

This committee laboured hard. The members could not arrive at a unanimous decision in respect of the entire rule 75. What did it agree upon? Let us realize the importance of this? I will come back to my attitude in a minute, if I have one left.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: We were worried about that.

Mr. Lewis: I can only say touché; I meant if I had a minute left. This committee agreed on 75A and 75B. What does that mean? That means an attempt by the parties of parliament to limit the time of debate. It means the rights formerly held by individual members of parliament, including the right to squeeze the government, if you like, for as long as the rules of parliament would permit until they got something for their constituencies or something that their electors sent them to this house to get, would be completely lost under 75A and 75B. It means that no individual under these rules could get up and refuse unanimous consent. Under 75A and 75B an individual member would not have the right to interfere with the progress of the house—not a single member or indeed ten, twenty or fifty members. This right would be withdrawn because the measure would be decided by a vote of the majority of this house. This was what was given up and agreed upon.

The Prime Minister has gone a step beyond this with 75C. Negotiations between house leaders and the President of the Privy Council resulted in some concessions. The official opposition made a number of concessions and accommodations. We made suggestions for accommodation, and I would like to deal for a minute or two with them.

We said to the government, and I was not there but I am sure that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) presented this fully and carefully to the members of all parties, that we appreciated the debate on second reading is a debate on principle and that the principle could be stated and discussed in a couple of days, just as well as in four or five days. We admitted that the third reading stage is the apex of the entire process, and that when the clauses of the bill have already been passed this could be dealt with in a couple of days, but we said this cannot apply to the report stage.

We have upgraded the committees of this house, and instead of the committee of the whole we now have the report stage. As I

have said and I repeat, it is utterly unreasonable to try, ahead of time, to limit the debate at the report stage. How can you do that? The present rule, as I understand it—and I will be corrected if I am wrong—is that if there is no amendment on the order paper at the report stage, there is no debate at all.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Right.

Mr. Lewis: Whether the debate should be half a day, one day, two, three, four or five days obviously depends on the number of amendments on the order paper, and not only the number but their importance, the weight of the issues with which the amendments deal. It is utterly stupid, to use an adjective the Prime Minister used in another connection much less reasonably, to suggest in a rule that you will limit debate during the report stage, when the report stage of every bill is an entirely different thing. In one case it may require no debate at all; in another case it may require a debate of an hour or two; in a third case it may require a day, and in a fourth case it may require five or six days, without delaying anything but dealing as honestly and as briefly as possible with the ideas of hon. members which they have the right to place on the order paper for the consideration of parliament.

We said to the government we would agree to a limitation of time on all the other stages, but the report stage should be removed from that limitation. It was possible to discuss the matter further. If the President of the Privy Council had not, on the orders of the Prime Minister, a cabinet committee or the cabinet, I do not know which, closed off discussion, I am certain that some accommodation would have been found. Personally, I felt that if we could not agree upon removing the report stage from 75c, a sensible way of dealing with the matter would have been to place the matter in the hands of Mr. Speaker of this house. In the light of the number of amendments that are put on the order paper and which he now has the duty to consider and decide whether they are in order, to group together wherever grouping is reasonable, and the duty and right to defer votes wherever that was good for the progress of the house, Mr. Speaker could have been given the authority, perhaps after consultation with the house leaders of the various parties, to set a reasonable time limit on debate, bearing in mind the weight of the amendments. This would have been a perfectly reasonable accommodation which would have been made if the government had not been determined to put this stupid, unworkable rule on the order paper.

I agree with the Prime Minister that parliament will not go to pot by the introduction of 75c. The people of Canada will make sure that in the future there will be the kind of government in this House of Commons that will protect parliamentary and democratic rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I said that I wanted to say something about my own attitude. I tell you frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I do not get excited about rules, as some people do.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: I do not think that one particular rule or another will do this or that, in the long run, for the Canadian people. I do not have a technocratic approach to this question. I do not think we will settle the problems of Canada and the Canadian people by setting up a framework and believing that everything else will magically fall into place. This seems to be the belief of the Prime Minister. I do not believe in that kind of thing.

All the time we have spent on this question would not have been worthwhile if it were not for the fact that the government would not even look at the rule which the committee report proposes and see how stupid and unworkable it is, how it is designed to invite chaos in future sessions of this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: We are not discussing limitation of time in the abstract; we are discussing a particular rule which is before us. Rule 75B provides that if a majority of the parties in the house agree on something, there is an agreement.

An hon. Member: Brilliant!

Mr. Lewis: Unless there is no agreement, 75c cannot be imposed. I would, as a lawyer, be prepared to bet a great deal on whatever reputation I have in that realm that if the three opposition parties wanted to agree every time, they would produce an agreement under 75B and the President of the Privy Council would be unable to say to Mr. Speaker, "No agreement has been reached with regard to this piece of legislation". The government recognizes that.

I have tried hard to understand the government's position in this respect. I have listened to a great deal of the debate and read much more of it in *Hansard*. Why should the government have insisted on closure and on ramming this meaningless, unworkable rule down the throat of parliament, thereby inviting chaos in future sessions of this parliament? Would the Canadian people have lost anything if the committee had been asked to study the matter further and bring in a rule that made sense? Would the Canadian people have lost anything, would this parliament have lost anything, if we had adjourned and the government had taken the time to clean up this rule and to make at least the changes which the President of the Privy Council said must be made? I suggest that the answer is obviously no.

It would have been a sensible, responsible attitude of any government and any Prime Minister who did not believe in his divine right to govern and were not determined to impose their will on parliament, though that imposition made no sense even from their point of view. They were just going to show the opposition who is boss here. I can see no other purpose. When I look across this aisle from time to time—I say this not too offensively, I hope—and observe the disdain with which the Prime Minister treats parliament, and the way he looks at us in the opposition, I often say to myself: There but for the grace of Pierre Elliott Trudeau sits God.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: He sits there stern and severe, Mr. Speaker. Why do this to the house? Why create the atmosphere which is here now? What does participatory democracy mean, if I may use that favourite phrase? Does it mean merely the possibility of some people saying something some time at the will of the Prime Minister or a minister of the crown? What are our young people in Canada crying out for? Are they crying out merely for the opportunity to have a meeting—

An hon. Member: They are not crying out for you, anyway.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Are they crying out merely for an opportunity to have a minister of the Crown, the leader of my party or the leader of the Conservative party appear at a meeting to speak to them? Participatory democracy, in any genuine sense, means giving people an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process of the country, giving them an opportunity to feel that the environment in which they live is one they have helped to fashion. Apply that to this parliament. Are not the members of this house as entitled to that kind of participatory democracy as anyone else in Canada? Is it not our duty to be a part of the decision-making process of parliament? And is a decision made merely by a vote? Surely, not!

• (8:50 p.m.)

Surely, it is a most simplistic and idiotic idea to say that a decision is made only by a vote. The process of decision making is more complicated than that. It is an exchange of ideas. It is listening to other proposals. It is producing a program which emanates from both sides of the house. This is what is now to be in the hands of the government alone under rule 75c. That is why we say it is a bad thing.

Many years ago I said at a meeting in one city in the country that in my view the days when parliament was a bear pit where the government and the opposition faced each other in battle are gone. Nowadays, parliament has more positive things to do and must play a more constructive role.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is most difficult to hear the hon. member's speech when there are these interjections.

Mr. Lewis: I think I can say without immodesty that, perhaps on many occasions in this parliament, I have shown that not only do I believe in the constructive work that must be done in parliament but I think I have participated in it. I think I can point without shame to my participation in the parliamentary committee dealing with collective bargaining for the public service and I think I can point without shame to my participation in the special committee on the official languages bill, to mention only two things. But I do not believe that the constructive work of parliament can be done by an unenforceable law. Every law which is not enforceable is a bad law. I do not believe that the constructive work of parliament can be done if the government is to have every right in its hands.

Mr. Speaker: I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member but his time expired a few moments ago. He can continue with the agreement of the house.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is agreement.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: It is difficult for the Chair to ignore the negative voices. I regret to say that the hon. member cannot continue.

Mr. Lewis: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will ask again whether the hon. member has the agreement of the house to continue.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I shall point out that I represent the constituency of Témiscamingue, not that of Villeneuve. In any event, I would hate myself if I did not say a few words at this time on the new Standing Orders proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and by the government.

I was listening moments ago to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) telling us about the great kindness he had shown the opposition. He said, for instance, that considerable amounts of money had been made available to opposition parties in order to facilitate research, to study legislative proposals, to find their weaknesses, so as to better discuss them.

On the other hand, the Prime Minister says to the opposition: from now on, debate on this or that bill will be restricted to so many days.

He makes me think of someone who takes the opposition members for school children to whom one gives candy to win them over. I saw once a man trying to break a horse in a corral; he did not show the halter, he hid it behind his back and held a dish full of oats in his hand to get the horse to come to him. Then, as soon as the horse started to eat oats, he put the halter on it.

That is about the way the Prime Minister is trying to treat the opposition. We are being offered a dish of oats and then the halter, in the form of rule 75c.

Mr. Speaker, for the last two days the Prime Minister has been busy repeating on local and national news casts, on CBC radio and television, that the opposition parties are talking drivel, that the opposition members are drivelers who are merely trying to keep the debates going interminably, wasting the time of the house, and so on. But if there are drivelers in the house, they are not to be found in the opposition but there on the government side.

The government is trying to impose rule 75c, and I will tell you exactly why. The opposition of the Ralliement Créditiste to the omnibus bill to amend the Criminal Code, on which the Prime minister had set his heart, is the reason why the government is now presenting rule 75c. And after that, they will come and tell us that the rights and privileges of the opposition parties are not interfered with. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) even said, and I quote:

> —I do not expect hon. members to accept this. On the other hand, surely they cannot expect me to encourage a system under which a small group of members would control the activity of the house.

Mr. Speaker, our purpose was not at all to control the business of the house, but to take enough time to arouse public opinion in Canada and to enable the people of Canada to express their views to the government. This is what displeased the Prime Minister and this is why he will not forgive the Créditistes their fight against the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is no concern of the Prime Minister's. If the official opposition or the New Democratic party wages a fight against a bill, it does not behoove either the Prime Minister or the government to decide when that party will lay down its arms. It will fall, however, to the Canadian people to decide whether that political party abused public confidence, or the privileges of the house; when election time comes, the people will have their say. We have seen examples of it before. In 1964, we voted with the government of the right hon. Mr. Pearson, to impose closure at the time of the famous Canadian flag debate, and the one who opposed the most vigorously the Canadian flag, the right honourable member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) shocked not public opinion but his own followers to the extent where they replaced him as soon as they were able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to the people to decide whether or not a party deserves its confidence.

Let us go back to the great pipe-line debate in 1956: the one who fought to get the bill through, former minister C. D. Howe, lost the following election in 1957, in the riding of Port Arthur, to a young New Democratic

teacher, Douglas Fisher, for having moved closure.

Mr. Speaker, it is public opinion which threw out the right hon. C. D. Howe. It is also public opinion which rejected the Liberal government in 1957, and elected a Progressive Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the responsibility of a political party or a government to impose rules such as standing order 75c which they want to ram down the throat of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, drivelers are not all in the opposition. There are some on the government side.

As far as extending the debate on the omnibus bill, the Canadian people will judge us in that respect. We fought in earnest. We fought with conviction and I cannot see why a government would now want to practically render the opposition powerless to carry on the struggle.

If we do not have the right to take the necessary time to arouse public opinion about a bill, what is the use of parliament? Why not resort to standing orders 75c and 75d in order to abolish all opposition parties?

The Prime Minister boasts about the fact that he gave us 28 days to blame the government but what bills can the opposition introduce in the house? We can criticize the government for a day or for 28 days but that does not change the legislation. The government alone has the right to prepare and introduce legislation. Now it practically takes away from us the right to discuss that legislation when the time comes to do so.

The government talks about improving parliamentary procedure. But the closure rule is nothing new. I heard the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) say the other day "We will almost never use section 75c." Then, why include it in the standing orders of the house?

Opposition parties were willing to accept sections 75a and 75b, but not 75c which constitutes a permanent closure rule. Tonight we are witnessing, I repeat we are witnessing the last hours of parliamentary democracy. With standing order 33, they want to impose on us a permanent closure rule, known as section 75c.

Mr. Speaker, if that is democracy as the Prime Minister understands it, it is a democracy that strangely resembles what I saw in Moscow a few years ago and what is to be seen now in Communist China, under Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. Speaker, when debates are hindered, when the opposition is prevented from expressing its views, as I said a while ago, what is the use of an opposition? The Prime Minister said that a minority cannot impose its views on a majority. Therefore, must we always submit to the majority, refrain from discussing government measures, be content with receiving the allowances the Prime Minister says he has granted the opposition for research work, and then have no longer the right to debate anything? We are being gagged with section 75c.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition parties are not the only ones protesting against Standing Order 75c. I was reading today various Canadian newspapers—not Conservative, Progressive or N.D.P. papers—but papers of a certain intellectual standing that are against Standing Order 75c.

I have before me an editorial from the Montreal *Gazette* of July 24—it is not so long ago—and the writer warns the government against the passage of Standing Order 75c.

Finally, let us reverse the roles somewhat. If the Prime Minister were sitting in the place of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), what would he honestly say about Standing Order 75c? He would fight against the government that would want to muzzle him.

Well, we have the right to fight the government who wants to muzzle us. We do not accept closure and the government will not impose it upon us tonight, at one o'clock. I quote this editorial:

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

If that parliamentary majority approves of what the government proposes, then democracy is in action and must not be hindered. This doctrine, however, omits something which is essential. The government is very unlikely to receive critical review from its own supporters—

[*Translation*]

We have only to look in front of us to see that members do not rise often to criticize the government. They cheer at random, they howl because they are held up and caught, because they are put on the spot, because they have to do it, because they are afraid and it is with such spineless followers that an

appeal is made to democracy in action in a country like ours.

[*English*]

The government is very unlikely to receive critical review from its own supporters, least of all in parliament. The majority which approves its proposals in parliament is a highly regulated majority. It is subject to all the pressures and penalties which any government in power may exert to regulate its followers.

Look at the regulation!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: They are regulated under the regulations of the party in power.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, about the stab that is to be given at one a.m. to the right to debate in the house, I say that many who will vote in favour of this rule, will regret it in a few years. But, then, it will be too late. We are being sucked into one-sided decisions. We are moving towards we do not know what. The Prime Minister, to conceal the perfidy of rule 75c, talks to us about the men who have travelled to the moon.

I wonder why he did not join those travellers to the moon a few days ago, but for one way only.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of closure was first applied on April 24, 1913. A debate had lasted from December 12, 1912, to April 10, 1913. At that time, the Conservative government applied the rule of closure. It was applied twice in 1917 and, then, was not invoked for four years.

The closure rule was applied by the Borden administration in 1917, on third reading of the Canadian National Railways bill.

It was applied a second time when the War-time Elections Act was being considered. The war in question is that of 1914-1918.

It was applied again in 1921 by the Meighen government, in connection with interim supply.

It was also applied in 1932, by the Bennett government during a debate on unemployment. Mackenzie King said on that occasion that it was "the most arbitrary and most coercive measure a government could enforce." He expressed the hope that it would not be considered as a precedent.

His 1969 successor is trying to show us the bright side of a system that is gagging us, of a system that presents us from saying what we have to say. The goes on merely repeating that the opposition members are always making the same speeches and always singing the same tune.

It is sometimes important to repeat a speech when people do not understand or refuse to understand. Again I say that rule 75c could have been entirely discarded as recommended or suggested by the opposition. Rule 75A and 75B were enough. We would have gone on discussing here in the house while allocating reasonable periods of time for the consideration of government legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today it is a so-called Liberal who is applying the closure rule and who wants to make it permanent with this section 75c of the standing orders.

In 1956, it was applied four times in the space of 22 days by the Liberals during the pipe line debate. On May 14 1956, the Right Hon. C.D. Howe gave notice of the motion and on May 15 it was adopted. On May 30, prime minister St-Laurent gave a similar notice in the course of the debate on the bill to establish the crown corporation known as the Northern Ontario Pipeline. On May 31, the Right Hon. Louis St-Laurent had the legislation passed on quite recently, on December 14, 1964, the present solicitor general (Mr. McIlraith) took the same stand on the sixth report of the flag committee.

This measure always tends to cut off protracted debates.

Standing order 33 states that no member shall rise to speak after one o'clock in the morning and that the question should then be put.

Tonight, at one o'clock, the vote will be taken Mr. Speaker. We said what we had to say, we said what we thought and I think the government had in hand everything required to make progress in the business of the house.

Indeed, citation 88 of the fourth edition of Beauchesne reads as follows:

Let us now briefly indicate the influence directly exercised by the leader of the house on the course of business.

—of the house. In the present case, it means the President of the Privy Council.

It is his task in the name of the government and the party in office, to distribute over the session the programme of legislation announced in the king's speech and to advocate it in the house.

That is the responsibility of the house leader of the government.

He assumes the duty of proposing all such motions concerning the agenda of the house as are deemed advisable by the government and is their spokesman in the debate thereon.

When a bill is brought before the house, it becomes almost the sole responsibility of the government house leader. It falls to him to introduce a priority bill or one which is more important than another. And that is what the government has failed to do in the past. The government has failed to introduce the most urgent bills, the most important ones to deal, for instance, with Canada's economic problems.

We have been fighting for three weeks over section 75c while the number of unemployed is increasing in Canada, while the wheat problem has yet to be solved in the West even if $250 million have been promised and while the problem of milk production has not yet been solved in eastern Canada. So, our economic problems are not settled, but bills are being introduced so that the members of the house will spend four or five weeks discussing them.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council is the one responsible for this situation.

• (9:10 p.m.)

As for the government bills, the house leader decides in the last resort the course to be taken. Indeed, he decides the period of time allotted for each stage of the debate and the putting through of closure, as he did this evening. He is asking hon. members to pass a provision to put through permanent closure or other means to shorten the debates and to bring matters to a successful issue.

The entire behaviour of the government, especially to the extent where it concerns the internal life of the house and the bills which are proposed, is centered on the person of the house leader. Moreover, when progress in the house is slow, the responsibility lies in the first place with the present President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement Créditiste will continue to fight, not for partisan purposes, but in order to give Canadian citizens the maximum results they expect from the administration of national affairs.

We will keep on calling for necessary economic reforms. The Canadian people do not need rule 75c but rather the implementation of effective and urgent measures which will bring results for the entire population. It is for this reason that Canadians elect a government and representatives to the Canadian Parliament. It is not only to give the government the exclusive right of proposing

motions, legislation or rules in order to annoy everyone instead of clarifying the situation.

The Prime Minister is well aware that if he proposed to the house some workable economic reform, such reforms would be agreed to by the house and would attract public opinion. What is the use of going to western or eastern Canada and telling the people: We do not have any money. This is not a solution to the economic problems or today.

If the Prime Minister can find the billions of dollars needed to co-operate in all kinds of international programs aimed at assisting other countries, I think the government's first duty is to run the nation's business as the people expect it to.

Mr. Speaker, our position has been clearly set out in this connection. In fact, my colleagues rose in turn and stated the position of the Ralliement Créditiste with respect to rule 75c which amounts more or less to a stab in the back of Canadian democracy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) speaking a few minutes ago I thought of Jonah in the whale. It was dark inside there for Jonah and the whale had swallowed quite a mouthful. As I listened to the Prime Minister's facetious sophistry about the minority wanting to frustrate the majority in the debating of legislation, I thought the Prime Minister felt a little sick and I was on the point of sending him over some Alka Seltzer.

Mr. Woolliams: If the Prime Minister can't take the heat he should get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Nowlan: The Prime Minister is now leaving the chamber. I did not realize that his stomach was so upset that he would have to leave the chamber when I rose to speak. Perhaps I ought to take some Tums to help my tummy, because as I listened I began to feel sick myself. I was upset that the principles of the just society had been subverted within one year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: It is no wonder that hon. members opposite were caught out of their seats not long ago. As you may remember, there were not enough government members present to constitute a quorum of 20 members. Why was that, Mr. Speaker? They are following the Prime Minister's example; since

being elected leader of his party, he has made few contributions to debate except for statements made on motions. Immediately after routine proceedings are finished he gets up and leaves the house for other business, supposedly. In fact, since being elected to this chamber in 1965 he has made few contributions in this chamber. We were both in the same class that was elected here, so to speak, only he advanced, perhaps too quickly, because he has not learned what parliament is all about. I will not quote from his few contributions in this house. Having been elected in 1965, he first became a parliamentary secretary and then took the highest job in the land. Tonight, having made his contribution to the debate that some experienced parliamentarians say is the most important debate that will come up in the life of this parliament, the Prime Minister has left the chamber.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The opposition is united, man to man, as no opposition has been united since I came to parliament in 1965. We are in favour of change; we are in favour of the majority taking its responsibility on legislative items. But let there be no mistake about this, Mr. Speaker. The just society now means "just numbers". If you have a majority of numbers you can put anything through. The opposition, having agreed to rule changes in 1965 and in December of last year in addition to agreeing to adopt proposed rules 75A and 75B which, if adopted, would mean that there would be little likelihood of a filibuster, now stands united as it has never been united possibly since 1956. Not only did the Prime Minister swallow his principles today; but the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) has suddenly been resurrected to contribute to the debate for the first time in seven months. The last time he used his recognized talent for debate was in the rules debate last December. He has been on notice since then. He was resurrected, gave a definition and perhaps will not be heard from after this debate.

• (9:20 p.m.)

We, on this side, are left with this man who talked about dialogue, participation and communication. He has destroyed the meaning of all those words by misleading, mistating and misrepresenting the opposition. The opposition is in favour of change, in favour of the majority ruling on legislative items and of assuming its responsibility under closure, but this, Mr. Speaker, is closure on a closure rule of this institution.

In the criminal sense this is not only rape, but it is indecent assault compounding the act of rape. Dialogue is no longer the word. It is dictate! Participation is no longer the word. It is now program or programming procedures. Communicate is no longer the word. It is closure when you cannot get your own way by any other means.

This is a sad day for parliament, Mr. Speaker. I was elected to this house in 1965. I shared some of the aspiration of the many new members who came into this house after 1968. There are 64 new members opposite, 17 in our party, 9 in the New Democratic Party and 6 Créditistes. This makes a total of 96 new faces in this parliament. I am in a little better position to judge this debate than the 96 new members because I was in the class of 1965, as was the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I came into this house at the end of an old era which was moving off the political scene. This was the era of Mr. Pearson and Mr. Diefenbaker, both of whom contributed much to Canada.

We now have two new leaders, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Stanfield. This was to be the new age. I shared with those 96 new members the hope and anticipation that there would be a new day. When I listened to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) and the Prime Minister in his straining of logic and reason—he is supposed to be a man of logic and reason—trying to justify an ill-conceived rule which had been improperly drawn being forced upon a parliament in an autocratic and inexcusable manner, I came to the conclusion that the era of 1965 was a piece of cake compared to what it is going to be in the years ahead. That is, unless the government minimizes, clarifies and retreats from Rule 75c which is not a legislative item.

This is not a reasonable use of closure. It is the first time I have heard of closure being imposed on a debate on rules changes. After all the energy and animation used by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration this afternoon in telling us what dear old merry England was doing and how debate in that Parliament had been shortened from one day to two hours, I asked the question, was closure used? The minister knew the question was coming, and yet he never answered it He could not answer it. All I can infer from his convoluted answer, which I know is correct, is that they did not use closure to ramrod the new rules into that parliament. I do not

want to waste the limited time I have pointing out the differences between England and this country. God help us if we are to be like England, with the troubles they have now, let alone the troubles they have in their parliament! We have yet to throw things back and forth or come to fisticuffs. If the condescending, autocratic, arrogant manner displayed in the last few days continues in this parliament for the next few years, we may have to behave in that manner.

By this arbitrary act of conflict and confrontation, we are beginning a period which could well stamp the 28th parliament as the sad and sick parliament. Why? We did not make it that way. The government brought in Rule 75c. The reason the opposition has been united, man for man, as it has rarely been united before, is not because of any one act or bill that the government has brought in about which the opposition feels so strongly. There may be such bills in the future. It is because this whole procedure has been so necessary. It has betrayed the hopes and aspirations of all of us that there would be a new day in parliament and there would not be conflict and confrontation.

The only conclusion I can reach as to why we have this dilemma and why there is this conflict and confrontation is that there is a fundamental difference in the concept of parliament which is predicated on two thoughts that have run throughout this debate. The first is the divine right of the majority to rule on any issue, even the rules of parliament itself. These are not the rules of government, they are the rules of parliament. The word "participation" has been replaced by the words "program and programming". I will not waste too much time talking about the philosophy of the divine right of the numbers game, the majority always rules, the majority is right. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and others have belaboured that.

The Prime Minister, in a debate a few years ago, suggested that the government is the master of the house and the majority governs. I will not dwell too much on the fundamental fallacy of a man coming into this chamber and saying, "we are the masters of this house." No matter how *Hansard* might try to clarify that statement, I was in the house and heard the Prime Minister say it. I agree the Liberal Party was elected to be the government. They were given a mandate to lead. There is not a piece of legislation to which they can point in this 28th parliament and say that the opposition held up this item on the order paper.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: They won an election, Mr. Speaker, but the point is no man is the master of this house. This afternoon, in an agonizing moment on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, said he was not the master of the house, but a servant.

Every member has equal stature in this house. Because a government wins a mandate, they cannot say they are the master of the land or the master of Canadians. They happen to be the government with a mandate to govern. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker. There is no other institution like this in Canada. It symbolizes the heart of this nation. The members in this house personify a cross-section of the Canadians we represent in occupation, religion and geography. We in this house represent all Canadians, including native Canadians and those who have been discriminated against. The two members who came to this house in 1968, the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) and the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) help us to represent all Canadians. This is what parliament is about.

Among the members of this house are lawyers, doctors, engineers and professors. There are also silly Canadians, stupid Canadians and bright Canadians. Sometimes in this chamber when members do not agree with the point of view of another member, they say it is a silly or stupid speech. We symbolize and personify 20 million Canadians. That is why it is sometimes hard to swallow that the Prime Minister, who was immersed in a classroom and had a protected existence for many years, finds it difficult to appreciate and listen to all types of speeches in this house. At times I can sympathize with him. But, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed that that same Prime Minister could call something which is fundamental to the rules of the house a stupid filibuster after only 10 hours of debate and after six Liberal, six Conservative, four N.D.P. and two Créditiste members had spoken, a total of only 19. That is when the Prime Minister said it was a stupid filibuster. On the same day, he said that 80 per cent of the question period was hypocrisy. The fear of the opposition is that if he will make such a statement with so little proof, who is to say this man would not say that 80 per cent of the debates in this house are hypocritical and wasteful. Who is to say that in a few years he

will not say that 90 per cent is hypocritical and wasteful, and on as little evidence.

• (9:30 p.m.)

My time is moving so fast I can hardly believe it. The other point it has to do with programming, and I am speaking about the President of the Privy Council. Because we personify people, any government that tries to program people will run into the kind of conflict in which we are now involved. You can legislate, organize, consult, compromise and co-operate with people, but you cannot program people. That is the fundamental fallacy of the Liberal government's position. You can program a computer, but this commons has a long way to go before it will become a computer. I can only hope, in the months and weeks before we meet again, this government will appreciate that while we can organize, consult, conciliate and compromise, so long as it tries to use this idea of programming, we will run into conflict. Look at the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). I agree with a lot of things he says. Only yesterday he told us about the rights of collective bargaining. What is the ultimate weapon when the parties cannot come to terms? It is the weapon of the strike. I suggest there is an analogy in his domain.

The Minister of Labour is against compulsory arbitration because he says it takes away from collective bargaining. He has a very valid point and he agrees with me. I say, on a like principle, that in the parliamentary process, 90 per cent of which is dependent upon co-operation or agreement, if there is an insurmountable conflict, then the only weapon the opposition has—it is not the numbers game—is prolonged debate. You can call it what you like, but it is prolonged debate. That is as essential, I suggest, to the parliamentary system as the right of strike is to the collective bargaining and labour-management system. Any parliament or government which fails to recognize that will be in trouble.

With the rules of relevancy Mr. Speaker and with television right outside this chamber, the time limit in respect of debate will automatically be reduced. There is no reason whatsoever to even attempt to have this autocratic 75c. The sad thing is that the scar tissue—let no man doubt this—which has been created by this debate will fester in the ensuing sessions unless some people come to their senses. Some names have been called. I shall not adopt a name calling attitude. I am afraid we have come too close to the philosopher king concept in respect of 75c. I refer to the government's position that they are the masters and they will govern. Plato, in his "Republic" developed the philosopher king idea. It might have been an efficient way to govern, but it is not the democratic way to govern. So long as we have this philosophy permeating this government this scar tissue that has erupted will grow.

It is a strange paradox that the man who swept in on a tidal wave just a little over a year ago, in this age of consent, by communicating with the young who are so bothered about the establishment and the rules their fathers had, is not going to pay homage to these acts of consent but is going to cut off the right to debate in this supreme parliamentary chamber, this parliament which personifies the people of the land. There is not a provincial legislature which has this rule. I look across the way and see some hon. gentlemen who have been mayors and councillors.

Rule 75c is not a legislative bill. It represents the right of the government to predetermine how long we will debate a matter. It is this to which we object. Any mayor who ran for office on such a program would be defeated. There are many members here who have contributed their services to school boards. Any school board chairman who tried such a program would be tossed out of office. The university councils and the senates of the universities, which the students are trying to storm, would be in a state of constant uproar such as we have had in the past few days if such a thing were tried.

If anyone wonders about co-operation or compromise, they have only to look at the charade of yesterday when the rules were used to their full maximum. Things bogged down.

In my closing minutes I should like to refer to excerpts from the New York *Times* of November 26, 1922 in the days of Mussolini. There is a heading, "Rome (by wireless to the New York *Times*)." Then there is a headline, "Near Dictatorship given to Mussolini". Following that there is a subhead, "Premier Dominates House". Then there is a sub-subhead entitled, "Wrings Vote of 275 to 90 from Weary Members". I should like to read this report:

> By 225 votes to 90 the Mussolini Government tonight received from the Chamber full powers to adopt any measures it thinks best in all matters pertaining to bureaucratic and financial reforms. These full powers are valid up to Dec. 31, 1923—
>
> The Mussolini Government can now proceed with all the reforms it advocates, quite unhampered by

parliamentary considerations. But at the same time the full weight of responsibility is thrown upon the Ministry—

—Premier Mussolini ... said "We ask for full powers because we wish to assume full responsibility for all our actions."

The entire afternoon in the Chamber of Deputies was spent in the discussion of the bill granting to the Government full powers for bureaucratic and fiscal reforms. At nine o'clock tonight Deputies on all sides of the Chamber, pleading that they were hungry and tired, asked that the sitting be adjourned to Sunday but Premier Mussolini rose and said: "I prefer that the discussion be concluded tonight."

The Speaker asked for a vote on the subject whereupon all the Deputies ... that desired adjournment approved of Mussolini's suggestion amid considerable hilarity.

Socialist Deputy Modigliani complained about the haste in closing discussion.

"The Chamber should be at least allowed to make its testament before being killed", he declared.

Deputy Chiesa said he would have preferred a full detailed program of what the Government intends to do if the Chamber granted full powers.

"Vote against the Government and be done with it", cried the Premier. "We don't need you."

My closing remark is not that we have come to the situation which existed in the days of Mussolini, because I do not believe this will happen in respect of 75c. I say, however, the end has come to the bright start of the 28th parliament. There is no doubt about this. This parliament will not die. There will be other members here in time. The unfortunate thing is that, although parliament is not dead, this marks the end of the beginning of the brightest prospects we have had, with some of the brightest members who have been elected to parliament. We now have the beginning of a parliamentary confrontation and conflict that will not do justice to and will not enhance this parliament. Mr. Churchill, many years ago, said that democracy is the most inefficient form of government designed by man but it works. That is the way this parliament has worked. In the name of God, Mr. Speaker, if men can land on the moon why can men not work together, debate together, consult together, co-operate together and compromise together in this institution? This is the only way parliament can function constructively in this day of change, as it always has functioned in the past.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the government house leader is probably now sitting in the position in which he is in order to control the work of the Clerk's office.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan).

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, as all sides of this house—

An hon. Member: Take your foot off the chair and stand up like a man.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: And put your purse down on the floor.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I do not claim the respect that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) receives, and I do not claim even the respect that the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) received, but I would appreciate the opportunity to be heard.

As all sides of the house acknowledge, yesterday and the day before have been sorry days in this house. This has been a shocking and frightening debate carried out at a low level. On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker was on his feet more often than the speakers from the floor.

There have been several low points in the debate. Perhaps the lowest was the speech by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), who is unfortunately not in the house now. I hope there is no other speech in the records of this house that is as low.

Another low point came from a surprising source. It came from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He laid before Mr. Speaker yesterday a series of considerations and arguments that the rules would permit, and indeed authorized, a procedure whereby without any intervening business the Chair might be obliged to entertain a series of motions for adjournment at fixed times—at perhaps 10 minute intervals. This novel proposal, which Your Honour indicated had never been argued before to your knowledge, would allow any five members of the house who could command a standing vote to prevent parliament from ever considering legislation again.

Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, was a great relief, because I read the rule in question and I could see the possibilities. This submission was not worthy of a man who loves this institution, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre does, and who has given his life to it. It was not worthy of that hon. member.

The final feature of the last two days on which I want to comment as a foundation for the points I should like to make is the demonstration we have had in the last two days that closure, in its 1913 variety, will no longer work against the style of dissent which we encounter these days. Then, if time allocation is appropriate, which is what I want to discuss, a new method is required. The proposed rules 75A, 75B and 75C are, generally speaking, such a measure although they would not apply to debates on changes in the rules. The question is, are the rights of parliament and of members of parliament really dead as a result of 75A, B and C? Is participatory democracy over? Have the rights of hon. members been extinguished? This is what I should like to consider.

On Tuesday night the member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) observed that parliament was just as much a place for the opposition as it was for the government. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said this afternoon, that the right of the opposition was equal to the right of the government in the house. I go further than this and say, in a special sense, that parliament is more the opposition's place, and that in some respects the opposition's role is more important here than the role of the government.

I could sum up the difference by saying that the opposition expresses itself and performs its functions in this chamber; the government, on the other hand, expresses itself in its legislation and in its administration, not only by what it in fact achieves by way of a legislative program, but by way of what it fails to achieve.

We can talk in this chamber around the clock and around the calendar. Government members can produce the most beautiful speeches you have ever heard. Every member of this chamber can speak for 20 minutes or 40 minutes on every section of every bill. We would then have participation which would make ancient Athens look like a police state. But with such a forum, the government would not be giving this country what it wants; it would be failing the Canadian people.

This country is changing and the government has to respond as best it can to these changes. There is in this country a growing sense of fairness, a growing openness, an increasing humanism, a growing respect for privacy, a growing concern for poverty, a growing distaste for militarism and a growing trend towards urbanization. The government has to meet this mood. Whatever good the members of this house do in this chamber will not satisfy the Canadian people if the government of this country has not provided good administration and good laws.

The opposition has no such responsibility. Sometimes the opposition will propose a policy alternative; sometimes they will suggest improvements to legislation. I agree that the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) often has done this, but the opposition has no such responsibility. If the government fails to govern or governs badly until the next election, normally that is no reflection on the opposition.

As a result there are two perspectives on parliament. Parliament serves more than one function. To the government, it is part of the process by which its legislative proposals are enacted. To the opposition it is a place to criticize government administration and to let the public know about government failings. It is a place for proposing amendments, not so much to have them accepted but in the spirit of showing that if the opposition were the government the legislative proposals would have been perfect to begin with. This is fair enough, it is our system.

A dangerous proposition which the opposition has lately advanced is that when the opposition proposes legislative changes the government has to compromise in order to have its legislation passed. I am not referring to compromises relating to the rules, I am suggesting that the opposition argues for the right to effect compromise in the substantive legislation program. As one opposition member put it, "we must have freedom in this institution to express differences and resolve them", with the suggestion that resolving our differences might take longer than ten days in the case of what he called bad legislation.

I firmly agree and all hon. members surely agree that there should be freedom to express differences, but I dispute that such differences have to be resolved here. Canada's differences will never be resolved and should never be resolved. This country with its diversity—cultural, religious, regional and economic—can never be governed by concensus, and any effort to try can only lead to frustration and inaction. The search for concensus is one way in which the public is informed of the differences between the parties, but I would be suspicious that if concensus were obtained on this measure or on a great many measures, that it would mean that all the interests in the country and all diverse points of view were not being effectively represented here.

This principle that concensus should not be our goal was wisely recognized by the fathers of Confederation and inserted in the B.N.A. Act as section 49, which says:

Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a Majority of Voices—

I would think that the B.N.A. Act would take precedence over the interpretation of the rules being alleged by the opposition. The concensus principle if accepted would be a tool by which any minority party, however small or regional or doctrinaire, could force its will on the majority at the price of deadlock. And yet, this is precisely the substance of the argument of the member for Winnipeg North Centre.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) this evening advanced a different proposition. Perhaps that was his own point of view and not his party's because the position which has been taken all day and all through this debate by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is clear; he is arguing for consensus.

Mr. Stanfield: On rules.

Mr. Kaplan: I shall come to the question of the rules. I do not think there is very much difference between rules and other matters.

Mr. Stanfield: You can stick to the facts, anyway.

Mr. Kaplan: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre does not feel that the majority should have power to move forward until the minority agrees.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Kaplan: I will at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker, if I have any time left.

Why should the minority agree? As I say, it might in certain cases have to betray its minority supporters in order to agree. Why should it do this? Such position is simply not tenable. Parliament should be a place where a variety of views may be expressed loud enough and long enough for the country to hear; but it must be a place where legislation is considered and passed. It can never be, and should never be, a place where varying views must be resolved as a condition precedent to passing legislation.

There have been some strange noises in this debate.

An hon. Member: We are hearing the strangest one right now.

Mr. Kaplan: One of the strangest is the effort of the opposition to distinguish between procedure for rule changes on the one hand, and procedure for passing laws on the other. Attention is being concentrated on the fact that this is closure to create time allocation, and that closure is different when it deals with substantive legislation.

This is a distinction which is absolutely without a difference, more particularly because this rules debate deals with the question of time allocation. A failure to obtain the allocation on this so-called procedural matter would constitute failure to have time allocation on substantive matters. Mr. Speaker ruled before dinner that there was no such distinction in finding that although the resolution in question related to a report on rules; it was for Your Honour's purpose and the purpose of the house, like any other report, notwithstanding its content.

Standing Order 33, which deals with closure, makes no such distinction. All these questions are simply questions relating to resolutions whether dealing with rules or legislation. The British North America Act makes no such distinction.

This is an opposition that wants us to enact only what they call good legislation. With respect to bad legislation they want the right to veto. As a matter of fact, they now have the right to veto, and they want to keep that right. That is what this debate is about.

Mr. Stanfield: It is not what this debate is about.

Mr. Kaplan: This basic strategy is being masqueraded as a special concern for rules, which they allege deserve special treatment.

When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has spoken on this question in the past, he has talked in terms of a big legislative program and restrictions on our time, about planning, efficiency and the recognition of priorities. The opposition has called this the sausage factory approach. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) used a similar expression this evening. But in addition to all the arguments one can raise about efficiency, planning and priorities, there is a question of principle. Is this country to be governed by negative veto, by a minority special interest group in this country or even, to follow the line of reasoning tendered to

Your Honour by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, by any five hon. members who would invoke repeated adjournments until they got their way; or is this country to be governed by majority rule?

A great deal of talk has been directed to the government's alleged unwillingness to compromise. I was not present at the negotiations and can only take note of the statements of the house leaders. Some of the Conservatives who attended the meetings, to their credit, accepted the principle of majority rule in regard to time allocation and seek only a longer period for debate. I would have thought that under those circumstances a compromise would have been possible. But the N.D.P., as the hon. member for York South has indicated, do not accept majority rule at the report stage. If there is no majority rule at the report stage, there is no majority rule. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the tyranny of the majority. But is that worse than tyranny of the minority?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kaplan: It has been suggested that these hot, political, controversial issues be referred to Mr. Speaker who would determine the time to be allocated. This is obviously unacceptable.

The most difficult opposition argument to answer is that this rule is entirely satisfactory to no one. There has been the suggestion that further negotiation might lead to what the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) called rapprochement. This might happen with the Conservatives, but never with the N.D.P. if they insist as a precondition that consensus prevail, because if it is to prevail in respect of the rules, it will prevail in respect of all our business. There is no difference between consensus in respect of the rules and consensus in respect of anything else.

The answer that satisfied me on this point was made in the house yesterday by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), who affirmed on behalf of the government that it would honour the package deal compromise which it offered in its negotiations, and that it would be prepared to see the rules changed to that effect. As I said, that satisfied me.

Mr. Stanfield: It does not take much to satisfy you.

Mr. Kaplan: In its pursuit of the consensus principle the opposition has introduced a theme, which was stressed again tonight by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley, which can only be described as a sort of blackmail. Speakers from all parties have stated repeatedly that if the rules cannot go their way, no business will be transacted in this chamber.

Mr. Forrestall: That is a harsh criticism of 1,000 years of democracy.

Mr. Kaplan: The hon. member for Annapolis Valley this evening said there is a scar tissue which will fester unless the government changes its position. What clearer threat could there be than that? There have been dozens of statements to this effect: if the opposition does not get its way, to hell with the majority, to hell with the business of the people. This is an interesting way of protecting a democracy. How does yesterday's performance differ from smashing computers at Sir George Williams University?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kaplan: How do these threats differ from throwing bombs in Montreal? No property was damaged here, but parliament was damaged.

One of the speakers in this debate said the other day that an opposition does not put the government out of power; the government puts itself out of power, and the opposition just puts the government out of its misery. If that has been true in the past, the next round may be, perhaps for the first time, a case of the opposition keeping itself out of power, reducing its constituency and doing itself real damage by its undemocratic approach to the procedures of this house.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Kaplan: I will entertain a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Barnett: I listened attentively to the hon. member because I thought he was trying to make a constructive contribution. Does he know of any other organization to which he has belonged wherein the constitution and by-laws are subject to change by a simple majority vote?

Mr. Kaplan: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. And, the constitution of Canada provides for changing the rules of this house by a majority vote.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question. All I wish to ask him is this: Is he honestly prepared to say that he would recommend the adoption of this rule by the house in its present form as a good rule?

Mr. Kaplan: With the undertaking of the house leader to make certain changes, yes.

Mr. Stanfield: I wonder if the hon. member would answer the question I asked him in simple and straightforward language. That is all I ask. Is he prepared to recommend to the house this rule in its present form as a good rule which the house should adopt?

Mr. Kaplan: The hon. member will see me vote for the motion, and that will express my feeling about it.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) would like to put a question. I might again point out to hon. members that it is not the usual practice to have a protracted question period following a speech by an hon. member, and I invite the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby to put his question briefly.

Mr. Broadbent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. member who is about to speak. The reason for putting my question is that I enjoyed the contribution of the hon. member opposite which I think was a very thoughtful and constructive contribution to this debate. I agree with his argument to a very substantial extent. It is a serious point to which I would like an answer. I do not wish to be argumentative. If I understood him correctly, he said at some point that the majority should have the right to determine not only substantive legislation but also the rules of the house. In fact I am in agreement on this point, but would the hon. member agree—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. As I pointed out originally, I think it is a bad practice to allow a series of questions following a speech made by an hon. member. There is no provision for it in the rules. It is left to the discretion of the Chair and the courtesy of hon. members. Although I allowed hon. members to pose questions, I would not like this to be the pattern in the future. Therefore, I invite the hon. member to put the question immediately.

Mr. Broadbent: Would the hon. member agree that the provision that there should be a period no longer than one day for the report stage under the proposed legislation is sufficient for an important piece of legislation?

Mr. Kaplan: This would depend generally on the bill, but I do not think this would necessarily be one of the sticking points in the negotiations. It is the principle that is the important thing and it is the principle that is not acceptable to the hon. member's party.

Mr. Stanfield: The hon. member is just as evasive as his leader.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker, in the ebb and flow of debate that has been going on in this house for so many days, and in the ebb and flow of public opinion as expressed in our news media, the radio, the T.V. and the press, I had hoped that this debate would end by the meeting of reasonable men arriving at a conclusion I had hoped the government would be reasonable and adjourn this house or withdraw that part of the report which we find so obnoxious, namely rule 75c, so that we could adjourn the house and go home. Then, I would not have to make this speech tonight. However, I, along with a lot of other members of this house, have had the opportunity and the privilege of welcoming hundreds of young people to these beautiful parliament buildings, to these marble halls and to this attractive green chamber throughout my period in this house. I have been always proud to show them this building in all its beauty and magnificence. I have heard members of this house explaining to our visitors the traditions, privileges and rights of this place and what it stands for

However, this place in which my remarks are being made tonight is sometimes referred to as that funny house, that place, and this debate in which I am taking part has been called a stupid filibuster. I have a feeling that there are some people in this area who would like to see these walls come tumbling down, like the walls of Jericho. This could happen. It has happened before in democratic countries where irresponsible people let their rights and privileges be chiselled away. That is what is happening tonight; one of the privileges of free debate is being interfered with in this house. Sometimes I wonder if a time

will come when members will be as proud as they are now of this particular chamber. It is rather interesting to note that the very chair in which Your Honour sits is made of wood from the roof of Westminster Hall and from Nelson's flagship. Westminster Hall is that great English hall where the law courts of England sat for so many years and from where many of our great laws and traditions were handed down.

This is a place of freedom, as is indicated by the accoutrements that we have here, and as such we should revere it and be honoured to be members here. We should stand on guard to prevent anybody from destroying our rights and democratic privileges.

It is with a feeling of nostalgia that I enter this debate tonight because my memory goes back to a few years ago when an arrogant government majority tried to curtail debate in the house, as will be done by the use of rule 75c. In 1955 an arrogant government tried to change a piece of legislation on which there had been a time limit of three years. I refer to the emergency powers legislation of 1951. In 1955, the government of the day thought: Why worry about a time limit? Let us change this legislation. What did they want to do? They wanted to extend those wartime emergency powers by removing the time limit on the legislation, thus giving the government arbitrary powers over every segment of our economy in peacetime, the same as had been necessary during the war years.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that I take part in this debate with nostalgia because the debate to which I referred was instituted by a man who was a great Canadian. As an administrator during the war years he had done much to unite the whole Canadian economy in an all-out war effort. He brought together the economic forces of our farms, our manufacturing agencies, our mines and our forests into a unit which helped in the second world war by supplying food, munitions, clothing, lumber, and all the things necessary to support our forces and to help feed, clothe and supply a great many of the components assisting our allies during that terrific struggle.

• (10:10 p.m.)

I say this with a feeling of nostalgia, because that man bore the same name as myself; he was referred to tonight by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), and his action at that time was the beginning of his downfall and of the downfall of his own party. I refer to the late Right Hon. C. D. Howe. He was something like our Prime Minister today who last session coined the phrase "We are the masters of this house." The Hon. C. D. Howe coined the phrase: "If we want to get away with it, who is going to stop us?" Mr. Howe did not like the House of Commons. We find this feeling exemplified today. As I said in my opening remarks, it would appear as though some would like to see the walls of this place torn down. There were days when those on the government side derided us in opposition, saying "Let the people decide". Well, in 1957 the people did decide, and in 1958 they did so even more emphatically.

The defence production debate left such a bad taste in the mouth of the Minister of Defence Production that he made up his mind to bring in some form of closure immediately debate was instituted in the following year should there be objection to his proposals. This is what he did. How similar this is to the situation which now faces us. The government of the day was forced to withdraw its 16A proposal before Christmas. Then, in the closing days of the present session they bring in a report which if adopted would create an untenable position for the opposition. It is interesting, too, Mr. Speaker, to recall that the debate to which I referred earlier took place in 1955, 20 years after the Liberal government had been elected in 1935. Today, just one year after its election, the Liberal government is trying by all the means available to it to force measures on the house which would destroy democratic principles by curtailing debate, by taking away from parliament the opportunity to debate an important issue long enough to make the people of Canada aware of the implications of a particular piece of legislation or to provide an opportunity for a vigilant press and a vigilant public to examine thoroughly each piece of legislation presented to it. This is of the utmost importance, Mr. Speaker, as is pointed out in an editorial which recently appeared in both the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* and the Guelph *Mercury*. I should like to quote from one of these editorials. It is headed: "Voter Feedback Important in Commons Rules Debate."

> If, as seems likely, Parliament is headed for a prolonged and bitter battle over proposed rules changes, events will be guided to a large extent by public reaction.
>
> "Feedback from constituencies," is the way most MPs describe this. The feedback, in the form of letters, telegrams and telephone calls, pours into the offices of MPs whenever Parliament bogs down on a major issue.

No doubt the government thought that since this was holiday time the people of Canada would not be interested in the issue. They thought they could rush this through. They were wrong. Public opinion has been aroused, as editorials in most of our newspapers tell us today. Most of us here could cite many examples of cases in which public reaction has been important, and in which legislation has been improved by opposition amendments and criticism. I could refer to the Canada pension plan which was brought in and pulled out like a yo-yo. Even now I sometimes wonder whether the government realizes that this was one of the factors which produced the present inflationary period—and the problems which inflation has created particularly for all those who have to live on fixed incomes and old age pensions.

I might refer to the transport legislation which was presented at one session, withdrawn, and presented again at a subsequent session so amended that its final version bore little resemblance to the original except that it did provide a very rewarding job for the then minister of transport. I might also cite the drug licensing bill which in its original form did not contain the safety measures suggested in the Harley report which contended that the people of Canada were entitled not only to cheap drugs but to safe drugs. Many of those present can remember what happened when this bill was first presented. Arguments were repeatedly advanced by the opposition that measures for greater safety should be incorporated in the bill, while the then minister of consumer and corporate affairs persisted in indicating that the legislation under the Food and Drugs Act was adequate. Suddenly, after the debate had been going on for several days, the minister himself came over to the opposition saying: Keep it going; we want it to die tonight. Which it did. The legislation was not brought forward again during that session and when it did reappear this session, it incorporated the measures for which we had asked.

Had 75c been in force at that time, and had the government been adamant about passing the drug licensing bill, I wonder whether the cheap drugs which could have been brought into Canada under the legislation would have been subject to an adequate examination so as to ensure the good health of our people.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, there was the case of the estate tax. I do not need to remind the house how unrealistic this legislation was,

or how great was the feedback to every member of parliament when those implications were understood. As a result, the government was forced to change its stand. I contend that had 75c been in force at the time very little opportunity would have existed to make the press and the public aware of the extent to which this particular piece of legislation was unrealistic, taking into account the present inflationary pressures.

It has been said that the government opens the house with the Speech from the Throne indicating its legislative program for the year, but that the opposition closes it after examining, criticizing and proposing amendments to government legislation and expenditures. This is the situation which has existed almost from the time of the first parliament, but today we are debating a proposal which gives the government the right to shut off debate, to shut up parliament, almost at will. Is this what the people of Canada want? Is this what government backbenchers want? I have participated in seven parliaments and in each there was a group of members who felt the rules needed revision. I was not a member of the committees which took part in this procedure, though I was of the opinion, as they were, that the rules of this place could indeed be improved and amended. I should like to congratulate all those who, in the past, in a friendly and amicable fashion, have been able to reach conclusions in this field without situations developing such as that which has developed here today. Never before has a government waited until the last two days before a recess, whether at Christmas, at Easter or in the summer, before bringing in a report containing an item such as 75c which would destroy all the privileges and rights of this, the highest court in the land. On whom is the onus? May I refer to an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* of Tuesday, July 8—and goodness knows, the Toronto *Daily Star* has never been a strong supporter of the Conservative party. I quote:

• (10:20 p.m.)

Canadians who take their politics seriously will applaud members of Parliament who are prepared to debate proposed changes in House rules at length, regardless of their shortened holidays. Rules are the stuff that democracy is made of. They permit governments to govern; they protect opposition parties from being ignored. Where you put the accent all depends upon which side of the Speaker's chair your party sits.

Then it goes on to say:

What's wrong with the existing closure rule, which puts the onus wholly on the party elected

to govern? Or, better still, closure at one or more of the debate-stages of a bill's passage? No government is likely to forget the people's anger when closure was used during the Pipeline Debate. A deterrent was created there, and before any government overrode the opposition it would have to feel certain it had the people behind it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the onus in the present debate is on the government. Once again I detect a similarity between this debate in this parliament and the debate of 1955 in a previous parliament. Here, I wish to refer to the words of the late Hon. James Gardiner, then the minister of agriculture, who proved himself a great Canadian by his outstanding service to his province and nation. He became carried away by continual Liberal government and became somewhat arrogant and overbearing because, as recorded at page 1422 of *Hansard* for 1951, he said that as long as he, the minister of trade and commerce, and the prime minister, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, were here, the country would be assured of good government. There, however, the similarity ends because we all know that the President of the Privy Council has been told that until the Prime Minister decides he must not make a move. He is not a member of the present troika made up of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the Prime Minister. So, he cannot sit in on their deliberations, he has been told to follow orders and to disregard what his colleagues in the backbenches, who should be looking after their businesses and getting acquainted with their families, may think.

In the former case I alluded to, two members and public opinion prevailed on the minister involved, C. D. Howe, and he was persuaded to go on holiday—maybe a fishing expedition with some of his colleagues from the Maritimes. When he came back a time limit had been placed on the legislation being considered and the opposition had won a battle for democracy and for parliament, the people's forum.

In closing I should like to say this. Rule 75c should never have been brought before the house. The government no doubt will win the vote and bring 75c into force; but that will not be a defeat only of the parties in opposition; that will be a defeat for parliament itself and for the democratic order it represents.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I hope that in delivering my remarks this evening I can avoid generating the rancor and bitterness which seems to have been evident during the last two days of debate.

An hon. Member: Impossible.

Mr. Hogarth: It is my view, sir, that over the past decade or so, bit by bit the respect of the people of Canada for this institution has slowly been eroded. The science of politics in Canada has failed to keep up with advances in the other disciplines of the community. We have failed to provide immediate responses to challenges taking place in a rapidly changing society, and the younger generation that is now coming up is firmly of that opinion.

The reasons for this are obvious and some of them have become obvious in this debate during the last two days. Other reasons could be cited. I do not blame any particular government, any particular member or any particular opposition party here or in the other place for this. I just say that we have failed to accept change and to respond and react to it.

In my opinion, the people of Canada today think that we are all talk and no action.

Mr. Stanfield: That is right.

Mr. Hogarth: I think there is some justification for what they say.

Mr. Stanfield: That is absolutely correct.

Mr. Hogarth: I say that because in the last six months we have seen debates in this house—and I admit that both sides participated in them—which took a seemingly endless time to conclude.

Mr. Stanfield: Why does the hon. member not talk about policy?

Mr. Hogarth: We have seen debates which in part were filibusters and which were admitted by one segment of the opposition here to be filibusters in part. As a result, it has taken us until July to finish the work of the house.

Actually, we began debating the present subject matter last November, and the debate has no yet finished. We have seen how the Standing Orders of the house have been used to obstruct and delay the work of the house. We have had that obstruction in place of the constructive criticism the opposition is supposed to supply here. As a matter of fact, I have heard so much about this man Beauchesne in the last three days that I am convinced he would not be elected dog catcher in my riding. I think it is time to bring in a few changes to the rules.

An hon. Member: Why don't you burn the books?

Mr. Hogarth: We have had endless repetition. We have seen the same points endlessly repeated.

An hon. Member: Burn the books.

Mr. Hogarth: Speaker after speaker in the same debate has repeated the same point.

Mr. Bell: Stick around a little while and you will learn.

Mr. Hogarth: I believe we are dedicated to the simple proposition that this government must produce policies for the people of Canada—

Mr. Stanfield: Then why not produce them?

Mr. Hogarth: —because we must solve the contemporary problems facing the people of Canada today.

Mr. Monteith: Then it is time the government performed some single act which would support that claim.

Mr. Hogarth: If we want to carry out our aims, we must have a more effective parliament.

Mr. Stanfield: Nonsense.

Mr. Hogarth: To do all this, parliament must become more reputable in the eyes of the people of Canada. If we are to perform this work we must reform the rules under which our legislation is to go through parliament.

Mr. Stanfield: Really, this is nonsense.

Mr. Hogarth: We are also dedicated to the simple proposition that in a democracy the rule of the majority of members of the House of Commons must prevail.

Mr. McGrath: Might is right.

Mr. Hogarth: It does not matter to which political party you belong; the will of the majority of members must prevail. That is provided for under section 45 of the British North America Act which governs the manner in which substantive legislation shall proceed through the house.

In the report of the committee and in this debate we have reached an impasse. This is an obvious impasse, brought on perhaps because we have too many political parties in this country.

[Mr. Hogarth.]

Mr. McGrath: The government is prepared to have only one political party in this country. That is where it is heading.

Mr. Hogarth: Perhaps there are other reasons for the impasse. I do not attach blame. Nevertheless, the impasse is here to be seen. It seems to me that in the ensuing debate, which some members of the opposition have referred to as a senseless debate, the majority in this house has said that its will must prevail. Unless the majority will prevails the work of this house cannot be carried out. We cannot do something if all 260 odd members insist on talking about something. In the early hours of tomorrow morning, the majority will say that it must have the right to carry out a program. When I say majority, I do not necessarily mean one political party. It is the majority of the members of this house which will do it.

• (10:30 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Hogarth: No, not right now.

If we abuse this power under Rule 75B and 75C, if we have abused the power under Standing Order 33, we shall pay for it. We will be slaughtered at the polls in the next election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hogarth: As the hon. member for Wellington-Grey (Mr. Howe) stated a few moments ago, many of us in the Liberal Party acknowledge the mistakes of the fifties. On June 10, 1957 we got it in the neck because we abused the power with respect to closure. We know what can happen. We are conscious of this fact. Our house leader will continuously be kept conscious of this fact by the backbenchers on this side of the house.

I am very interested in some of the remarks made by some of the hon. members opposite, particularly those by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The remarks of the hon. member were adopted by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan). The remarks I am referring to are recorded at page 11474 of *Hansard*:

> The result of this decision, if it is carried through, is as clear as can be. Proceedings during the next session of parliament will not be of the kind that they have been during this session. There will be confrontation and frustration. There will be work to rule, no more participating democracy. I appeal to the government even at this late hour to reconsider its position—

The reaction from other hon. members has also been disappointing. We have heard words of deep bitterness from members opposite. The words have been provocative rather than intending to find some solution. We have seen the Nazi salute given. Members of this house have been called fascists. Those things do nothing to enhance this parliament.

Mr. Bell: Who started it?

Mr. Hogarth: I want hon. members to know, Mr. Speaker, that as far as those words and gestures are concerned, they do not anger or embitter me or other members of this government. I reflect with sorrow on the effect to which they will extend and promote the degradation of the science of politics in Canada today, particularly dealing with the threat of working to rule.

An hon. Member: What about the Justice Committee?

Mr. Hogarth: I can think of countless instances in the Justice Committee of give and take and if the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) were here they would support me on this. There were no party politics.

An hon. Member: You destroyed all that.

Mr. Hogarth: There was no work to rule in this committee. All points of view were considered. Opposition amendments were sometimes recommended far more rapidly than those put forward by government members. What is going to happen and what did happen in that committee? We did not work to rule. Will we have to work with this threat being held over our heads? Injustice will be served.

I hope in the next session we will have another Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. We have some very interesting legislative programs to bring forward. We must again serve justice. If we are going to be faced with working to rule, this parliament will not be serving the people of Canada.

I am a member of the Fisheries Committee. We went on a trip out west. I see the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) here.

Mr. McGrath: I didn't go west.

Mr. Hogarth: I was going to talk about the seal hunt when I referred to you.

Mr. Baldwin: There are the seals, over there!

Mr. Hogarth: In any event it was the member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) who went west. He has gone east tonight. If, when we went west, we had worked to rule and demanded that all the rules of the committee be enforced properly, I wonder if the people of western Canada would have presented so many briefs to our committee? I wonder what they would have thought of parliament if we had been quibbling about politics in this committee? I know a couple of issues that would not have got through. We would have been lynched.

An hon. Member: You might still be lynched.

Mr. Hogarth: My reaction is this, Mr. Speaker. There will be no confrontation by me during the next session. There can be no work to rule and frustration of good ideas. I say, Mr. Speaker, that only good will can bring about good government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: I say that only good rules can provide effective legislation. Backbenchers on the government side, considering their position and desire for freedom of speech and knowing that they will have to face the electorate when the time comes, have to make sure that it is not the government house leader that is going to fix the time for debate. They are going to make sure in caucus that there is ample time for everybody. We should not be here to promote the political ambitions of our independent parties over and above our obligation to serve the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: It is regrettable that no solution was found in the negotiations that went on for so long with respect to this particular rule. It is regrettable that these proposals were met with filibuster and useless debate. However, the ultimate aim and objective of the majority must be carried out. It must be carried out in the manner that majority requires to have an effective parliament with effective legislation providing good and just laws for the people of Canada. If at the end of the time we have been sent here to serve the people of Canada it is proven we are wrong, we will not be back.

I do not pretend, as many members have done yesterday and today, to be an experienced politician. I do not pretend to be

able to offer suggestions as to how this impasse could possibly be handled and dealt with. Some of us have not been here long enough. I am one of them. However, there are some who have been here too long.

An hon. Member: The Solicitor General.

Mr. Hogarth: We were all sent here to serve.

• (10:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) is rising on a point of privilege.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member should be allowed to insult the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) like that. He is a respected long-standing member of the house, the dean.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, I always thought he was one of the younger members.

If I might conclude, I should like to say that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) suggested to the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) that there are still some things wrong with the rules.

Mr. Stanfield: I asked him a question.

Mr. Hogarth: Yes, and he thought there were. I think any rule in a court of law or in the articles of association of a company or society can be misused or misconstrued. If these rules we shall adopt in the early morning hours tomorrow should work to the disadvantage of democracy, in my view and I know in the view of every member on the back benches either in the minority or majority, we will have to change those rules.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: We will have to change them time and time again if necessary, until this chamber becomes a rational and productive institution responsible to the people of Canada.

Mr. Bell: By closure?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps the hon. member might have indicated his willingness to answer my question when he finished. Will he say quite frankly and honestly whether he is prepared to recommend this rule to the house in its present form and whether he considers it is a good rule for the house to adopt?

[Mr. Hogarth.]

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the Opposition referring to 75B or 75C?

Mr. Stanfield: I am referring to the motion which is before us.

Mr. Hogarth: I will answer, Mr. Speaker. My position is that it is too late to try to change it now in this session.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bell: There is the first honest answer we have had.

Mr. Hogarth: I say that we should use what we have here now, see how it operates and not cry until somebody is offended.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: Not one of you are satisfied with this rule.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure all hon. members are anxious to hear the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis).

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tuesday, July 22, was a bleak day for parliament, for it marked the rupture of a process whereby government and opposition, the two essential parts of the House of Commons, were seeking to work together to streamline and modernize the machinery of parliament, and regardless of what may or may not be said here we all want to streamline and modernize the machinery of parliament. But we want it streamlined to work more effectively to pass government legislation without interfering with the vital function of the opposition which is to criticize government measures and bring forward alternative policies.

We have heard a lot in this debate from government spokesmen about the need for the government majority to rule. Let us make no mistake about what happened on Tuesday. When the government house leader gave notice of closure on Tuesday he was turning the country away from rule by the majority to the direction of arbitrary government, first the rule of one party and then the rule of one man government. Let us make no mistake about it; we are, under this rule, getting away from majority rule. Democracy is the new thing which the world is striving so hard to build today. Autocracy and dictatorship represent the age-old road—there is no doubt about it—of those who have no faith in the people, those who fear the people and those

who are determined to ride roughshod over the will of the people. That is what has happened.

Last Tuesday we who sit opposite the government witnessed something very disturbing as the government house leader gave notice of closure. The mask of democratic leadership slipped suddenly from the face of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who sat revealed as a man of supercilious arrogance with mockery in his face. He sat there while the three opposition leaders made their statements. Then, in a house dazed by the shock of the government's action, he rose and, turning his back on parliament in an ultimate gesture of contempt, he made his nonchalant way out of the chamber. Those of us who witnessed it will not forget it. It will take many, many oceans of words to sweep away that expression. It will take much more than words; it will take a great deal of action to obliterate that.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mrs. MacInnis: The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) mentioned the fact that some members have been here in this chamber too long. That is probably true, but some of us are concerned about those who have not been here long enough to know the traditions of this house. In the Prime Minister we have a man who up until four years ago had had no parliamentary experience whatever, a man who had no feel for the traditions of parliamentary government, a man who would brook no opposition to his will. He was chosen by the members of his party because they felt he could lead them to victory at the polls. He did. But it is a hollow victory for the party today, and it is a bleak day for the Canadian people.

The Canadian people gave this government power because they believed that the new Prime Minister, a man of undoubted intelligence and charm, would use power wisely and responsibly and in the best interests of the whole population. But now, in one short year, we see what has happened. The first duty of the government is to protect and strengthen the instrument of parliament itself. A democratic parliament requires a strong opposition, for the job of the opposition is vital to protect the public. There are grievances to be raised and wrongs to be righted. There are minorities with viewpoints to be safeguarded. There are dangers and shortcomings in government policies to be criticized and removed. There are alternative policies to be enunciated and publicized. Without this, parliament becomes nothing but a dead shell of once living democracy where the government leader tramples on the remaining vestiges of freedom while eloquently assuring the people that he is building participatory democracy and a just society.

We of the opposition parties have done all we could to prevent this happening. We shall continue in the months ahead or in the weeks ahead in our efforts to prevent this happening and to see that the trend is reversed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, influential sections of the press and the media are determined that this shall not happen. People are slowly but very surely beginning to realize that something is very wrong in this house, in this debate. They are beginning to ask questions. These questions are sifting in through letters, editorials and news items in the press. Questions of this nature are asked: Why, when the government has completed all its legislative program for the session is it necessary to bring in rule 75c to choke and gag the opposition? Why do they want to weaken the opposition if an opposition is necesary for good government? Why do they want to get rid of criticism of their policies if their policies are so good and meet the needs of today? Why, if they are anxious to get ahead with legislation, do they propose not to call parliament until October 22, three whole months from now?

The hon. member for New Westminster told us the government has policies in line with the requirements of the people of Canada and that they are programming legislation to meet the needs of the people in this country. Let me tell you this. Programming is no substitute for the failure during a whole year to introduce the kind of legislation that the people of this country want, need, and are crying for. Let me ask this question. Does programming for the next year include improved legislation to help veterans and their families?

• (10:50 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mrs. MacInnis: Then, why was it not done a year ago? Does it include legislation to help people on old age pensions? Will it help the superannuated civil servants? Will it include measures to assist people who do not have jobs? Will it include measures to assist families on low income to buy the houses they

need at prices they can afford? Will programming include legislation for genuine consultation with the Métis and Indian people who are being told what is good for them, whether they like it or not? If it includes all these things the government does not need 75c. The opposition will be only too eager to pass such measures.

The people of Canada are alarmed by 75c, and we are alarmed about it. They know that the kind of legislation which will be passed with the full consent and co-operation of the opposition is the kind of legislation to which I have referred, and they wonder why in thunder we have not passed it before now. The reason for the alarm in respect of 75c is that if the government wants 75c it must want it to prevent the kind of legislation which should be brought in to look after people's needs in the years ahead and to stifle the criticism by the opposition.

Is this program that the government is proposing to bring in next year intended to control the high rates of interest in this country? Will it deal with the steadily rising cost of living? Will this program deal with the growing pollution problems of air, soil and water in this country? Will this programming deal with the problems of Canadian control of Canadian industry and its development?

An hon. Member: No, never.

Mrs. MacInnis: That is the answer.

An hon. Member: What about the cost of fudgsicles?

Mrs. MacInnis: It will not even deal with the false advertisement in respect of fudgsicles. I worked for two or three months to get this government to make a firm assurance that the weight of as small a thing as a fudgsicle would be as advertised and this relates only to one small item—chocolate bars that children buy.

On the basis of legislation introduced this session the answer to all these questions is a resounding, no. The government has shown no interest whatsoever in such matters. Some of you may smile because you feel you will keep the government in your hands and stifle the criticisms we are trying to make. Things will be different in this parliament after the next election.

People are not happy, and we shall not rest until we find ways and means of getting their needs across to the government in this chamber. There has been enough talk in this house about opposition obstruction. I want to tell you that it is this government which has obstructed every single effort to get action in respect of the urgent needs in this country. Only the government has had the power to bring in legislation dealing with these problems. It has failed to bring in that legislation; that is obstruction of the will of the people.

The people want the government to give top priority to things like jobs, training for jobs, the development of industry, restrictions on the interest rate and the high cost of living, and the provision for housing for people on low incomes and to deal with the wheat problem and all these things. Until the government absolutely had to give money to the western farmers to keep them from sinking into nothingness it did not do anything worthwhile about this problem. Let us have no more talk about opposition obstruction. If the government can now hamstring the opposition by this closure rule they think they will have no need to worry about criticism in the future. They can close their eyes and their ears to public clamour for legislation of the kind we need in this country.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) claims that people feel parliament is becoming less relevant to the problems of today. If parliament is becoming less relevant to those problems in the minds of the people it is because this government has contributed to making it less relevant. It is no wonder that people feel parliament is becoming less relevant after trying in vain to get this government to understand that there are a number of problems that need solving. In spite of this, the government can turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to these needs of the people.

Let me point out that at Christmas time the Vancouver *Sun,* which is the organ of the Liberal party on the west coast, published an editorial pointing out that the government had the good sense to put the then proposed closure rule, 16A, in the deep freeze. It said it would be wrong for the rest of us to think that the government was putting this rule through to hobble parliament. But it added that the Prime Minister had made a mistake. The editorial went on to state:

> The plan of wholesale advance closure inherent in rule 16A was seen on examination to be intolerable. He [The Prime Minister] had not realized how sensitive parliament and people are to the rights of this great institution.

The Prime Minister, inexperienced as he was, was surely entitled to a mistake. But when only six months later we see the same mistake coming around again we are entitled

to second thoughts. Why should he make the same mistake, one which shows complete lack of understanding and of respect for parliament? Is the Prime Minister that accident prone? Is this a death wish shared by the cabinet? There is mounting evidence that a number of Liberal backbenchers are reluctant to be a part of this new charge of the Light Brigade. They would rather have a more viable cause for which to lay down their political lives. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) indicated very well his reluctance about Rule 75c when he said it was too late now to back out of this position.

Let me point out that this is precisely the same mistake that was made once years ago by another Liberal government. This was back in 1956 when the Liberal government had a muscleman who also got himself confused with God. Among other lordly utterances of his were the famous "What's a million", and 'Who is to stop us?" These off-the-cuff remarks had about the same slow-burn effect on the public as the more up to date remarks "There is no housing crisis" and "Why should I sell the Canadian farmer's wheat?"

The effect in 1956 was to bring about the defeat of an arrogant government and to scatter its shattered remnants throughout the valley of desolation, where they wandered for years. The valley is still there, waiting. Parliament cannot be mocked or manoeuvered with impunity. Parliament has its defenders in this chamber as this debate amply testifies. As we fight on, the forces of public opinion outside are growing and will continue to grow as people realize more and more fully just what is at stake.

Who is to stop us, asks the present government as they bring down the guillotine. Let them reflect at this eleventh hour on the fact that this house is one of the few remaining places in Canada where the Liberal party remains in power today. Of course, there is Newfoundland. The Liberals are pretty rocky there as the stalwart contingent of opposition M.P.s from that province demonstrate in this Chamber. There is Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, both with strong and effective shock troops here. Lastly there is Saskatchewan. Having recently experienced public sentiment there, I should think the Prime Minister would realize that there are times when discretion is the better part of valour, unless of course the urge for political suicide becomes too strong on his part to be resisted. The truth is that Canadians are becoming sick and tired of being fobbed off by grand gestures and empty phrases about participatory democracy and the just society. They want a start on the real thing. Province by province they are turning away from the Liberal party which tries to be all things to all men—and women—and ends up being nothing to anyone.

• (11:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis: Now, while there is still time, the once-great Liberal party would do well to look to its age-old traditions of free speech and free assembly. It used to be proud of the fact that it had those traditions. Unless it can reverse the step it proposes to take tonight, this government is headed for the boneyard of history. Already in British Columbia it is being written off in the forthcoming election.

In this modern age, when two men have set foot on the moon through the co-operative effort of thousands of people the world over, any petty attempt by a minor tyrant to stifle free speech in Canada's parliament is doomed to ignominious failure.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, since the commencement of this very important debate on rule changes I have listened fairly constantly to it. I listened this evening to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth), who sat on the justice committee. The hon. member's approach to the rules of the house reminds me of the Perry Mason series in which Hamilton Berger prosecuted in the courts of the United States. The hon. member for New Westminster may be able to do it in the courts of Vancouver and New Westminster, but he cannot come here and impose restrictions and coerce the members of this house, especially those in the opposition, the way he apparently does in the courts of the country.

I was very sorry to hear him speak the way he did. During the sittings of the legal affairs committee he quoted various people and books. He does not think much of Beauchesne, apparently. Beauchesne was here before him, and I suggest will be here long after the hon. member has gone. He spoke about the need of programming and all that goes with it. He spoke of the techniques of automation, of computers, and so on. He spoke of the necessity of changing the rules until parliament is productive, as he put it.

An hon. member of this house—I shall not pinpoint him—said not very long ago that by the time the new rules are passed we will not recognize parliament. I wonder what was meant by that. I wonder what legislation will be brought forward by the government during the next session.

Mr. Bell: "President" Trudeau.

Mr. MacEwan: There will perhaps be changes in taxation and welfare. One morning, as I was walking to the house with a government member—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are a pretty broadminded guy, Russ.

Mr. MacEwan: —he asked how many members there were from the province I have the honour to represent. I told him. He said, "That is too many. I represent a large city constituency and I do not think it is right that your province has so many members." I said, "Try and change it. The number of members from my province is provided for in the legislation of this land. The members from my province can be no fewer than the number of senators". He said, "We will change that". Perhaps this is the thinking of the government, namely, to change the British North America Act and the number of members who have the right to represent the provinces of this country. Perhaps that is why the government brought forward 75c.

The hon. member spoke about rules and said, "We will try these rules, and if they do not work we will change them". I wonder who will change them. What faith can we have in this government when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at New Year's said, after rule 16A had been withdrawn after the great speech of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen), who came to the front today and rolled into the aisle to speak—he is always brought forward on occasions such as this—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He is a great Nova Scotian.

Mr. MacEwan: He is a member from Nova Scotia; in fact, the only one on the other side. At one time we enjoyed the fact that in parliament there was no Grit from my province. That will happen again.

An hon. Member: And very soon.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): One to ten is good odds.

[Mr. MacEwan.]

Mr. MacEwan: The grandfather of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) came from Nova Scotia.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): From your county.

Mr. MacEwan: I think the minister has forgotten that, because he is supporting these proposed rules. We Nova Scotians care for democracy and I am surprised at the attitude of the minister in this regard.

Mr. Bell: He deserted Quebec.

Mr. MacEwan: The hon. member for New Westminster said the government would change the rules if necessary. What faith can we have in this government when just after rule 16A was withdrawn the Prime Minister, in a television interview, told the Canadian people, "We are not really interested in changing the rules too much. All we did was suck the opposition in so they would accept a certain part of the rules which were put forward"? How can we believe a Prime Minister who makes such a statement?

The hon. member for New Westminster said that some members have been here too long. Perhaps they have. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) has been here too long. He is collecting taxes, and that will not help him in the future; people may hold a personal grudge against him. It is not for the hon. member for New Westminster, the Prime Minister or any member of the government to tell me, the member for Central Nova, that I have been here too long. The people of Canada decide that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: The area I represent does not have any beetroot growers, as has the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan); we have coal miners, farmers, fishermen and shipyard workers who are in favour of democracy. They sent me and other members to this house. I suggest it is not for the government to introduce rules to muzzle members of parliament.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Don't forget they are Liberals, Russ.

Mr. MacEwan: That is right. The question was asked: What is the government trying to do? The simple answer is that it is trying to control the procedures of the house; in other words, it is trying to make parliament the errand boy of the government. One of our oldest traditions is that parliament controls

its own procedures. It is parliament which makes the rules, not the government. Now we have the government asking parliament to bind and gag itself.

I suggest that hon. members on the other side think about this. If we came into this house and silently acquiesed in what I would call the mummification of parliament, we would never again be able to hold up our heads among the honest Canadians of this country. They did not send me here in order to assist the government to ride roughshod over parliament. Those who have attempted to bring in these restrictions, those who have attempted to place parliament in a straitjacket, have used the excuse that this is the way things are done in England. I suggest it is not the way things are done in Canada.

• (11:10 p.m.)

I do not know who cooked up rule 75c, but I have an idea. Perhaps the government house leader had something to do with it, assisted by someone else who is now no longer within these walls but who is a former member of parliament. I will not go into personalities but at one time he sat as a member of the opposition.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is a pretty mysterious statement.

Mr. MacEwan: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) works in mysterious ways, as well as other members of the government. Some of them are here one day and gone another. Their spirits and ghosts are here, so we know about that. The Minister of Justice should uphold justice and remember about the previous great ministers of justice of this country. The present minister should keep that in mind when his legislation is brought before the house.

Mr. McCleave: He can forget about his predecessor.

Mr. MacEwan: With regard to these rules, if the house leaders cannot agree or do not reach a conclusion which is satisfactory to the government, then a minister will have the power of life and death over the business of the house. He, and he alone, will have this power. That is a lot of power to place in the hands of one man, however modest, unassuming and solicitous of the rights of others that man may be. In this particular instance I am not referring to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) because it is definitely a terrible temptation to place before him. I suggest that the government house leader has already demonstrated his lack of fitness to wield such absolute power over the business of this house.

There is one reflection which comes to my mind if rule 75c—to which I refer as the butcher rule—is passed, and that is the considerable saving that will ensue in parliamentary positions. For example, we will no longer require any of the opposition house leaders because in that instance the government house leader will be all powerful. Perhaps we will no longer require opposition whips. This would be a terrible thing for the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) because there would be no point in him coming to this chamber. If rule 75c is passed, this parliament will simply become a graveyard of free speech, and the battle, like so many battles for freedom, will be lost quietly, unspectacularly, and with hardly a whimper. Parliament will simply become another occupied country with the government acting as the occupying power.

Parliament cannot accept the imposition of a gag by this government. Members are not sent here simply to say yea or nay. Members are sent here to complain, to criticize, to demand redress of grievances and to point out the faults and failure of the government.

Mr. Sharp: And to legislate.

Mr. MacEwan: The minister should know all about that. He has been in the backrooms of deputy ministers for so long. He has been a bureaucrat, and he has shown it in the legislation which he has brought forth here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: I am not sure how it is in other branches of the Department of External Affairs, but the passport branch is certainly not so good. I suggest that we need more legislation there.

However, let us go back to the consideration of rule 75c. Members are also sent here to be informed, to represent the people who sent them, to put forward the interests of their constituents, and so on. Parliament cannot degenerate into a series of seminars, with government ministers telling us what to think, what to say and how long to speak. If we are only allowed to vote and not to speak, we will be getting suspiciously close to the systems practised in countries where the state has been allowed to become the supreme entity of the nation. The issue is simple: Is the state a creature of the people, or are the

people creatures of the state? A stand has to be taken, and that stand can only be made in parliament.

The control of the finances of this nation must be returned to the people of this nation, and that can only be done in parliament. It cannot be done in committee; it cannot be done in newspaper editorials; it cannot be done on TV panel shows. It can be done in this house, and this house only. That is why this parliament must rise up and reject the motion by the government and support the amendment proposed by the opposition house leader who clearly set out the dark chasm toward which we are steering. This is the time for parliament to say no and to make it plain that all sides of this house will maintain the supremacy of this institution and its freedom from control from whatever source.

Many editorials were written and many statements made regarding this matter. Perhaps I should quote what the Prime Minister said outside the house, where he usually says things. This is what he said:

—many Canadians have begun to feel parliament is irrelevant. His government will stand or fall on the proposition that reasonable men can take a decision on a proposal after the arguments have been heard, and the decision must be the decision of the majority.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: I am glad we have a little support from the Minister of Justice. The Prime Minister said that Canadians have begun to feel that parliament is irrelevant. I do not know where he got this idea. I suggest that he has a lot to learn. Canadians do not feel that parliament is irrelevant and they will prove this at the next election, wherever it may come.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: My suggestion is that under rules 75A, 75B and 75C members will not have a reasonable chance to speak. The time limit is such that after a lapse of ten days a vote has to be taken. Certainly, this is not a reasonable length of time. This allows only for four days of debate in ten days during which a major bill must be processed. Again I ask the following questions: What will the government bring forward during the fall session that requires us now to pass rule 75c, not to bring in further legislation but to bring in closure on debate in parliament, or closure on closure?

I have listened to my friend, the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger). He is much changed since the time when we went on trips together. Since the government has a majority he has changed much. He was a pretty good fellow on the trips. When we were out west six years ago he showed democratic inclinations. Even the chairman of the committee, the former member for Hamilton West, was democratic. But now there is a change. We have listened to government backbenchers, and especially to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth), who will streamroller over anyone who says that we have been here too long. Rule 75c curtail the right of the opposition to work effectively in this parliament. This is what was said in this regard:

If parliament is to be preserved as a living institution His Majesty's Loyal Opposition must fearlessly perform its functions. When it properly discharges them the preservation of our freedom is assured. The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends. It upholds and maintains the rights of minorities against majorities. It must be vigilant against oppression and unjust invasions by the cabinet of the rights of the people. It should supervise all expenditures and prevent over-expenditure by exposing to the light of public opinion wasteful expenditures or worse. It finds fault; it suggests amendments; it asks questions and elicits information; it arouses, educates and molds public opinion by voice and vote. It must scrutinize every action by the government and in doing so prevents the short-cuts through democratic procedure that governments like to make.

It was also said once that:

The absence of a strong opposition means a one party state. A one party state means an all powerful cabinet.

Not every member of this house who has been here a few years has the opportunity to speak as much as he would like. This applies to everyone here, and especially to government backbenchers. Members sitting in the opposition have more opportunity to speak. I suggest this rule 75c will gag parliament. It will curtail the rights of all, and I hope some of the backbenchers on the other side, ordinary members like myself, will not go along with it because—and I say this seriously—if they do, they will live to regret it.

• (11:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de Grâce): While I do not think that I, or anybody else on this side for that matter, will ever be able to convince the opposition that 75c is a good rule, I do believe it is important that we on the back benches on this side

should make it clear to the Canadian people that we fully support this rule and believe it constitutes an important and positive contribution to improving the rules of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he prepared to recommend this rule to the house in its present form?

Mr. Allmand: While we on this side are not as perfect as members of the opposition are, I would say that the rule is one of the best rules I have seen—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Allmand: —suggested or put to the house in connection with the allocation of time. It is much better than anything proposed by the opposition and I shall fully support it when it comes to a vote.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The Liberals bowed their heads in shame when you said that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Allmand: Right now we are seeing the respect the opposition have for democracy. I have sat here all night listening to their speeches. Now, when I get up they are not willing to listen to me for a while. I want to say that we, the backbenchers of this party, not only support this rule but support it as a matter of principle to the extent that we are willing to place our political careers on the line for it. If, as members of the opposition assert, this is a bad rule or one which the people of Canada do not want, then the people of Canada will have an opportunity to choose. If they want the kind of parliament which the opposition demonstrated yesterday and in the last week or so, I shall gladly leave this place and decline to participate in it because I do not want to sit in a house such as we sat in yesterday, and have sat in for the last ten days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Allmand: During this debate members of the opposition have asked what we on the back benches over here think, and that is what we think. We do not support this rule because the whips are on, or because we are members of this party, but because we think it is an important rule in enabling parliament to do the business which needs to be done for Canada.

In particular, I think rule 75 is necessary for several reasons. I shall enumerate them because the opposition is so misinterpreting this rule that it is important we should put forward a positive argument in its favour. First, while this rule will allow reasonable time for debate, for all points of view to be put forward, it will not permit the filibuster, or debate merely for the sake of obstruction. Second, it will prevent long, unproductive debate with much repetition and irrelevance. Third, it will help the House of Commons to become a much more productive and efficient institution. I do not think there is any other way in which a government can properly plan a legislative program, schedule business and organize parliamentary manpower and parliamentary services. There must be proper co-ordination between the government and the legislature. The government has responsibility for preparing legislation and if this is to be done properly there must be some kind of schedule. Finally, I believe that a system providing for an allocation of time will make for much better debates. When there is a limit on debates I find that all parties put forward their best speakers; they are better prepared and this leads to a much more productive debate, within the limited time, than those endless debates which go on without limit.

What do we see at the present time? At the present time we have a parliament which is at the mercy of the opposition, as we saw yesterday. It is subject to the control of the opposition. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) pointed out tonight, we do have closure at the present time: it is closure by means of filibuster, repetition and irrelevance. While bills may eventually come to a vote, so much time is taken up in wasteful debate that many important measures never get to the floor.

There are several basic questions which I believe we in this house and the Canadian people generally should ask regarding this matter. First, should parliament be controlled by the majority or the minority in the final analysis? Second, should freedom of debate be an unlimited right or should it, like all other rights, be subject to limitation? As part of the civil law of Quebec we have a well known doctrine known as the *abus des droits* —the abuse of rights. According to this doctrine, no right is unlimited; it is always subject to restriction when it might interfere with the rights of others. There are many examples of the limitation to the right of free

speech. In our present law we have a limitation in respect to slander, limitations in respect to libel, sedition, obscenity, and so on.

We need to ask ourselves another important question: to what extent should the freedom of debate be tempered by the need for efficient operation and productivity? What should be the balance between freedom and efficiency? When we talk about productivity we get the impression from hon. members opposite that they do not believe productivity in this house to be important. Yet I cannot recall one election campaign in which the main basis of attack by the opposition has not been: how much has the government done? How many bills have they passed? During this debate the opposition gives the impression that productivity is not important—that the important thing is freedom to debate as long as they wish, or for as long as they think is in their interest. What are we to believe? Are we to believe them at election time, or are we to believe what they say in the course of this debate? In my opinion their credibility is greatly in doubt. Both things are important. There must be freedom of debate but there must also be a measure of productivity. I should like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Montreal *Star* this evening. It is entitled: "Not for freedom". It says:

• (11:30 p.m.)

As they waged their last ditch battle against the government's time-allocation rule, opposition members of Parliament tended to present themselves as the last bastion protecting defenceless citizens from a government anxious to ride roughshod over their liberties. But it is a curious fact that the last time the opposition exercised its power to hold up legislation by filibuster, it was trying its best to prevent an extension of freedom.

The issue was the bill to amend the Criminal Code of Canada. By decreeing that it would no longer imprison homosexuals for acts committed in private, or doctors for performing abortions considered necessary to preserve the health of the mother, the government achieved a modest but genuine increase in human liberty.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Allmand: I am surprised at the N.D.P., Mr. Speaker. I was attracted to its ideas in earlier years and had always looked on it as a party which believed in planning. I always thought that party was interested in planning and supported the principle that humanity should control its environment by planning, controlling and scheduling. Sad to say, that party uses the concept of planning for its own political expediency. It is interested in planning when planning helps it and against planning when planning does not help.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Be accurate, for heaven's sake.

Mr. Allmand: The opposition has alleged that this government and this proposed rule are dictatorial and autocratic. I ask, was the government being dictatorial or autocratic when it proposed last fall that the opposition should have more money to spend on research so that it could better criticize the government. Was that a dictatorial or autocratic action?

An hon. Member: No.

Another hon. Member: That was a waste of public money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Could we have order so that the hon. member can deliver his remarks.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, he deserves to be interrupted for not being accurate.

Mr. Allmand: Was the government being dictatorial or autocratic when it proposed that as a general rule all bills ought to go through committee, thus prolonging the legislative process? Every bill is to be examined in a forum that is open to the participation of the general public. Expert witnesses may be called—

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): For one day.

Mr. Allmand: Is this government being dictatorial when it proposes that we have a bill of rights entrenched in the B.N. Act?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Where is it?

Mr. Allmand: Is it being autocratic when it seeks to preserve the civil liberties of Canadians and their language rights? Is the official languages bill, which protects the rights of a minority, dictatorial? Was the government being dictatorial when it introduced the bill providing for regional economic expansion and industrial incentives with respect to underdeveloped areas of Canada? When the Prime Minister went out west recently and sat in the back of a truck in Saskatchewan exchanging ideas with farmers, was he acting as a dictator?

An hon. Member: Why don't you read his book?

Another hon. Member: Tell us about the little boy.

Mr. Allmand: You see, Mr. Speaker, I am touching the opposition's sensitive spot, because it will not allow me to speak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Allmand: They want to shout me down. That is their concept of democracy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Allmand: Under our constitution, enshrined in the British North America Act that we cannot amend in this house, there is a provision that there must be elections every five years. We say that the majority has the right to put forward its legislative program. If it is bad legislation, if it is wrong in changing the rules, it shall answer to the people. It has that responsibility. If we are doing the wrong thing the opposition should be happy. After all, that will put them on this side of the house after the next election—but I doubt it. Our constitution guarantees that Canada, which is a federal state, shall have elections at least every five years. Therefore the accusations of dictatorship or autocracy are ridiculous.

It is strange to hear opposition members say that the opposition is badly treated and is not given enough debating time. Has anyone counted the pages in *Hansard* devoted to the speeches of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for Peace River and other opposition members? And we should consider not only debate but the question period and other procedures in this house. If we compare the number of pages devoted to opposition members with the number of pages on which we appear, then certainly it may be said that we on this side in the back benches are the slaves of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the hon. member permit a question. Will he tell me at what point the house leaders of the opposition parties will be reduced to the status of backbenchers on the government side of the house?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I expect more sensible questions from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Monteith: That is a typical approach.

Mr. Allmand: Why do we require time limits in this modern age, Mr. Speaker? Would anyone belonging to a club, trade union, corporation, or private association tolerate a situation in which a minority of people at a meeting could prevent the taking of a decision indefinitely? Would opposition party members at one of their political conventions tolerate a situation in which a minority group could block the taking of an important decision? Just look at political party conventions. They are conducted under time limits, and that is reasonable. The opposition has a double standard, supporting the idea of time allocation when it suits it at their conventions and similar party functions, and opposing it here, simply because it is the opposition.

An hon. Member: Is that the case for the defence?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): There is no need to impose time limitations on a party that has nothing to say.

Mr. Lewis: I shall think of a retort to that quip by tomorrow.

Mr. Allmand: Some hon. members are trying to give the country the impression that the idea of time allocation on debate is new and that we are trying to foist something on the parliament of Canada. I think it is time the Canadian public were made aware of a few facts. There are many instances in our rules in which time limitation is permissible.

Mr. Bell: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: It is not always by agreement. The time limitations have been brought in over the years because legislation has become more voluminous and complex. First of all, we have a six day limitation on the budget debate.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: And an eight day limitation on the Throne Speech debate.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: We have limitations on supply debates.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: And we have limited the question period to 40 minutes.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: We have limited the time to be spent on private members' business.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the opposition accepts the principle of limitation of time.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: If they are to be consistent and logical, they should be willing to extend this principle and accept this rule.

Mr. Lewis: That is a classical *non sequitur*.

Mr. Allmand: We have set limits on how long we are to speak in debates. There is a limit of 40 minutes.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: The opposition parties have accepted the principle of 75A and 75B.

Some hon. Members: By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: Clearly, the opposition accepts the principle of time limitation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): By agreement.

Mr. Allmand: Had 75B been in effect in the previous parliament in which the Liberal party was in a minority position, it could have formed a majority with the Ralliement Creditiste and the Social Credity party under that rule which would have enabled the government to set an allocation time against the wishes of the conservatives and N.D.P. Those two opposition parties, with the government, could have combined against approximately 90 Conservatives and 22 or 23 N.D.P. members. In the previous parliament, this rule would have meant that closure would be imposed against slightly more than 100 members. They will accept that situation under 75B, but they will not accept 75c which could impose closure on a smaller number of people in parliament. I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is a great inconsistency in their stand for principles here. On the other hand there are many safeguards for the opposition.

• (11:40 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Repeat it. We did not quite understand you.

Mr. Allmand: I am very easy to understand. There were many other simple things you failed to understand in this debate.

Mr. Baldwin: Will the hon. member permit a question at this time?

Mr. Allmand: I have already answered two or three questions from that side. They have not been very productive.

Mr. Baldwin: Will the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat some of the safeguards in the constitution of this nation and in the rules of this house which protect the opposition from autocratic rule, dictatorship and all the other things they allege. As I mentioned before, there is the British North America Act which guarantees an election every five years.

Rules 75A, 75B and 75c can only be put at one stage of the bill at a time. This means that after we have put on time allocation under Rule 75c for second reading on the committee stage and the public has had a chance to listen—to that debate and there has been reaction from the press and perhaps the public, we then have to set another allocation for the next stage. This is a very real protection and safeguard for the opposition. We can only set a time allocation for one stage at a time.

As was pointed out by the Prime Minister, there are 28 opposition days. There are also the very real powers of the free press in this country. At this time I wish to read a letter I received this afternoon from a student in my constituency in regard to this matter. The letter reads:

Dear Mr. Allmand,

I absolutely support the government position on house procedures and support immediate implementation of Rule 75c, as well as 75A and 75B.

Mr. Trudeau was correct in his analysis of the public in Canada. Parliament is becoming regarded as irrelevant . . . because so much talk goes on and

very little action seems to be forthcoming. Important business is always snowed under by so much verbocity on completely trivial matters.

Messrs. Stanfield, Douglas, Caouette seem unaware of the fact that we now live with nearly instant communication (in T.V. and radio) and that public opinion may be stirred up literally overnight to prevent passing of undemocratic or unconstitutional law.

An hon. Member: Who signed it, Dr. Ollivier?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, this letter is from a young student in my constituency.

Mr. Baldwin: It sounds like he is an old student.

An hon. Member: Who signed the letter?

Mr. Allmand: Never mind who signed it. It is a person I never met or even saw before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Allmand: It is an ex-member of the N.D.P..

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Charlevoix.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the rules allow a member to put on the record a letter he has received without giving the name of the one who sent it.

If it is actually signed, the member should, under the Standing Orders, indicate the name of the sender before the letter can be entered in the official report of the House of Commons.

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know that is not a rule or precedent of this house.

An hon. Member: Yes it is.

Mr. Allmand: Your Honour can make a ruling. As far as I know, there is no rule. I do not have permission from this person to use his letter.

Mr. Monteith: You read it.

Mr. Alexander: You should not have read it then.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Monteith: Learn the rules.

29180—733

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the practice of the house has been when an hon. member reads a letter he takes the responsibility for its contents. I think this has been the normal practice. In the event it is a personal letter, hon. members may request the name of the author. I could consult further with the table if this objection is pursued. The solution may be that the hon. member's time has already expired.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rise to correct a misrepresentation made by the hon. member during the course of his speech. When the hon. member said it is only the opposition that is responsible for obstructing and not permitting matters to be brought to a vote in the house, I am compelled, unwillingly, to bring to the attention of the house and the hon. member that he is the hon. member who moved an amendment to the fifth report to the Standing Committee on Transport dealing with the railroad situation in Newfoundland. This report had been approved by a majority of the committee, and he thereby stopped that report from being voted on in this house.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Allmand: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I moved that the report be sent back to the committee because I thought it was a bad report. I followed the same course as the opposition when they moved that rule 16A be sent back to committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have very grave doubts as to whether the original point of order is valid.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I had intended bringing to the attention of the house that the hon. member had moved this amendment to Government Order 68, obviously causing obstruction to the operation of this house. I feel almost out of this tonight after hearing some of the so-called young-fry from the Liberal backbenches suggesting there is a new look in the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Monteith: Quiet please.

Mr. Mackasey: I never said a word.

Mr. Monteith: The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth) was here a moment ago. He seems to have disappeared.

An hon. Member: It's his bedtime.

Mr. Monteith: The hon. member suggested that many of us have been in this house too long. I am pleased to see the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) coming into the chamber because he has some 13 years more service than I.

An hon. Member: He is ready for the Senate.

Some hon. Members: To the Senate, to the Senate!

Mr. Monteith: I suggest that some hon. members who have been around here a few years have quite a reasonable amount of respect for this House of Commons as an institution. I think the hon. member who just took his place, the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) was properly put in his place by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) when he was asked a very simple question. He was asked if he would recommend the adoption by the house of the rule as it presently exists. He cannot follow that through. He knows very well there have been suggestions made by his own house leader and by our people with which he would go along. Therefore, the present rule is not one which should be adopted by this house. Your Honour has had a very long day. I trust Your Honour will be patient with me. I do not intend to be disruptive or argumentative. I will try to put forward what I consider a rather serious approach to this whole problem we are facing. As I rise to participate in this debate tonight, my memory goes back to 1956. I was sitting in front of the curtains. I was participating in another closure debate. At that time I was called to order by the late Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, a very good friend of mine, because I had been attempting to compare the late Right Hon. C. D. Howe to Julius Caesar. I thought I had a good point. The Deputy Speaker did not think so. I had to bow to his opinion and as a consequence did not follow up that argument any further. That was during the closure debate. Tonight, I trust I shall keep entirely within the bounds of what you, Mr. Speaker, may suggest is order. I am entering this debate tonight because I feel so strongly that the government is completely wrong in its approach to this matter. This is not the way reasonable men should resolve their differences or reach solutions to problems in which there is conflict on both sides. This House of Commons is, or has been, a democratic institution. Until this particular stage it has been an institution where members have the privilege and the duty to be heard. I am not a particular student of the rules of the House of Commons. I have never pretended to be such, but I have been here long enough, since 1953, to feel I know what makes parliament tick. I think I have a feeling for this institution. I do not like what I see going on here today.

• (11:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: I see the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who has been here longer than I have. I see the hon. Solicitor General who has been here longer than I have. I do not see the hon. member from Brantford, but he came here the same time I did. There are several others who came at about the same time or prior who do not like what is happening to parliament today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss what happened in this House of Commons in 1955. I believe it was a very interesting situation. During my years here I have seen rule changes. Subsequently, those changes have had to be reformed because they became outdated. I think this is a natural course; it is something which must happen. However, I should like to review exactly what happened in 1955. I was here at that time. Not too many of the present members were here. The Solicitor General will recall this, and I hope that he will listen intently to me because I am sure he will have to agree exactly with what I say.

In 1953 following the election of August 10, a special committee was set up to consider, study, evaluate and recommend changes in the rules. That committee sat for approximately two years. It had frequent meetings. Our party at that time was in opposition. I remember very distinctly the members of our party coming back to caucus and reporting that they and the government members on the committee were trying to negotiate and work together so that they might eventually come up with a unanimous recommendation. The Hon. E. Davie Fulton was a representative of our party on that committee. I recall him coming back to caucus and suggesting that certain steps might be taken. The Hon. Walter Harris was government house leader at that time. The approach we had to the rule

changes at the time was entirely different from the approach of the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) today. This Prime Minister and this minister are trying to ramrod changes through the House of Commons. In that day it was done by negotiation.

May I just tell you a little about the result of that negotiation. It was for the good of parliament. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will recollect this because he was a member of the committee. In those days, some 15 or 16 years ago, he was even then considered a knowledgeable man concerning the rules of the house. I think he probably was about the most knowledgeable man in the House of Commons at that time. The committee met on many occasions. The members of the committee came to the conclusion that the only thing to do was to bring in a unanimous report, one that would receive the commendation of all parties in the House of Commons. That procedure is so different from the procedure we are facing today. I suggest that the recommendations of that committee were as far reaching as they could be. In 1955, the first time since 1867, a period of 88 years, one of the recommendations brought in was that there should be a limitation of time for the throne speech debate. Another was that there should be a limitation of time on the budget debate.

This evening the Prime Minister spoke about allocation of time as though it was something entirely new. What does he know about it? He has only been around here since 1965. In 1955 a change in the rules was brought in to effect a limitation on the throne speech debate and on the budget debate for the first time in history. I think that should be noted. This was done by negotiation. It was done by a conciliatory approach by all parties. This was the approach that was felt to be proper by all members of the committee of that day. When members of the government today suggest that allocation of time is new they are talking utter nonsense. They do not know what they are talking about. This particular change was brought in by negotiation, by agreement and by good common bargaining and consent. It is true the members had their differences at times, but they got together.

At this point, Mr. Speaker I should like to place on the record one or two quotations from the debates in 1955. I believe they are very interesting. Here is one quotation.

• (12 midnight)

> I want to make it very clear that we appreciate the attitude taken by the minister—

He was referring to Walter Harris, at that time the house leader of the government. The quotation continues:

> —in the subcommittee and carried forward by him into the main committee after the subcommittee had completed its negotiations.

That quotation can be found at page 5564 of *Hansard* for July 1, 1955. The statement was made by the hon. E. Davie Fulton who was in the opposition at that time. I am sure the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) would be pleased if he could find himself able to make that statement at the beginning of this particular debate after reasonable negotiation and the application of simple good common sense by everyone.

Mr. Stanfield: The hon. member for Peace River is a very reasonable man. Everybody knows that.

Mr. Monteith: I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre must also have nostalgia when reading *Hansard* for July 1, 1955. I am sure he would like to have been able to repeat today what he said on that occasion.

An hon. Member: He certainly has neuralgia.

Mr. Monteith: The hon. member said this:

> I too wish to add my expression of pleasure at the way in which the Minister of Finance dealt with us. Not only did he spend a great deal of time in connection with this matter, not only did he bring to bear the results of a great deal of study, but when it got down to the hard business of compromise and bargaining the four of us who met together found that as a result of collective bargaining in good faith—something which I support wholeheartedly—we have been able to come up with a report which is unanimous so far as the committee is concerned.

That quotation can be found at page 5568 of *Hansard* for July 1, 1955, and those are the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Times have changed.

Mr. Monteith: Times have changed drastically, as the hon. member suggests. This is the way it was, and members from both sides of the house worked toward a common sense end for the good of this institution.

I should like to refer to one other quotation. I will not quote it but it is a reference to

the debate at that time in 1955. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) delivered a short and friendly speech in which he recalled the tradition set forth by Macdonald, McGee, Laurier and Burke. Contrast that speech or approach with the speech he delivered here last week in which that right hon. member felt obliged to launch a vigorous attack on the decision of the government as embodied in the report of the committee. He said the privileges and prerogatives of the house and its members were at stake, and there is no doubt about that. This is the result of the intransigency and ill will caused by this government and its approach to these rule changes.

I should like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of the house should compare the approach to the 1955 rule changes to the present one. I neglected to mention this earlier, but at that time the rule changes were discussed in his chamber for exactly two half days; one half day on July 1—we worked in those days when I first came here on all holidays, and the house sat on July 1—and another half day.

In 1955, the actual motion for adoption was moved by the Hon. Walter Harris and seconded by the Hon. E. Davie Fulton. This indicates co-operation, and what can be done if the determination is there to get together and work out a common sense solution. That is not what has been done by this government today. This government is trying to shove everything down the throats of the opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: DeGaullism, that's what it is.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Co-operation, that was a very important factor.

Mr. Monteith: It was a very important factor. I have referred only to two of what I thought were the major changes in respect of limitation, one in respect of the throne speech debate and the other on the budget debate. There has never, in 88 years of our history, been any limitation on the time of debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but I must bring to his attention that his time has expired. He can continue with the consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I would not deign to continue any longer as a result of the "no" I heard from across the chamber in this

House of Commons. I was only pointing out certain truths which I hope members on the government benches will appreciate and realize to be truths.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, this debate is coming to a close and, indeed, to a forced closure. I am not so certain, on the basis of my persuasive powers, that I expect at this witching hour of midnight to persuade any members opposite to change their minds and vote against this illiberal and iniquitous measure before us. I want to say that my conviction is that this has been a very sad week for the Canadian parliament. It has been sad because the spirit of free co-operation which is essential to the successful operation of any institution such as a parliament has suffered a severe blow. It has been over-ridden and crushed down by a government decision to impose its own version of parliamentary procedure by the arbitrary means of closure. The government has deliberately preferred the bulldozer, the bludgeon, and the parliamentary knout to the principle of consultation among reasonable men.

I suspect that this will turn out to be a sad week for a party which calls itself Liberal.

Liberalism at its historic best, as I understand it, involves responsibility toward minorities, respect for the process of debate and discussion among equals and willingness to give oppositions and minorities their fair share in decision making and debate. I am distressed that in a party which calls itself Liberal not a single person has stood up during this debate and propounded genuine Liberal principles. I fear that within a few minutes we will vote on this motion to limit the debates of this parliament, and not one Liberal will have the courage to vote for the amendment and against the motion before us. That flouts every principle of Liberalism.

I do not believe that a party which has so clearly demonstrated its contempt for parliament will long enjoy the confidence of the Canadian people who are, I believe profoundly committed by a sense of fair play to democratic principles and practices. Another melancholy feature of this whole matter is that it has been totally unnecessary. It is unnecessary because the reason for the prolonging of this debate and the imposition of closure to conclude it have both been caused by the insistence of the government to put through rule 75c. This rule is as unnecessary for its stated purpose, a reasonable allocation of time, as it is arbitrary. I do not say this because I do not believe in the reform of our

parliamentary procedure, nor because I do not believe in the necessity of time allocation. On the contrary, I have been a zealous advocate of both parliamentary reform and time allocation.

• (12:10 a.m.)

I have been appalled at times by what seemed to be the inefficiency and dilatoriness of house procedure. I think that if parliament is to do an effective job, it is necessary to streamline parliamentary procedure. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Liberal party have no monopoly on the desire to streamline parliamentary procedure. I have always advocated that our procedure needs streamlining, and I do so now. We should have a greater limitation on the time allowed for speeches. I believe it would be better if more members spoke and the time limit for speeches were reduced. I think most of us can do better in 20 minutes than we can in 40 minutes. I agree that there is a necessity for getting through the house in an orderly way an extensive legislative program. Legislation has been promised year after year and not introduced at all. I have personally listened to ten different ministers of immigration promise a new Indian Act, which I assure the house is badly needed; but it has never been introduced.

We have heard successive Speeches from the Throne promising a Canada Development Corporation. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has brought forward a long awaited revision of our expropriation statutes, which are much outdated and unjust, but we have not found time to enact it into law. Problems of pollution are grave; they have found their way into the forefront of the public conscience, and rightly so. The water act, which is to set up machinery to enable full federal participation in dealing with water pollution, languishes in some ministerial filing cabinet.

I believe that members of parliament can, through the committees system, become the originators of much needed legislation. I am quite sure that when the party I represent becomes the government, which I think may be sooner than some hon. members anticipate—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin:—it will want to present, and will present, a varied and vigorous program of legislative action. For all these reasons I welcome, as I believe this party does, steps toward an orderly allocation of time and the planning of the business of the house. It is for this very reason that I regret the government has chosen a method of time allocation and a means of imposing it which could not help but rouse the firm opposition of any self-respecting member of the house who is not silenced by obligatory support of the government.

I regret that the government brought this measure into the house at a time when perhaps it hoped the weariness of the opposition after a long session would enable it to ram through something unacceptable. I think the government was mistaken in believing that the opposition could be bludgeoned or cajoled by the deprivation of a summer vacation into abandoning its duties and what it believes in, which is parliamentary rather than governmental control of parliamentary business.

I regret that the government has seen fit to ram through the house this unconstitutional and improper rule change through the process of the guillotine or closure, which should be used only in an emergency. There has been no emergency. The Prime Minister, in his superior manner, spoke of the stupid filibuster. I distrust the judgment of those who accuse their opponents of stupidity and hypocrisy. To do so smacks of the spirit of blindness, if not arrogance. Whether or not the battle put up in this house by the opposition parties has been stupid depends upon the purpose of the operation. I think this operation, call it filibuster if you will, was to preserve a balance between the rights of the executive on one hand, and the rights of opposition members, representing as they do the people of Canada, on the other.

We are not being stupid. We are only doing our clear duty in resisting a change in procedure which would put the balance too far in favour of an executive-dominated house. If there is stupidity in connection with this debate, may it not more reasonably be charged against those who have made the debate necessary and who have to resort to closure to end it? The government insists on the passage of 75c, but 75c is not necessary to the effective conduct of legislative business.

The root question which we are deciding in this debate is whether as a general rule the business of parliament is to be based on consultation or consensus on the one hand, or coercion and dictation on the other. I am absolutely convinced, as a believer in time allocation, that the former method is more effective. However, the government has deliberately chosen the latter.

Without 75c, and indeed without 75A and 75B, the government has received from the opposition parties, through the process of consultation among the house leaders, all the co-operation required to run the business of parliament in an orderly fashion. There has been no evidence of obstruction in this parliament. I think the criticism of the government by opposition members has been constructive. We have tried to urge the government forward rather than to hobble it. Good politics as well as common sense, not to mention ordinary patriotism, means that with 75A and 75B an orderly allocation of time could have been effected.

The government seems to be basing its insistence on 75c on the fears of the past rather than the realities of the present. It is one of the ironies of history that those who would be responsible for making time allocation work under 75A and 75B are all men of responsibility and moderation, men who believe as much as any government member in making parliament work. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) are all of course, responsible to their respective parties; but it would be hard to imagine individual members more conscious of the importance of a working and functioning parliamentary system. I would have been prepared to add to that group of reasonable men the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). He is a man with a reputation of being an able, cool-headed lawyer. To my mind one of the mysteries of this debate has been the part he has taken in the proceedings. I personally thought he would have had more sense than to ram this measure through the house. Perhaps it is because he is not his own master.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin: I repeat that 75c is not necessary and never has been. A reasonable time allocation could be achieved by 75A and 75B which the opposition parties were ready to accept, without any question of closure or any need to rely upon Standing Order 33 which should be used only as a last resort. Supposing I am wrong? Why not proceed by steps? Why not try rules 75A and 75B which the opposition parties accept? Why not try to work out a reasonable and agreed system of time allocation, and if that does not work, obstruction occurs and the government's timetable is disrupted, then would be the time to press for some such rule as 75c. One can only conclude that the insistance—in pressing on with 75c is evidence of an attitude of mind which prefers to impose its will rather than to persuade.

I prophesy that future historians will see in the events of this week the seeds of the disintegration of the Liberal party. The ultimate judges under our system are the sovereign people of Canada, whose servants we are. I believe the people of Canada will condemn in no uncertain manner the government for what it has done this week as soon as they can. I believe this will be a salutary lesson of the vitality of Canadian democracy and the parliamentary system as it is known in Canada. I believe that the people of Canada will restore the balance between the government and parliament which has been seriously upset by the procedures we are asked to approve tonight.

• (12:20 a.m.)

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, as a backbencher I rise to speak in this debate near the end of a thrilling, difficult and exciting series of speeches, points of order and motions. I believe that there is one point that can be made from all parts of this house in unanimity, that is that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the speaker have conducted this debate on the highest plane and have set an example for all parliaments throughout the world by conducting this debate with distinction and decorum. I think I can speak for all members of the house in thanking you for the magnificent manner in which you conducted our deliberations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gibson: May I say as a backbencher that the performance of the Speaker in the Chair is one of the most important facets of our life in parliament, and we all appreciate this.

It seems to me that the debate which we have been conducting here is very much like the situation where an irresistible force meets an immovable object. Someone has to give, and the majority party in this house is not going to give; it cannot give or we will have no government at all, we will have chaos.

Our parliamentary colleagues opposite in the New Democratic party, who profess to be the main repository of parliamentary principle, who adorn themselves in the unstained raiment of virtue, and who profess an undying allegiance to the right to free speech,

have provided the House of Commons with another example of why so many people in Canada have become disenchanted with this great institution. Two nights ago, in a virtuoso performance of invective, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) went on a rampage of character assassination of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), festooned with solemn appeals to principle.

The speech of the hon. member for Skeena was a great insult to the greatest contemporary Canadian, namely the Prime Minister of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gibson: In reply to his poetry of sarcasm, I have only this to say:

> There once was a member from Skeena,
> Who bayed like a wounded hyena,
> The force of his words fell flat on the floor,
> And he left for a smaller arena.

An hon. Member: Such as Manitoba.

Mr. Gibson: I was saddened by the television antics of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) who, on a T.V. program, in discussing the conduct of the Prime Minister before a group of students at the centennial fountain, by means of the most reprehensible demagoguery, misled these young Canadians by implying that the Prime Minister is a dictator.

An hon. Member: Fascist.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member could identify for us the document from which he is reading.

Mr. Gibson: I am reading my speech from notes.

No party in Canadian history was ever permitted more freedom of speech, suggestion and action than the present Liberal party under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the cabinet. I submit that this house is the freest house in the world. The entire rules debate reveals how powerless the majority is when faced by obstruction and how necessary it is for Canada to return to majority rule. The Prime Minister has successfully contributed more in the process of uniting the people of this country from any threat of tyranny and fascism than any other Canadian. The proof is in his record when he actively helped to defeat the Duplessis machine in Quebec. His writings demonstrate his belief in federalism and the Canadian constitution. His actions prove the validity of his words. If opposition members would only realize that we are moving toward more freedom and not less freedom, then parliament would be a stronger place.

An hon. Member: Who wrote that?

Mr. Gibson: The charter of civil liberties and the bill of rights, as well as the language bill and all the other measures, coupled with our rules reform in the whole context are unfolding a new democracy for Canada that is freer than ever before in our history. We are all on this side of the house bound and determined to make parliament work more effectively in co-operation with the opposition parties. We on this side of the house have learned, participated and constructively strengthened parliament with existing reforms of committees and rule changes. We have also learned through the course of this debate that there are many very valuable members of the opposition who have contributed a great deal to this debate, and we have much to learn from many of them, including the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned me by name. I wonder if he would permit a gesture?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He is taking a bow.

Mr. Gibson: It is more than a coincidence that in the past few months parliament has successfully passed over 50 statutes, including the omnibus Criminal Code amendments and the languages bill. So progress is on the way, and we have demonstrated in this debate the necessity to complete reform of the rules, as we were given a mandate in 1968 to do.

An hon. Member: Go on to page three.

Mr. Gibson: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has taken a very active part in this debate. If we adopt the suggestion of the hon. member to remove closure from rule 75c at the report stage, it would make a real mockery of the closure rule for it would permit unlimited debate at the report stage.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gibson: The hon. member knows that this would not work.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Since the hon. member has mentioned my name, would he permit a question?

Mr. Gibson: No, Mr. Speaker. To pretend otherwise is sheer hypocrisy, and that fact is well known to all of us in the house.

An hon. Member: The answer to the question is not in his notes.

Mr. Gibson: The entire structure of rules reform would collapse because, as hon. members well know, and particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, any number of amendments would be debated at the report stage and no reform would be passed. There would be no restraint on a filibuster which has been and would be conducted by frustrated opposition parties.

I condemn the shoddy tactics of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to invoke "work to rule" tactics in the House of Commons. Such a sloppy, unCanadian idea was resented by all good Canadians during the recent Air Canada strike, and it is resented now. We do not advocate such a course.

• (12:30 a.m.)

Mr. Lewis: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gibson: We in the government party are sincerely dedicated to making parliament work well—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Keep going.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hesitate to interrupt this interesting speech, but I cannot hear whether the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) is rising on a point of order or to ask a question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that since the hon. member did not mention my name—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: —may I ask him a question?

Mr. Gibson: I might entertain it, if the hon. member could get it out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, or no!

Mr. Gibson: It is only in exceptional circumstances, when the opposition prevents the majority from governing, that closure will ever be used. I am sure all members realize that the government believes this, and we believe it. If this does not happen, I pledge, as a backbencher and as a member of our caucus to see that it is changed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gibson: Modern living requires some order in our parliamentary lives. Our mandate in 1968 was to govern Canada, not to be shackled to outmoded procedural barriers in the way of reform. Let us proceed to participatory democracy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the assurance given by the hon. member that he is going to straighten everything out, I wonder whether the house would agree to our adjourning until three o'clock so that we could reconsider our position?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) who, at such a late hour, with a well prepared speech, has cheered up the house. But, in refusing to answer questions, he certainly did not give the example of participatory democracy as his leader wants it.

In any event, I can forecast a promotion for him for singing the praises of his leader as well as those of the cabinet members. I am convinced the hon. member will be promoted in a very short time.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member believes in Standing Order 75c, I say to him, this may be the last speech he will deliver in the house because it applies to the backbenchers as well as to the members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this session, the Prime Minister, (Mr. Trudeau) the ministers, and the government members have used the news media to publicize their views. They have stated that in the house of commons nothing was being done, time was being wasted and that, obviously, drastic measures were required to remedy the situation.

The Prime Minister told us tonight, that his government had received a mandate to move this motion of closure known as rule 75c. Had

he told the people of Canada that he would introduce rule 75c to muzzle the opposition and to bring it to heel, his government would not be in power today.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, as a young university student, I was deeply interested by the present Prime Minister's statements and writings. I told myself he was a true defender of freedom and democracy. I was also interested in the fight he carried on to try and protect the asbestos workers' freedom. I considered him a supporter of democracy. I used to read his articles published in *Cité libre,* where he defined what he meant by "an efficient opposition in a democratic government" and criticized the Union Nationale government, and sometimes he was right. When he became Minister of Justice, I hoped that at last someone in the House of Commons would respect and enforce the principles of true democracy.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, since he has said those famous words while Minister of Justice, during the debate of February 1968, when he told the house that the government was master there, the Prime Minister started to disappoint me and I thought that he was not sincere when he referred to real democratic principles.

Mr. Speaker, introduction of standing order 75c means that the Prime Minister wants to put into effect what he said in the House of Commons in February 1968, that the government is master of the House of Commons. All those who took part in the debate, at least the opposition members, have strongly reaffirmed the equality of all hon. members, of their rights and privileges, and it is not the Prime Minister of Canada who is going to change these privileges even with his closure rule standing order 75c.

Mr. Speaker, by using its majority to impose standing order 75c which is in fact, as I said earlier, a permanent measure of closure, the government has shown through such inflexibility that there was no place anymore for the opposition in parliament.

This measure which represents the basic philosophy of totalitarian governments will lead us inevitably to the establishment in this house of a one party system in which the members of the opposition, stifled by the government majority, will not be able to make people hear the complaints and the claims of those who elected them democratically and, as many speakers said today: There is nothing, in he present circumstances, to justify the introduction by the government of rule 75c because in the course of this session—and I think I can say it—no government ever received such sincere and frank co-operation from the official opposition and from the other opposition parties as did the present government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Asselin: The Prime Minister and other members of the government accuse us, through the radio, television, and public statements, of holding up government bills, because repeatedly in the last session, the government was not ready to bring bills before the house, although we were ready to study them, criticize them and approve them. That is the role of the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Besides, we of the opposition know, as I said a while ago, that the Prime Minister of Canada, when he wrote articles for *Cité Libre,* studied the concept of opposition in politics. In the May 1960 issue, No. 27 of *Cité Libre,* the Prime Minister spoke of the opposition but not quite in the same way as he did tonight.

He said and I quote:

> In a parliamentary democracy, the opponent is the one who professes to believe that the party in power should not be there; not necessarily because everything the party does is wrong but because another party could often do better. Consequently, whether he sits in parliament or is otherwise active in politics, the opponent must systematically and mercilessly criticize the errors of the government, and use all true arguments and legal means to bring the people to eventually bring another party to power.

That is the definition the Prime Minister gave of the opposition when he wrote in *Cité Libre.* However, when he introduced 75c, he forget his great democratic principles; he is trying, as I said a while ago, to muzzle the opposition, to destroy it.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we dwelt at length on important measures, such as the amendment to the Criminal Code, the officiel languages bill, but the members of the opposition have not abused their privileges.

• (12:40 a.m.)

Indeed, rule 75c is going to change drastically the structure of parliament, or the rules. From now on, the executive will no longer be at the service of parliament, but parliament will be at the service of the executive. Such will be the natural outcome of the government's tendency to establish forcibly—as I said before—the one-party rule, that of the majority which will not only rule also impose

its will in the drafting of important legislation, which will have serious consequences for every Canadian.

This one-party system that rule 75c aims at establishing, exists in developing countries, in young African countries, for instance. In order to step up their development, those countries have adopted the one-party system, thus wiping out opposition.

Well, under rule 75c, the Prime Minister and the government are indirectly trying to impose on us the one-party system. Mr. Speaker, in a democratic parliament, there is place for an opposition. In a free and democratic country, it has an important part to play.

History has proved repeatedly that freedom dies where criticism is stifled. Opposition maintains a proper balance between freedom and democracy. As a matter of fact, it was Lord Acton who wrote, and I quote:

> Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Men and governments alike fall a prey to the temptation brought by power.
>
> The word "democracy" ensures no protection against tyranny. Without supervision and control, the better disposed people become autocrats.

The favour British parliamentarian Quentin Hogg said, and I quote:

> Without an organized opposition, countries cannot be entirely free.

Between the absence of an organized opposition and complete dictatorship, there is not very far to go, Mr. Speaker.

> Without an opposition to watch, to scrutinize, to sound the alarm, a government could oppress the people without limit. The opposition is an assurance that the government governs fairly, taking into account individual rights and liberties.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition's role, I repeat, is to scrutinize, to ask questions, to consider, to make suggestions and amendments, so as to obtain in every possible way the necessary information, for the education and guidance of public opinion, in order that electors might make a sensible choice.

The government sometimes begrudges the opposition the time they take to pass legislation. We know—and the government also knows—that weeks and days can go by before the public becomes aware of a measure.

We have found that the government, following an intelligent argument put forward by the opposition and representations on the part of the public, often changed a legislation because they realized that such a measure was not in the public interest.

[Mr. Asselin.]

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, is a place where in the heat of debate, freedom is preserved, arguments are put forward and considered and decisions are made. An opposition, which properly fulfills its responsibilities, becomes, for the purpose of sound critic, the public's instrument.

I compare section 75c to compulsory arbitration and I know that the minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), who is not here tonight, has always fought against the imposition of compulsory arbitration on unions by the provincial government. Maybe he was right. At that time, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion stood up, as a union leader, for the collective freedom of workers.

I wonder today why he approves that legislation that smacks of compulsory arbitration, in my opinion, because according to standing orders 75A and 75B, if the house leaders agree, the debates might be restricted. However, rule 75c states that the government, on its own initiative, through a minister, will arbitrarily decide to apply standing orders without consulting the other house leaders. This compulsory arbitration goes still much farther than the one existing in labour circles, because there an unbiased arbitrator is selected, while under 75c, the government house leader will be arbitrator and party at the same time.

I maintain that under those circumstances standing order 75c, being close to compulsory arbitration, is not only unacceptable to parliament, but also to all Canadian democratic organizations.

The opposition is not alone in its fight against rule 75c. Almost all Canadian newspapers opposed it.

Tonight, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) quoted the *Montreal Star* as a newspaper supporting the government for introducing rule 75c. I would advise the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce to be very careful because it was the only newspaper, in 1956, to support the government for imposing closure during the pipe-line debate. We remember that the government was defeated then Mr. Speaker. Therefore, if the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has the backing of no other newspaper than the *Montreal Star*, I can tell him that he is due for some surprises at the next election, if history repeats itself, as it often does.

• (12:50 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker, several newspapers have supported our stand in this connection. I have

here an article published in *Le Devoir* of July 15, 1969, where it is said:

> Therefore, the government did not have any serious grounds for complaining about filibustering tactics by opposition parties. They were actually resorted to on one occasion only, in the debate on the omnibus bill, the passage of which was unduly delayed by the Créditiste group. But that case alone did not justify the introduction of such a rule as 75c.
>
> The government should have made better use of the friendly atmosphere that prevailed to extend further the co-operation between the free men who make up parliament. Instead, they preferred to put forward a rule which would amount to converting parliament into a college. Such an attitude, unacceptable in principle, actually points to an unfortunate lack of understanding of the human element without which the finest technocratic plans are doomed to failure.

I could also read certain articles published in *La Presse* and *Montréal Matin* that matter. After having called on the good will and good faith of the government house leader and of the government members, concerning the possibility of negotiating on rule 75c, it seems strange that those people should think that all the members of the opposition are wrong and that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) alone possesses the truth. Apart from that, in this house all the members of the opposition were absolutely wrong when they opposed rule 75c.

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we will be casting the fateful vote which I think will toll the bell for parliamentary freedom. That does not mean, that we of the opposition should give up fighting here tonight. We will continue in the months ahead to fight against rule 75c, even if it is adopted tonight, so that the government cannot apply it abusively. Otherwise, a dictatorial system will be established in the house, which is unacceptable to the opposition, and which will be rejected, I am sure, at the proper time by the majority of sensible Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore say that the opposition will keep on watching—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time seems to have expired. Unless he has the consent of the house, the hon. member will not be able to finish his speech. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Asselin: I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of my party (Mr. Stanfield) has put up a brave, courageous and gallant fight against the way the government has presented and wishes to implement rule 75c.

I wonder if the Prime Minister was sincere when he stated this afternoon that it will perhaps be possible to revise rule 75c.

I am still willing to give the Prime Minister credit for the good faith he deserves. However, I would have preferred that the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), before introducing a rule as serious and significant as rule 75c, had consulted the leaders of the minor parties and the Leader of the Official Opposition, and tried to come to a compromise in an effort to correct this rule. Here we have the Prime Minister putting us before a fait accompli. Rule 75c will be passed and will become part of the Standing Orders of this house. But we may be able to correct it later if we find that it is too rigid.

Beforehand, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Prime Minister that rule 75c will perhaps be useful to the government, but at the same time it will destroy the freedom of speech that has existed for a century in this house.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of rule 75c, we will carry on the fight because we feel that ours is a just cause, that the majority of Canadians support it and that in due course will be able to see that the government was mistaken in putting into effect rule 75c.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. John Roberts (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, it is not often I speak in the house. I was reluctant to inject myself into this debate. I thought as one of the new members that perhaps I should leave it to some of the more experienced members. However the fact was brought home dramatically two days ago yesterday and today, that experience is a far cry from wisdom.

I was astonished to hear what some hon. members, such as the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), had to say. I thought it was uncharacteristic of her and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) to taunt the new members of this house by saying they did not have sufficient experience to judge this question.

Mr. Monteith: You don't.

Mr. Roberts: They tried to discredit these new members because of a lack of experience. We are all equal in this house. We do

not speak by virtue of the fact that we have five, ten or 20 years' experience. We speak by virtue of the fact we have been sent here by our constituents to represent them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: I do not deny those with experience and who know this house have a legitimate point of view to present, but those who have just come to this house have a fresh point of view. They also have something of interest and value to say because they do not look at this house with the coloured and distorted spectacles that some members who have been here many years sometimes inherit.

Some of the experienced members, especially on the opposition side, spoke of their love for this place and their love of democracy. I wish to assure these members that new members on both sides also love this house and democracy. Over the past few days we have been called Nazis and fascists by the opposition. This impasse has been described as good guys versus the bad guys. It has been described as stopping evil men. That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker.

I do not charge the members of the opposition with insincerity, nor should they charge us with wicked intentions. Both sides of this house are motivated by a sincere concern for parliament. Members of the opposition have no monopoly on these qualities. Before us are the differences of honest men with divergent views concerning a basic problem in parliamentary organization.

This is not a new problem, although it takes a new form today. It is a concern for that tension which has always existed in parliament, that tension between the right of the government and the public, to have legislation passed in this house; and the right of the opposition, and the public, to scrutinize that legislation.

I think it was the leader of the New Democratic Party who quoted the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as if the Prime Minister were on his side of the debate. The Prime Minister was dealing with exactly that balance I am describing, the balance between the right to govern and legislate and the balance on the other side to criticize.

• (1:00 a.m.)

The history of parliament, at least over the past century, has been a history of a steady increase of government control in the House of Commons. Why? Not because of imperialistic government but because parliament does not exist in a vacuum. The rules of parliament correspond to social needs. We cannot freeze our procedures so that they become irrelevant. We cannot look simply to the legacy of the past. We must look at the function of parliament in the context of the society in which it operates. The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), in a speech which I thought was one of the best and one of the most learned speeches in this house, referred to Burke. I do not quote Burke often because he is not one of my favourite philosophers, but what Burke emphasized above all else was that political institutions, and society itself, were growing organisms which were developing through time, that they were moulded by time and that they must meet the changing interests of the society in which they exist. That is true in this parliament as well. The old rules of the past simply are not sufficient for the new era. That is the mistake which I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has made in this debate.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre focussed completely on what has happened in the past, a point of view governed by his rear view mirror. I have been enormously interested, amused and delighted by the whole pageantry of characters that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has presented in this debate. There was first St. Stanley of St. Stanley and the Dragon riding to the rescue of a beseiged democracy plaintively crying for help. But, of course, the outrage and distress in democracy was more in his mind than anywhere else. Members of the opposition have spoken of the outraged public but I did not need to fight my way through outraged mobs of citizenry to get into the house today. The newspapers have been split on the issue; some have been for and some against. Some of the columnists have been for and some have been against. I have received two letters on the issue and two telephone calls, one for, one against.

After the image of St. Stanley we had the member for Winnipeg North Centre as Horatio at the bridge valiantly battling back the forces of tyranny. That was replaced by his kind of King Canute-like stance bidding the waves to recede. After that we drop to perhaps a little less attractive image. It was the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre as a little boy with the marble game—"If you

don't play by my rules I will break it up". What did he say? He said there would be confrontation, there would be no more participatory democracy, there would be no more co-operation. That seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be one of the most remarkable things a member of the opposition could say. I could understand him saying, "Look, when you bring in bad legislation we will oppose it vigorously" but when he says they are going to oppose to the death all legislation, are going to oppose everything whether it is good for the public or not and are going to punish the public of Canada for what he considers to be the sins of the government, that seems to me to be going too far.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I do not mind the pleasure the hon. member is having with these characterizations he is making of me, but I ask him not to say things which I did not say. I gave no indication that we would oppose good legislation.

Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not want to put words into the mouth of the member. What he said was there will be confrontation, there will be frustration, there will be work to rule and there will be no participatory democracy. If he says he is not going to do it, who does he expect to do it? Does he expect the government is going to do it? Where is the obstruction and confrontation going to come from? Well, that takes me to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in his last role. I hope he will not mind a slightly light comment. In the end he really came to remind me of that lovable old codger who used to inhabit Allen's Alley on the Fred Allen show, Digby O'Dell, the friendly undertaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: —because what he keeps emphasizing is the desire to preserve the traditions of parliament. What Digby O'Dell arrived at was embalming.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is rising for the purpose of asking a question, if the member will allow a question.

Mr. Roberts: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will allow a question.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has been referred to as an undertaker I wonder who the hon. member considers is buried.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk on the part of the opposition on the right to scrutiny and the right to debate. I suggest in all sincerity—and I am speaking more I think of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre than the official opposition—what they are really concerned with is not the right to scrutinize and not the right to debate; they are concerned with the right to obstruct and the right to blockade.

They have discovered that procedure can be used—as it was used by the Irish members in the mid 19th century in Great Britain—to blockade the government. If that had not been so, if they were concerned simply with debate and a full discussion of the issues, why did the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre not accept the suggestion of the government house leader for unlimited debate and discussion in the committees? That would have given time for a full discussion of the issue and would have given time to arouse the press and the public. I suggest the reason he did not want the debate in committee and wanted unlimited debate in the house instead was because he knew that unlimited debate in the house would block not simply one piece of legislation but the whole government program. That is what he wanted—to blockade the house. He does not want simply to blockade one piece of legislation. He does not want simply to debate it to arouse the country. He wants a pistol at the head of the government. He wants a weapon to use as an exercise in political blackmail, a quid pro quo for the government bending to the opposition.

Our task, Mr. Speaker, I think is not simply to discuss and debate in parliament. Our task is to make parliament pertinent to the needs of the nation. When listening to members of the opposition I was reminded of a statement made only two years ago by a Conservative member in this house—

An hon. Member: You were not here then.

Mr. Roberts: That is right; I was not here then, Mr. Speaker. I had the pleasure of listening to the debates of the house from the balcony. I remember very well the hon. member, Mr. Heward Grafftey, rising in this

house and saying during the debate—and it was a statement which was acclaimed spontaneously from the galleries of the house—that everybody who sits here knows that this establishment, particularly for the young generation, is becoming meaningless. He continued and said that the people of Canada were becoming sick and tired of seeing parliament fritter away its time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: I say that is still true. I say the people of Canada are sick and tired of parliamentary tricks and treats as played by so many members of the opposition. The basic question is how much time for debate is reasonable and who should decide this. I admit freely to the house, and I said so at the time, that the provision called 16A presented by the government last December was not a provision I could support. I would not because I did not think the balance it presented was fair. I am convinced, however, that the present allocation is a fair one which corresponds to our age of telecommunications. It may be that one day in the past, in the horse and buggy days, it required weeks and months of debate so that members could go back to their constituents and bring home to them the matters of concern. That is not true in an age when you can send in seconds a signal to the moon. It is not true when we have, as we do now, television, radio and newspapers nation-wide and responsive in bringing home to the public issues of public concern. Ten days delay and four days debate are sufficient in communicating to the public if the issue is one of genuine, serious and important concern.

Some of the best debates—those on urgent matters—are short. They take only one day. But they capture more press and public attention than long winded efforts.

I suggest that the people of Canada do not want simply a debate; they do not want repetitious, time wasting, sterile, fractious, carping. They want action. What the opposition wants is the ability to close off action and to obtain indirectly the power which the voters denied them directly. They want to be able to talk forever—to talk legislation to death. I have some news, for members of the opposition. There are many people in this country who are not as fond of hearing members of this house as some of the members are of hearing themselves.

• (1:10 a.m.)

The public want a House of Commons which will wallow less and do more. They do not want a web of words, a cocoon of parliamentary technicalities from which no butterflies of legislation fly.

In closing, perhaps it would be appropriate for me to mention the Leader of the Opposition who has been rising periodically in this house with a voice of doom, stretching out his wavering hand and saying, "In all honesty can you as a member of this house support this measure?" I will save the Leader of the Opposition that dramatic gesture. Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that the best is sometimes the enemy of the good. Nothing under God's sun is perfect. But this is a good proposal and I support it unreservedly.

An hon. Member: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Roberts: I will sit down shortly, but I have one more comment which I think hon. members might find interesting and useful. It relates to the Leader of the Opposition. He and those people behind him have been charging the Prime Minister with arrogance and a disrespect for members of parliament, no responsibility or respect for backbenchers, no respect for traditions and no respect for the rights of this house. They have charged him with having no respect for democracy with being a computerized technocrat and so on.

There is another hon. gentleman of this house who was once the leader of a government. What was his reaction when crossed during debate? I refer to the Leader of the Opposition who was crossed in a debate once in the Nova Scotia legislature. What he said was I am giving serious consideration to the idea of introducing a bill that would remove that hon. member's legislative immunity retroactively.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Roberts: That was his instinctive reaction. That is what he did say; and if that is what his instinct was as the leader of a government I suggest it is better that he and members of the opposition do not trot out charges of arrogance against our Prime Minister. It lacks credibility.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The incident to which my hon. friend refers involved a matter of possible slander against someone outside the

house. This was a case of the abuse of the privileges of the house by an hon. member. The circumstances were totally different.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not wish to prolong things at this hour, but I simply say this was a case of—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: This was simply a case of bringing the attention of the legislative assembly in Nova Scotia to an abuse of the house rules and privileges, the same sort of thing I have been accusing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of here.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 33 and in accordance with an order made this day and the provisions thereof, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put all questions which may be necessary to dispose of the amendment and the motion now before the house.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Baldwin) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Caouette
Carter
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
McGrath
McKinley
Marshall
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moores
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Rynard
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Valade
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—83.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock

Division

Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—141.

• (1:40 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I declare the amendment lost. I also bring it to the notice of hon. members that they should not come into the house or leave the house before the vote is completed. This would be the time to come in.

The question is now on the main motion. Is it the wish of hon. members that we put the division of the house without the call of the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Blair) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Éthier
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—142.

NAYS

Messrs.

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Caouette
Carter
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Lewis
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis, Mrs.
MacLean
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley

Division

Marshall	Ritchie	Thompson	Woolliams
Mazankowski	Rodrigue	Valade	Yewchuk—84.
Monteith	Rose	Winch	
Moores	Rynard		
Muir (Cape Breton-	Saltsman		
The Sydneys)	Schumacher		
Muir (Lisgar)	Scott		
Noble	Simpson		
Nowlan	Skoberg		
Nystrom	Stanfield		
Peddle	Stewart (Marquette)		
Peters	Tétrault		
Ricard	Thomas (Moncton)		

• (1:50 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried. It being after ten o'clock this house stands adjourned until eleven o'clock this morning.

It being ten minutes to two, Friday, July 25, the house adjourned, without question put.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 25, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY—EXTRACT FROM MINUTES CONCERNING MEMBERS' EXPENSES

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to lay before the House an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy, concerning certain additional expenses payable to members.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TAX REFORM

HOUSE MEMBERSHIP ON SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the house will recall that a few days ago we constituted a special joint parliamentary committee on tax reform but at that time did not name the personnel. I have a formal order here which, if the house is agreeable, perhaps might be made in order to constitute the membership of the committee so that it can meet during the recess. I therefore move:

That the Members of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee on Tax Reform to consider the Government's proposals for tax reform be Messrs. Blair, Burton, Clermont, Comtois, Danson, Gillespie, Gray, Kaplan, Latulippe, Leblanc (Laurier), Noël, Roberts, Saltsman, Trudel, Danforth, Ritchie, Downey, Flemming, Harkness and Lambert (Edmonton West); and

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

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, how does the House of Commons send a message to the other place when it has adjourned until October 14?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will have to consult the Postmaster General.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It will never get there by October 14.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY—EXTRACT FROM MINUTES CONCERNING MEMBERS' EXPENSES—MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Your Honour just referred to the decision of the Commissioners of Internal Economy concerning certain additional expenses payable to Members of Parliament. If the house is agreeable I should like to move, seconded by Mr. Olson, that the said extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy laid before the House today by Mr. Speaker, concerning certain additional expenses payable to members, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, as one of the members affected by this matter I cannot give my consent to leave to discuss this motion at this time. My refusal does not concern the substance of the motion but rather the granting of leave. In view of the discussion in respect of the rules over the past several weeks and in view of the fact that the government wants to operate on the basis of the rules, I feel we should operate on that basis.

Mr. Speaker: Since there is not agreement for the motion to be put, the motion will not be put.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT TO OCTOBER 22, 1969

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That when the House adjourns for its summer recess it shall stand adjourned until October 22, 1969, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

Motion to Adjourn House

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to support the motion. I propose to move that the motion be amended by deleting the words "October 22" where they appear in the second line and substituting therefore the words "September 22".

• (11:10 a.m.)

I rise to present this amendment, Sir, on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. The effect of the amendment is clear: We should resume parliament not on October 22 but a month earlier on September 22. In view of the accumulation of serious problems facing this country it is immature and irresponsible for the government to send parliament off on a three-month vacation. I think the people of this country will be scandalized at the casual and apparently carefree attitude adopted by the government toward the problems of the country and its responsibilities to find solutions to those problems.

I do not deny for a moment that Members of Parliament are as entitled to a holiday as anybody else, and it must be clear that a good many members of parliament are rather tired today. Furthermore, we all have important work to do in our constituencies and elsewhere. However, there is no reason in the world that parliament should shut down until October 22. The people of Canada will regard a three-month holiday as rather too much of a good thing and as representing a very blasé attitude toward our responsibilities.

I want to make it very clear where the responsibility for this proposed action rests. The government, and the government alone, is insisting on a prolonged adjournment and we on this side, at least those in this party, disassociate ourselves completely from this casual irresponsibility of the government. They are like kids who want to play truant from their responsibilities.

There is no reason—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: I would suggest, Sir—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: I would suggest that my hon. friends save their breath and their voices because if they are disturbed by what I have said so far they may need their lungs more for what I am going to say later.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

There is no reason for the government to keep parliament shut down for almost three months, except the complete disdain of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the cabinet for this institution. They do not like questions, they do not like free debate, and they find parliament a nuisance and an inconvenience. They cannot quite do away with the institution altogether but they impose rules which will give them complete control over it, and they will keep it adjourned just as long as they can.

In view of the kind of parliament envisaged by this government and its supporters in the house, a parliament which meets relatively briefly to endorse the decrees of Caesar after very cursory discussion, it is clear that the attitude of the government and its supporters toward the institutions of government in this country, the attitude of the federal Liberal party, particularly those in this government, differs very little from the views expressed by General de Gaulle—a great soldier, a great patriot, a great man, but hardly a democrat as we understand democracy in this country. It is not for me to suggest what kind of government or government institutions are suitable for France.

Mr. Trudeau: Why are you talking about France?

Mr. Stanfield: As I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say what is suitable for France. But it is coming through loud and clear all the time that this government envisages periodic elections and government in the meantime by press conference and pre-sessions of parliament. It is true we do not have a president, but a rose smells just as sweet by any other name—or a carnation, as far as that is concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: So does an egg plant.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Now we are told that parliament is to meet toward the end of October.

Mr. Hogarth: What year?

An hon. Member: That was a great contribution, Hogarth.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know. It might be put off for another year. In view of the problems that face the country, there is no adequate excuse for this action. The government

says it needs this time to get its legislative program ready for the next session. This is one of the most incredible explanations that could possibly be put forward at this point in time. The government was elected in June of 1968. This session of parliament began on September 12. It was stated in the Speech from the Throne, and it has been repeated numerous times by members of the cabinet and by the propagandists of the Liberal party, that the present session of parliament should be regarded as merely a "clean-up session", that the government, in its orderly and efficient way, wanted to tidy up all the legislative items that were hanging over from the Pearson administration. This session of parliament was chiefly to clear the decks for the new exciting legislation that would usher in the just society.

After spending a whole session of parliament dealing with legislative left-overs from the Pearson government, are the members of this cabinet seriously trying to pretend that they do not have a program ready for the next session of parliament?

Mr. Woolliams: They do not have a program.

Mr. Stanfield: That explanation, Mr. Speaker, is just not believable, unless the government is more inept and dishonest with the people than we feared. It should be mentioned in passing that there were items, some of them very important, in the Speech from the Throne which the government has not yet brought forward in legislative form.

An hon. Member: Due to filibuster.

Mr. Stanfield: I am not impressed by that interjection, Mr. Speaker. We hear all this talk about filibuster, and now the government is asking the house to recess for three months and to meet on October 22.

Mr. Crouse: What a joke!

Mr. Stanfield: It is comforting to have a government supporter show how hollow all this talk has been. What has happened to the educational television bill? What has become of that hardy, old perennial, the Canada Development Corporation? The government removed from the order paper the item having to do with the Indian Claims Commission, thus welshing once more on the understanding given to the Indian people. They have now decided to appoint a commissioner who, in effect, will decide whether there should be a claims commission and, if so, what claims will be considered worthy of being heard by it.

• (11:20 a.m.)

What has become of this magnificently efficient cabinet structure, organized so finely that decisions roll out just as though they came from a computer? What has happened to it, Mr. Speaker? I suppose someone will tell us that committees are meeting in September and that it is a good idea to have the committees free to meet when parliament is adjourned. That is not the same reason that has been given to us so far in any explanation as to why the house is not meeting earlier. We have been told that the government needs time between sessions to get its program ready. This is very difficult to believe of this highly structured, highly organized, computer-like administration.

We have been told in the course of recent days that the government has urgent and important business to bring before the house when the session resumes. Some of it is even said to be highly controversial. This, we were told, was why they needed the weapon of rule 75c. Let us come back here in September and let us see that important legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: If the government is going to chop off debate when we start to consider legislation, I suggest it is going to be pretty hard to add to this more subtle form of closure by keeping parliament adjourned for long periods. I know how unappealing the idea is to the finer sensibilities of the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, but is it not time that the parliament of Canada began to deal with specific solutions to the disgraceful situation in this country regarding poverty? The entire field of anti-poverty measures has been left completely untouched by this government. I suppose they do not want to get their hands dirty.

We were told there has been a review of the whole social welfare system in Canada. Where is it and what is it? When will we see it? What new solutions does the government have to propose? These are questions that directly relate to the thousands of people who are hopelessly trapped by poverty.

While this government relaxes during the month of September, many young people will be prevented from returning to school. Many

will not be able to take advantage of educational training programs because they have not been able to get work and will not be in a financial position to do so. For every day that this government delays the introduction of effective anti-poverty measures, thousands of Canadians sink deeper and deeper into poverty.

An hon. Member: Who is the author?

Mr. Stanfield: We were told that the water act is supposed to be ready in the course of the summer. Why cannot we start work on that? What about the government's own public service pensioners? Are they going to continue to be put off while parliament is in recess? What about the veterans of our armed services? These people and others must be near the top of the priority scheme of the government, if there is one. The people of Canada can only assume that the just society is just a cynical piece of hypocrisy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Are we to stay out until October 22 and leave the country's anti-inflationary program to the tender mercies of this government? Then there is supposed to be legislation relating to corporate disclosure. Why can we not deal with that?

There is no need for me to go on longer detailing the list of things that need urgent consideration. All I will say in closing is that this motion to recess until the 22nd day of October may be all right for the hon. gentlemen opposite who consider this institution to be of small importance, and who consider the important decisions as being those taken by the government and not those taken by parliament. It may suit them fine. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will appear reprehensible in the eyes of the Canadian people, and I call upon the house to support the amendment I propose and to reject the date proposed by the government this morning.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the amendment which has just been moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). Indeed had he not moved such an amendment I would have moved one along similar lines because I am in full accord with the proposition that parliament ought not to recess for three months and that we ought to be back in our places by at least September 22.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Trudeau: Why not earlier?

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Trudeau: Why did your members leave?

An hon. Member: So did yours.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has the floor.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I can understand the Prime Minister's petulance. He probably has not had much sleep.

I want to point out that the government motion that this house recess until October 22 completely destroys the credibility of the government. For months they have been trying to convince the Canadian people that parliament has been preventing them from passing much needed legislation, that they were obstructed in some way, or hindered in bringing in legislation which would completely revolutionize Canadian society. Now they have so little to present to parliament that they are suggesting parliament take a three-months' holiday.

In the house on July 8, as reported on page 10982 of *Hansard*, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said that if there had not been prolonged debate on certain matters, particularly the omnibus bill on the Criminal Code, the government would have proposed many important measures. Well, if there are important measures which the government desires to see passed, there are two things we could have done. We could have continued to sit on into July instead of planning to adjourn on June 27. There would have been no objection on the part of opposition members to sitting during the summer months in order to discharge their responsibilities. We have done it before.

The second thing the government could have done was to call for the reconvening of parliament early in September, immediately after Labour Day. But the government has not done either one of these things. We have dealt with no legislation at all since the first two or three days in July, and now the government suggests it has nothing to put before parliament and that there is no need to bring members back before October 22. I would remind the house that if we start a new session on October 22 with the debate on the address no legislation will be dealt with until the month of November. This means a period

of almost four months during which no legislation will have been dealt with by parliament.

• (11:30 a.m.)

On July 22 the Prime Minister gave an interview before the television cameras, where he seems to prefer to carry on most of his debates because the cameras cannot interrupt, ask questions or talk back. At that time he said that the people were confronted with a "do-nothing parliament". I would point out that parliament has been very busy. It has been busy most of the time trying to get the government to take action on the important problems that are facing the country. But the country is confronted with a "do-nothing government". The best proof that it is a "do-nothing government" is that it does not even want to bring parliament back until October 22 because it has nothing to put before it.

I would ask Your Honour whether you can imagine a course of action more inconsistent than this. The government brings in rules changes, ostensibly for the purpose of streamlining parliament. But we now find that the only purpose of streamlining parliament is not to enable parliament to do more business but to give its members a longer holiday. Closure was not introduced so that the government could streamline parliament and deal with the important issues of the day; it was introduced so that we could have shorter sessions of parliament, so that the government could get parliament out of the road.

I said that the government's credibility had been destroyed because it had talked about legislation it wanted to put before the house and had not done so. Where is this legislation? Why is it not put before us? Why does the government not bring it down, either now or in September? The time has come for the government to stop bluffing and to start performing. The time has come to put up or shut up. To use an old fishermen's phrase, the time has come to "fish or cut bait". There is also an old printer's phrase that is apt, Mr. Speaker, but our parliamentary rules would not allow me to use it.

The real fact of the matter is that this government, particularly the Prime Minister, does not want parliament around at all. Parliament is an unnecessary encumbrance, a continuing embarrassment. Hon. members opposite would like us to go home because the opposition has become a nuisance. The opposition keeps asking questions that the government cannot answer. The opposition keeps insisting that the government state its policies in regard to a whole host of matters, but the government has no policies and does not like to admit it. So the simple solution is to send members of parliament home and to keep them at home for as long as possible.

The government claims that it needs time to formulate its policies and to prepare its parliamentary program. If the President of the Privy Council is right and there is a lot of legislation that the government wanted to get through, then surely that legislation must be ready now. Therefore parliament could meet in September and deal with it while the cabinet meets to prepare any other legislation the government has in mind.

The government does not need three months to sit in an ivory tower to consider problems that have been before it for a long time. These are problems in regard to which the government has appointed task forces, committees and commissions. The desks of ministers opposite must be piled high with reports. If the government has no policies or legislation, then it should say so honestly. Let it say to the members of this house: "We are not ready because we have no legislation. We want a little time to think up some new answers to old problems, so please go away and leave us alone." That would at least be an honest attitude to take.

What the government is doing is telling the public, on the one hand, that there are many things the government wants to do but which an obstructive opposition keeps it from doing. On the other hand, when the government does have a chance to put legislation before the house, it tells parliament: "We don't want you around at all". The motion moved by the government to recess the house till October 22 demonstrates that the government is made up of phonies who are trying to fool the people of this country, and I want to tell the government that it will not get away with it.

During the course of the interview on July 22 to which I referred a few moments ago the Prime Minister said: "I think the greatest danger in this country was not closure, but the feeling of the people that the government was irrelevant, that things were happening, whether pollution, or housing, or moonshots, or urban slums, that parliament was not dealing with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I hear a few backbenchers opposite applauding. I notice that the majority of the

government members have the uncomfortable feeling that the matters which the Prime Minister says parliament was not dealing with are the very things that the government has not been dealing with. Has parliament not been dealing with pollution? Certainly opposition members have raised the question of pollution on every conceivable occasion. But what has the government done in connection with pollution?

Mr. Hees: Nothing.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It is almost two years since I heard the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen), at a time when he was minister of health and welfare, make a resounding speech in the house about legislation that he was just ready to bring down and which, to quote his words, was going to give Canada pure water and clean air. Where is that legislation? Never has there been as much pollution in Canada as there is today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would take the liberty of bringing to the attention of hon. members that it is extremely difficult to follow the speech of the hon. member.

• (11:40 a.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I do not mind the interruptions, Mr. Speaker. There is an old saying in the north that if you throw a stone into a pack of dogs and one yelps you have hit something.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Never has the problem of pollution been so acute as it is today. Never have the people of this country been so conscious of what we are doing to the environment of the Canadian people. Where is the water act? Where is the legislation to deal with pollution? We have had no legislation, We have not got pure water or clean air. All we have had is a lot of hot air.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): When the Prime Minister has the unmitigated gall to say that parliament is not dealing with pollution, the responsibility rests right on his doorstep because he and his party are the people who should be introducing legislation to deal with the matter.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Island).]

The second matter that the Prime Minister said parliament is not dealing with is housing. We are very conscious of the fact that parliament is not dealing adequately with housing. As a matter of fact, the government did nothing about housing until the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), when he was the Prime Minister's senior cabinet minister and deskmate, finally got so frustrated that he gave the Prime Minister a kick in the place where the Prime Minister was going to kick the little boy in Regina.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We finally got some legislation. It is inadequate legislation, but that is the only time the government moved with any commendable speed. The other matter the Prime Minister referred to that parliament was not dealing with was moonshots. I do not know what the Prime Minister wants us to do about moonshots, Mr. Speaker, but something which concerns the human race even more than moonshots is the danger of a nuclear holocaust that could destroy the human race.

As far back as March the Prime Minister said that the government would follow the question of the Safeguard A.B.M. system closely. He said that if Canada thought it would escalate the nuclear arms race the government would express its disapproval to the United States and to the world. On the other hand, if the government felt the Safeguard system would be of value it might be prepared to participate and its decision would be made known to parliament and to the Canadian people. Months have elapsed. The other day I asked the Prime Minister whether a decision had been reached. He said no.

In the course of the next few days the United States Senate will make a decision. The majority leader of the Senate says that in all probability the construction of the Safeguard A.B.M. system will be approved by that body. Instead of worrying about moonshots, the Prime Minister should be worried about the A.B.M. system. This parliament should have an opportunity to debate that question. We should be able to debate it on the basis of what the government's stated policy is, not on the basis of no comment and no decision.

The Prime Minister said the other day that parliament is not dealing with slum clearance. The only reason it is not dealing with slum clearance is that the government has not put any really useful and effective legislation

before the house so that we can deal with the question of slum clearance.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) keeps turning down every proposal on the basis that it is inflationary. Yet we have had no legislation to deal with the problem of inflation. Just two days ago the near-banks of this country raised their interest rates again. This will undoubtedly bring pressure to bear on the chartered banks to increase their rates further. An announcement two days ago indicates that the increasing interest rates for mortgage money has had the effect of reducing housing starts with the distinct possibility that starts this year will not even reach the 197,000 starts of last year.

Where is the legislation to deal with inflation? It took the government almost a year to set up the Prices and Incomes Commission. There has been no legislation on the matter of interest rates. There has been no legislation to implement the report of the Porter Commission to bring the near-banks under the control of the federal government through the Bank Act. There has been no legislation on inflation at all.

The government says that the most pressing problem in Canada today is inflation, yet there is not one piece of legislation before us now. We are going to be sent home until October 22. No legislation can be dealt with until November. Yet the government says inflation is a serious problem. There are many other problems, Mr. Speaker. I need not enumerate them all.

One of the most pressing problems is veterans' pensions. The veterans of this country have been waiting years for the Woods report. Now we have the Woods report. Instead of acting on it, the government is waiting for a white paper. They are going to send the report and the white paper to a committee. We could have had legislation in this session. If the government requested it, every member would stay here to deal with legislation to improve the plight of the veterans.

An hon. Member: Where are your members?

Mr. Stanfield: They are coming back on Monday.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The hon. gentleman is worrying about members. What he should worry about is where the government members were on the day parliament adjourned early for lack of a quorum.

Mr. Hees: There were seven in the house.

Mr. Speaker: Again it is difficult to hear the hon. member. I think in fairness I should point out that the verbal crossfire is between individual members on both sides of the house.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): One of the most serious problems which has not been dealt with by parliament because the government has no program and no policy is the plight of western agriculture. We are being asked to go home only a week before the end of the crop year. We do not know what the government's policy is going to be with respect to assuring the farmers that they will be able to deliver at least five bushels per acre in the present crop year which ends July 31. We have no understanding as to what the government's intentions are with respect to the price the farmer will receive in the new crop year which begins on August 1. We have received no indication from the government as to what its policies are to inject a massive infusion of cash income into the pockets of the western farmers.

• (11:50 a.m.)

The Prime Minister spent the best part of a week in western Canada talking to the farmers and meeting with various farm groups. When he had finished those discussions, at least he admitted that the farmers need money. When he returned we had a day's debate on this matter. The Prime Minister took no part in it. We had no announcement from the government concerning any policy envisaged for the coming year. The only reference was to legislation passed months ago to provide for cash advances on farm stored grain. Just a week ago I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), when he was Acting Prime Minister, when the government would make a statement concerning its policy in respect of western agriculture. His reply was very clear. He said it would have to be made before the end of the crop year. But we have had no statement.

It is very likely, Mr. Speaker, that important legislation will be required if we are to salvage the economy of western Canada. Next November will be too late. We should either be dealing with that legislation now or should be told by the government that it will have legislation ready for early September. We should be dealing with that legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the plight of western agriculture is not purely a regional matter. The farmers of Saskatchewan alone buy annually about $100 million worth of farm machinery, most of it coming from central Canada. They also buy large quantities of hardware, cars, trucks and other supplies. When agricultural income on the prairies declines by $430 million in a single year, it is only a matter of time until the rest of Canada feels the adverse effects of that decline. Here we have a government which professes to be concerned about the problem of the prairie farmers asking us, on July 25, to go home without any statement from the government about what it is going to do, and not only to go home but to remain at home until October 22 which means that in that period no legislation will be possible to salvage the situation in the prairie provinces.

There are a great many other things with which parliament has not dealt. In closing I wish to say there is only one reason parliament has not dealt with these matters. It is not because there has been obstruction. It is not because we are unwilling to sit here in the summer or come back early in the fall. The only reason parliament has not grappled with the problems that assail the Canadian people is that this government has no policies and no programs. It is completely bankrupt of leadership, and the motion today exposes that fact for all to see.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, at one o'clock this morning, the Liberal majority applied the rule of closure. At 1:20, the sinister rule 75c was imposed upon us again by the Liberal majority and now, at noon today, they propose no more or no less the pure and simple closing down of parliament for three months.

The present government is heaved-handed when it comes to closure, while very serious and urgent problems not only remain unsolved but have not been discussed or introduced by the Liberal administration.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to go on holidays. I am not against holidays for the hon. members, but in all ridings we note that there are some people who do not have the means to take holidays but who have them to pay taxes and allow their member of parliament to go on holidays.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

An hon. Member: You have been on holidays for three weeks already.

Another hon. Member: Some members take ten-month holidays.

Mr. Caouette: I hear a member saying that some members take ten-month holidays. We know that. We see them in the house on holidays, because they are not brave enough to rise and state their opinions. Those people are on holidays for four years. However, they are not on holidays when they have to go and beg for votes which they obtain on false pretences to come here and wear out the seat of their pants in the Canadian parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against taking holidays, even for three months, as was suggested by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). That would be normal under a normal system, if the legislative program were brought in. As for problems, we solve them from day to day.

Hardly a few days ago, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said that we could do nothing for western farmers with regard to their wheat surplus.

The Prime Minister went to Winnipeg and told farmers: You have wheat, sell it. It belongs to you. We have no miracle solution to suggest.

Recently the Prime Minister returned to western Canada where, in some places, he was given a rather stormy welcome. He was even insulted. The Prime Minister then made the following statement: We shall ear-mark $250 million to help western farmers. We shall provide them with those funds without interest until they have sold their crop.

And, in order to project a better image to the farmers, the Minister of Agriculture visited the same regions the following day and told the farmers: We may even ear-mark up to $500 million rather than only $250 million.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get the government to act, will it be absolutely necessary that the Prime Minister be insulted from one end of the country to the other, and that Canada's poor fling insults at him and at the government?

As far as the summer recess is concerned, the motion moved by the President of the Privy Council reads in part as follows:

—provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment—

—at that time, the house might meet again in September, in August or early in October.

• (12 noon)

Mr. Speaker, would it not be in the public interest to solve the unemployment problem in Canada in July 1969, in order to assist some 400,000 unemployed who cannot earn a decent and honourable living in their own country?

Mr. Speaker, would the introduction of measures designed to efficiently fight poverty in Canada not serve the public interest? There are many poor people in Canada, Welfare recipients, for instance, write us day in, day out. The Liberal members also get the same kind of letters. Some mothers are utterly crushed because they have to manage to live on a monthly income of $110, $115 or $125. Mothers with five, six, eight or even ten children write to us: We have no security, we are entitled to nothing more than $125 or $135 per month.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be more important for the Prime Minister and the government to present legislation to improve social welfare so that every individual would have the right to life, security and liberty in his own country, that is Canada?

Mr. Speaker, is it more important to go on holidays or to solve these problems? Is it more important to go on holidays than to work at boosting the Canadian economy?

Day after day, the Prime Minister repeats that we have enormous problems to solve. Are we going to leave those problems pending? When the time comes for solving problems, the Prime Minister says exactly what he said recently to the representatives of the provinces: We have no money.

Would it not be more important, during the holidays, to look into the monetary system of Canada, in order to gear it to our opportunities for developing the country?

No, they prefer to move a motion to enable us to take holidays. Meanwhile, all problems remain unsolved and their study is deferred. The provinces complain to the federal government and municipalities complain to provincial governments, yet no solution can be found to those problems.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier of western producers who, according to the Minister of Agriculture, will get up to $500 million in cash, as long as their wheat remains unsold. We are not against western farmers being assisted. We have always supported the measures that are likely to assist western farmers.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are farmers in eastern Canada also. The dairy farmers in Quebec have surplus problems. Some farmers in the Maritimes, some potato farmers and corn producers in Ontario have to sell their production below cost price.

Mr. Speaker, the government does not propose anything to help these farmers. It is good of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture to solve problems, to help and to promise $500 million to the western farmers.

However, this does not complete the farm policy for the whole country. Has the government offered a national farm policy for Canada since it has come to power? Has the previous government ever presented a general farming policy for Canada as a whole?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will allow me to interrupt him for a moment in order to remind him that the house is presently considering a specific motion. The hon. member should somehow keep in mind the rule of relevancy, and his comments should relate to the motion under consideration at this time.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) allows us to give the reasons why we will support it. The Leader of the Opposition himself blamed the government for its inaction.

The leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) had every chance to come out with what he had to say, and this too is related to the amendment, whereby the house would resume its work at the end of September in order to solve the problems that have been set aside, and which the government or the Prime Minister did not want to put before the house.

Since the beginning of the session we have been asked to adopt bills of very little importance while the government neglected to introduce the important ones. That is why, we will support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, so that the house might be invited to meet sooner to enable the government to introduce its legislation. The government has certainly prepared its legislative program because for a year and a half now, we have been hearing of all those steps that have been taken to realize a "just society". So, legislation must be ready. Why wait before putting it before parliament?

Some bills were introduced, namely the omnibus bill, other secondary bills were also put to us. This last month we have been discussing parliamentary procedures. But has that solved the economic problems in Canada?

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is important for the members to meet as soon as possible. If this was not urgent, I admit that perhaps we could take a break until October 22. I could even suggest better than that: that sessions always be held at set dates, that the opening of the session be set for such and such a date, the closing or adjournment for Christmas and the New Year be always from December 20 to January 18 or 20 and that the house adjourn in June to come back in September. In summer, the house would adjourn at the end of June or the beginning of July and convene when the school opens early in September, because there are so many school children on the other side and it would be too bad to deprive them of the education they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be appropriate for the government to pass legislation so that sessions should always be within fixed dates. However, owing to circumstances, such is not the case; we are asked to adjourn until October 22. The Leader of the Opposition suggests September 22 so that we may have a month for the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As the leader of the N.D.P. pointed out, that would take about ten days or about the whole of October. In November we could begin with the bills that were so much promised by the government in the last Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, in the public interest, I believe it is urgent that we talk for instance about the underdeveloped areas the producers the farmers the overall agricultural policy in Canada, the social security structure that should be amended, old age pensions, pensions to veterans and retired people.

Those matters should be discussed as soon as possible. For three, four years or even five years already, the government has been asked to bring solutions in order to help those pensioners. The minister will say again: We are asked by the opposition to spend more money, but the government has less and less money.

And the Treasury will run dry because precisely the government allows financial sharks to increase their interest rates. The government will be supplied by financial sources on which it has to pay accrued interest. If it borrows $1 million or $1 billion on a 12-, 15- or 20-year basis, it would have to pay back $2 billion. And to pay off the second billion, it would have to borrow again, because this is how the system works.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the Créditistes maintain that the first thing to be settled in Canada is the monetary system. The government should introduce in the house a specific, clear and definite legislative program with regard to the Canadian monetary system, which is at the origin of the inflation so often referred to by the Prime Minister. He dealt with it and we are sinking deeper and deeper into inflation which enables the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer.

This is the system in which we operate and as long as that system controls the destiny of our nation, we will be in the same mess. Whether it be under the government of this Prime Minister or the next one or a former one, we always end up in a dead end and a solution is impossible to find. Such is the situation in which we find ourselves.

The government proposes now the adjournment until October 22nd simply because he has no solution to offer, because he does not have the courage to introduce its legislative program and to suggest solutions to the problems. Let him at least put the problems to the house and we are going to provide it with the solutions Canada needs.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the amendment purports to have the session resume on September 22 instead of October 22.

I listened carefully to the interventions of opposition party leaders. I must say that one of them did not surprise me very much. As for the other two, I will deal with them in a moment.

The hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste did not surprise me very much. He was never in power and he will never be. He does not know what is a government.

An hon. Member: He will never know it.

Mr. Trudeau: He will never know it. This position is easy and quite clear. A very long time ago, no doubt when he was still a child, he stated his political theory and economic

philosophy. Everything boils down to the monetary system. He found the truth several years ago. He thinks he can stop thinking, studying and examining because he has the answer to everything: the reform of the monetary system. If there is too much pollution it is because of the monetary system. If housing is in a bad way, the monetary system is to blame. Canadian participation abroad also depends on the monetary system, and digestion too, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I understand why that party does not need any respite, that it does not need any time to study and do research. In theory, as well as intellectually, they have found out everything. They have only one thing left to do and it is to make the people believe it and for that, of course, they must talk. And in order to do so, they must of course, be in the house. Give them holidays and they vanish out of the picture. They become nobodies—they are just nil.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: They are here, Mr. Speaker, to be seen and to be heard. They need a forum and there is none except in the house. They do not want to go in their constituencies, because the people there do not want to see them. They have heard the same things over and over again for too many years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Well, they are welcome to stay in Ottawa if they like.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Témiscamingue has a problem. He wants to say a few words on the monetary system.

Mr. Caouette: You say you have no money?

Mr. Dionne: That is always what is missing, dollars!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Caouette: You mentioned that in Rouyn, you said you did not have any money.

An hon. Member: You also said that in western Canada.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Témiscamingue and his colleagues of the Ralliement Créditiste might take advantage of the time we are allowing them to study the problems a bit and to examine the solutions we are proposing.

The hon. member has just mentioned my trip in western Canada and, talking through his hat as usual, he referred to the solutions we proposed.

He refers to $250 million and $500 million that we are supposed to have thought up as a result of my trip in western Canada. It is not true, Mr. Speaker. It is only a matter of applying a policy already in existence which was misunderstood in the west. As a matter of fact, it is a policy of advance payments on unsold wheat. However, the hon. member did not understand it neither did several Canadians in the west.

That is why we are urging the hon. members to spend a little more time in their constituency in order to explain the policy or solutions that have been misunderstood.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand and to be in a position to explain, one needs a little silence, a little reflection and a little study. That is asking a lot from the opposition parties, especially from the Créditistes, who have always been in possession of the truth in all fields. They should at least show some indulgence and realize that others are not as blessed and are trying to determine the extent of the problems and to find solutions.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in order to program to some extent the legislative year, we have presented the measures under study. We have implemented a recommendation contained in the report of the Standing Committee on Procedure, presented to the house on December 6 last.

[*English*]

The Committee on Procedure recommended that there be a pattern of regular parliamentary sessions whereby a session would normally commence in September or October and the house would rise for the summer recess on or about July 1. There was no hidden desire on the part of the government to change this. We are following the plan that was proposed by the committee on procedure and about which I spoke in the house on December 10 last. At that time I explained that it was our intention as a government to follow this plan to have a regular legislative year which would begin probably early in October and end late in June. On December 10 I said we thought this was necessary, and I continued:

> This would enable the government to complete its legislative program during the summer months. By the time the house convenes, a substantial number of bills would be ready for first reading. The bulk of the legislative work would be undertaken in the autumn and early winter. The house would be able to concentrate on the main financial work in the spring and to complete it before a

summer adjournment. During each of three periods of the proposed annual session a fixed number of days would be set aside for the opposition.

And so on. This was the government's plan. We did not pretend that we had all the bills written up and all the policies defined for four years in advance. We said we would have to do a little bit of thinking and a little bit of reading of the reports which the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) has said are piled up on our desks. It is true that there are many reports we have to study and many policies that we have to think through. We have to give the civil service many directives so they can draft bills and prepare white papers under governmental direction in order that they can be examined by cabinet committees and then by the cabinet. These things take a little time.

I said that the leader of the Créditistes did not surprise me because he did not know much about governing. I am a little more surprised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the leader of the New Democratic party because they were premiers; they were heads of government in the past. They used to know what it was to govern.

Mr. Stanfield: And still do.

Mr. Trudeau: What were they doing in those days? I think it would be fair to say that the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia sat perhaps two or three months a year. Why not six? Was it because they did not clear up the mess in their province?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: What were they doing in the other eight, nine or ten months of the year? Were they off on vacation, as the leader of the New Democratic party just said? Is it because they wanted to send everybody home to do nothing, or is it because they thought that the purpose of the government was to come to grips with problems and to look for solutions, and that it was necessary for the members of the various political parties to be in their ridings, not only to understand the problems of the ridings but to explain to their parts of the province the problems in other parts?

Mr. Coates: Then you better give them a whole year to explain it.

Mr. Trudeau: Do you want to ask a question?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) should be allowed to make his speech.

Mr. Trudeau: I would have answered this question if it had been put, but let me tell the hon. member's neighbour, the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis), not to ask me any questions because I do not answer people who are not gentlemen.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which arises from the remark of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about not answering my questions. When he does not answer me he does not answer thousands of the constituents whom I represent, but at least he has not threatened to kick me, brown belt and all.

Mr. Bigg: He kicks children only.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the hon. member in a moment. I would just like to suggest to hon. members that we should conduct this debate as objectively as possible, and I am not sure we are going in the right direction at the present time. I now recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on a point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My point of order is that I agree completely with you, Mr. Speaker, and I think that our debate will be carried on in a better vein if we do not say of members in the house that any hon. member is not a gentleman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Without commenting on the point of order, perhaps I might revert to my original thought that we should return to the substance of the motion now before the house.

Mr. Trudeau: I was speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I related the reasons why we need to have a certain period of time between the sessions of this house, and I was saying that I was somewhat surprised that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) did not know about this. It is not so long ago that he was the head of a government in a province which had economic and social

problems. Was his solution to these to sit two months a year and send the members home on vacation for the rest of the time and go on vacation himself, or did he have to stay around and do some work? And if ten months were needed for him, why would three months be too much for us?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I must say that if both he and the leader of the New Democratic party had sat a little longer than six or eight weeks or even three months, perhaps they would not have left their provinces in such a mess and the federal government would not have to pick up the pieces.

I think we should encourage members of the opposition to leave. Every time they do, the I.Q. of this house rises considerably.

When the Leader of the Opposition rose to speak of truancy, there were only 27 out of the 70 members of his party in the house.

Mr. Baldwin: And there were only 65 of your party here at that time.

Mr. Trudeau: One of the difficult problems with which we have to deal, and which takes a lot of our time in cabinet committees and in cabinet, and with which the civil service has to come to grips, is the problem of regional economic disparity. Much of this disparity occurs in the province of the Leader of the Opposition, and if he had not left that province in such a mess, if he had done a little more for education and housing, if he had not left the heavy water industry and Clairtone in such a mess, perhaps we would not have to deal with it now, and perhaps the economic situation of the whole region would be better.

But no, they wanted ten months of holiday a year. According to their interpretation of the reason for our three months' recess, we want to send members on vacation. Apparently that is what they did and they think we are doing the same. But we are not; we are not sending members home on vacation. I hope they will take a few weeks' vacation and I hope the ministers will do so also, but we certainly do not intend to take three months' vacation.

Our members of parliament, the members of the Liberal party, do things in their constituencies during the three months' recess.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I understand that the government of the leader of the New Democratic party sometimes sat as long as six or eight weeks a year. Big deal! But when he is here he really comes to grips with problems. When he is in the opposition, he really knows how to solve problems which he did not know how to solve when he was head of a provincial government. We hear a lot of talk about wheat and about inflation. I wonder if the leader of the New Democratic party really did much to solve the problem of wheat when he was premier of Saskatchewan.

Some hon. Members: Oh, come off it.

Mr. Trudeau: When I was there last week I was appalled to see how many friends of his political party were misinformed about wheat problems, how his party has not really helped the people of that province to understand the real nature of the wheat problem, and how they have not helped this wheat growing population to embark on any kind of forecasting or planning in the solution of these problems. I can understand why.

The leader of the New Democratic party says that we are adjourning until October 22 because we want to give our members longer holidays. By virtue of the same reasoning which I applied to the Leader of the Opposition, I suppose that is what they did in Nova Scotia after sitting six or eight long weeks a year. They adjourned to send their members, as he said, on longer holidays. That is not the way we see it.

The opposition seems to think it has nothing else to do but talk. They say: if there is a problem, we will talk. If there is a difficulty, we will talk about it. If the government is going too slowly, we will talk about it. If there is a real problem in some part of Canada, we will talk about it. That is all they have to do. They do not have to govern, they have only to talk. The best place in which to talk, if they want a forum, is, of course, parliament. When they get home, when they get out of parliament, when they are 50 yards from Parliament Hill, they are no longer hon. members—they are just nobodies, Mr. Speaker.

• (12:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: We are quite candid about it. We have to do some thinking. Before solving the problems we have to examine them in depth. They have to be discussed between ministers. We have to get departments to work on them. Sometimes we have to name outside experts or set up task forces to look for solutions. Then we have to take time to

discuss them; we have to arrive at policy decisions. Then we have to send them for drafting, whether in the form of white papers or bills.

Mr. Nowlan: Macgregor Dawson said all that.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, but you should have read Macgregor Dawson.

Mr. Nowlan: I did.

Mr. Trudeau: So the hon. member read Macgregor Dawson. Now they have two authorities on which to rely—Macgregor Dawson and the Canada Year Book.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, and the Colonial Laws Validity Act.

It is only fair to confess that unlike the leader of the Creditiste party (Mr. Caouette) we did not formulate our solutions for all time 50 years ago, or 60 years ago, I suppose. We have to find new solutions all the time because the problems of Canada are changing. I may say we also have to spend time doing so.

I would suggest that the role of the opposition—and this is perhaps a chapter which the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) did not read—is not merely to talk about everything, not merely to be against anything the government does, not merely to say that our Indian policy is bad, that our position with regard to the Commonwealth is wrong, and that we are failing to stop inflation. This is one of the roles of the opposition, of course, and this is why we have allotted to them under the new rules—

An hon. Members: Isn't that kind?

Mr. Trudeau:—one quarter of the days in a normal parliamentary session. Hopefully this will give them a little time in which to talk against our policies and criticize our mistakes. But we urge them also to spend a little time trying to become a credible opposition.

We are told that the government has destroyed its credibility, Mr. Speaker. That is possible. We have come forward with policies which perhaps have failed to please everyone in the country. Someone asks, what policies? We have come forth, for instance, with a policy position on the Indian problem. When it was presented to the house I remember distinctly the leaders of all the opposition parties saying: Too late; you should have done that years ago; we have been pushing that for years; we told you so. In effect they told us we had adopted their policies, only many years too late.

A few days later, Mr. Speaker, the Indians began saying the policy was not such a good one after all—it is true they had once been against the Indian Affairs department, but now it did not seem so bad. The opposition switched!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Trudeau: Suddenly our policy decision, which had been theirs, but which had been adopted ten years too late, was no longer theirs. Somebody in the country was against it. Right away, it was no longer their policy. It was wrong, and it should be reversed.

Perhaps our Indian policy is wrong, Mr. Speaker. We are asking the Indians to discuss it, and we are asking the provinces to discuss it too. Perhaps the Canadian people are not prepared to live without discrimination among themselves. Perhaps the Canadian people think there should be treaties between one section of the Canadian people and another section. Perhaps we shall not be able to succeed in selling what we believe to be the right Indian policy.

But what is the opposition's Indian policy? It was one thing one day, and ten days later it was another. Precisely what it was we do not know. On one day it was years too late and on another it was years too soon. It might not be too much to suggest that in the time between now and September 22 the opposition members should try to meet a few of their constituents who still believe in them, and perhaps they could take a little holiday. But they might take the time between September 22 and October 22, the extra month we are asking hon. members to take as an interval between the two sessions, as time in which to come up with an Indian policy. Possibly it would be better than ours and possibly we could hear about it.

As to the other subjects which have been mentioned, it is true we did not settle all the problems of Canada. We did not pretend we would. But we did bring some propositions forward. For instance, for weeks and months one hon. member kept asking me what we intended to do about offshore mineral rights. I would say that we hoped to make a statement soon, next month, perhaps, or in two weeks time. Then one day we announced it. And not a word has been heard since then on the subject of offshore mineral rights. Is our

position the right one in the estimation of hon. members opposite, or is it wrong? We know that many of the provinces have approved its general lines while others have declined to accept it. The provinces will not get any guidance from the opposition, Mr. Speaker. Apparently they have not had time to think about it or to formulate a policy.

We have heard a great deal from the expert on oil. He has asked us constantly about our oil policy, and about the "secret agreement" which is a figment of his imagination. But what is the policy of the opposition on these complex questions involving offshore mineral rights? Should we divide the revenue—and I am talking now of the share which would accrue to the federal government—among the provinces claiming it, or among all Canadians? Should we divide it on a per capita basis? Should we divide it only among those provinces which have coastlines or should we give part of it to provinces which are already rich in oil, such as Alberta?

These are difficult problems, Mr. Speaker. We proposed some solutions. What are the solutions offered by the opposition? One day they hope to sit on the treasury benches. One day, they say, they will govern this country. And I am sure the first thing they will do is to abolish this infamous rule 75c. Their program is quite set in this respect. We know about that. And there will never be any closure under a Conservative government. I need not talk about any other hypothesis. This is their program. They will go to the people with it—"We shall abolish closure and we shall remove rule 75c".

What will they do about offshore mineral rights? What will they do to settle the Indian problem? What will they do about inflation? I realise I am probably testing your patience a little, Mr. Speaker, and I do not wish to deal at length with any of the issues. However, I want to explain that these are difficult problems

On the subject of inflation we have been asked, I suppose, 50 questions by one hon. member during the course of the year. They were not all in order, Mr. Speaker, but we have at least done something about inflation. We have not cured it, but we have provided for a budgetary surplus this year, the first, I believe, in 12 or 13 years. In order to continue this surplus we will have to do some more cutting. I remember that when we had to cut from our programs the causeway to Prince Edward Island the opposition were up in arms. They said we should have built that causeway. They told us to forget about the tunnel to Newfoundland, which had never been promised anyway, but the causeway was inviolate.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Prime Minister did suggest that he was testing my patience in this debate, but the Speaker's patience cannot, of course, be tested. I suggest to the Prime Minister, as I did to the previous speaker, that we are not debating the budget or the Speech from the Throne; we are dealing with a motion to adjourn the house. The comments of hon. members should be related at all times to the motion and the amendment before the house.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. The only point I was trying to make was that there are going to be some more difficult decisions that we will have to take during the next three months. We need three months because we are faced with the problem of further cuts in expenditure. We have had no guidance as yet from the opposition as to whether we should lay off more civil servants or should cut back on some public works. These are problems that are being dealt with by the government. We have a good deal of work to do. We will be using most of the summer, as I said in my speech on December 10 and to which I referred a moment ago, to prepare sufficient legislative material so that when parliament reconvenes it will progress efficiently in the next session.

Next session we are looking forward to hearing from the opposition not merely negative rejections of our positions but hopefully some constructive ideas that will help us as a government to be better informed to find solutions—not the problems which we can all see, but to find some of the solutions.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the Prime Minister answer a question at this point?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes.

Mr. Baldwin: During the course of the recess which lies ahead would the Prime Minister mind examining the 69 private members' notices of motions, the 133 private members' public bills and the numerous amendments that were put forward, substantially by members of the opposition, which might give the Prime Minister some guidance in connection with the problems confronting him?

Mr. Trudeau: That is true. I think the hon. gentleman will recognize that in much of our legislation we have tended to incorporate ideas that appeared in private members' bills. However, these are not always bills sponsored by members of the opposition; a great deal are sponsored by private members on the government side.

[*Translation*]

Before concluding my comments, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be worthwhile to ponder over the considerable attention which the Leader of the Opposition has been giving to gaullism for several days. He constantly speaks about General de Gaulle, his tactics, he sees gaullism everywhere. It seems to me that it is somewhat out-of-date. I feel that this attempt to bring hate and contempt on a country and on its former president is strangely irrelevant. I do not know if—

An hon. Member: It is despicable.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, indeed, it is despicable. I would ask the hon. member to count the number of times that his own leader has spoken of gaullism during the past few days and to note in what context he does it. That gaullism means the end of parliamentary government, I agree, but it is his interpretation. But what brings him to compare this policy with that of the government? I do not know.

All I can say about General de Gaulle is that I did not always agree with his policy, but I will at least pay him this tribute that to my knowledge, he never considered, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, depriving any member of his privileges retroactively.

[*English*]

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with interest to the pompous, glib, condescending lecture that has been delivered to us by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I am sure we have all been interested to learn from the Prime Minister's own lips that nobody, but nobody, in this country knows anything about running a government or a parliament except this self-styled little tin god on wheels. The pomposity of his speech is indicative of why this house finds it impossible to get along as other houses have been able to do, and to work out legislative procedures for the good of parliament and the country as a whole.

I want to join in this debate at this moment to speak to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and to say why I believe parliament should not be recessing at the present time for three months. Between one and two o'clock this morning the government brought in by means of closure a guillotine measure that will allow it to program parliament, to turn parliament into an assembly line. At one end of the pipe you will put in proposed legislation; at the other end you will take out statutes all polished and ready for proclamation to the people.

The justification for this action on the part of the government is that the opposition has been holding up parliament. In sending parliament home for three months the government is admitting that it has no legislation ready, and will have none ready for another three months. This indicates parliament has not been held up in any way, shape or form by the opposition. In fact the opposition has co-operated so well with the government that every piece of legislation that the government has brought forward has been dealt with expeditiously. Now the government has nothing to present to parliament and so wants to send members of parliament home for three months.

Parliament should reconvene a great deal earlier than proposed by the government because there is a great deal of work to do. The prime example of the sort of job parliament should tackle—the government has proved that it has no solutions at all to tackle this problem—is the No. 1 problem in this country, namely, inflation and the steadily accelerating rise in the cost of living. Parliament must sit to solve this problem because, as I shall demonstrate in a moment or two, the government's policies have proved a complete failure.

What is the situation today in regard to inflation? By May 1 the increase in the cost of living during the previous 12 months had risen to 4.4 per cent. One month later, on June 1, it had risen to 4.7 per cent. On July 1, the latest date for which we have figures, the increase over the past 12 months was 5.2 per cent. We ask ourselves what is the figure going to be for the 12 months period ending August 1? The answer is that it will probably be close to 6 per cent because right at this moment the cost of living in Canada is rising at a rate of 10 per cent a year.

• (12:50 p.m.)

What solutions has the government offered to combat this rising inflation and this steadily increasing cost of living? It brought in three budgets by which it raised taxes. The cost of

living kept going up faster and faster each month. Finally the government brought in a budget on June 3 and introduced two new policies. Those new policies were, first of all, to stop building in large cities in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the remarks now being made by the hon. member are in the form of an introduction to the address he is going to deliver to the house, but I have to remind him, as I reminded previous speakers, that the contributions of hon. members in this debate have to relate to the motion before the house.

Mr. Hees: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I intend to show that there are very real problems that should be dealt with in the next three months. I intend to show the reason why parliament should be called back earlier than October 22. The policies which the government has produced are a complete failure. The only chance this country has of getting sensible policies effectively introduced is for the government to adopt those policies that are suggested by the opposition. I intend to suggest them today.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) taunted the opposition and asked for positive policies. I intend to give him positive policies on a number of subjects if he will just sit in his seat, as he so seldom does, and listen to what the opposition has to say regarding positive policies for solving the problems of the country. This is the reason the Leader of the Opposition introduced an amendment to the motion stating that this parliament has no right to be recessed for three months.

Mr. Trudeau: Tell us what to do about inflation! Go ahead!

Mr. Hees: I will be very glad to do just that. First of all I will tell you in the next couple of minutes about your policies.

Mr. Trudeau: No, no. Tell us what you will do!

Mr. Hees: I will do that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will have to tell this not to the Prime Minister, but to the Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The first policy that you have introduced is to stop building—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not intend to adopt that policy at all! The hon. member should address the Chair.

Mr. Hees: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I got rather interested in my subject.

Mr. Trudeau: Interested in yourself.

Mr. Hees: I will relay my message through Your Honour. This policy of trying to stop building in the three provinces of Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia has already been a complete failure. Every builder in those provinces will tell you this. The government tried to stop them by withholding the 5 per cent capital cost allowance. The Prime Minister cannot take it! He is leaving the chamber! He asked for positive policies. You come back into the chamber at two o'clock and you will hear them. You won't be here because you cannot stand positive advice.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Hees: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I spoke directly to the Prime Minister because I was afraid he would be out of the house before I got through what I was saying to him.

I want the Prime Minister to be here at two o'clock. He will get the positive policies that I intend to lay before him for his consideration. I say he has not got the desire—I was going to use another word—because he makes a taunt, then turns around and runs away. He cannot stand the truth! I am going to give him the truth during the next 35 or 40 minutes. If the Prime Minister comes in here at two o'clock I will personally walk over and congratulate him. It will be very interesting to see if he has the plain, ordinary guts to come back into this chamber at two o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether we might return to the motion The hon. member has much less than 35 or 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Any builder in any city in Canada will tell you this policy is a complete failure because the cost of building is increasing at the rate of 12 per cent a year. If a builder postpones building for two years, as the government wants him to do, he knows that by that time the cost of building will have increased by 24 per cent.

The government in its naïvety is asking the builder to absorb a 24 per cent increase in the cost of building for the sake of saving 10 per cent in capital cost allowance. This just does not add up. The builders in Canada are laughing themselves silly at this stupid, naive Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) who brought in a measure which any practical man knows simply will not work. That policy simply is not working.

The second, and only other policy introduced was to bring in the Kennedy round tariff reductions three years ahead of schedule. That was supposed to bring down the cost of goods because lowering the import duties would make it possible for Canadians to buy goods cheaper. That would be a good policy, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) required the importers in this country to pass on to the consumer the reduction in tariff which was introduced in the budget of June 3. The minister is not doing it. He does not intend to do it. Like the builders the importers are laughing themselves to death at this government. There is nothing to require them to pass these tariff reductions on to the consumer, and so they are pocketing the tariff reductions. This policy is also a complete failure.

I see it is almost one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. When we resume at two o'clock I will tell the Prime Minister, and any other members who wish to listen, what should be done in specific, positive terms to lower the cost of living. On that high note—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m. this afternoon.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking to the house—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) on a point of order.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is to tell you there is one Tory in the house, two Socialists and one Créditiste.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And no Liberals.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking to the house before the luncheon break the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) challenged me to outline what I suggest the government should do to control inflation and the steadily rising cost of living. I am sorry to see the Prime Minister has not seen fit to come into the house at two o'clock. I assured him at three minutes to one that I did not have time then to outline these positive programs, but that if he would come into the house at two o'clock I would be glad to do so. It is easy to see that the Prime Minister is not interested in positive programs, and is not interested in positive suggestions which he has continually asked for. When an hon. member is asked to give them, rises in his place, and is prepared to do so, the Prime Minister turns tail and runs away.

An hon. Member: You are a turn-tail too.

Mr. Hees: That is a pretty good indication of how the Prime Minister regards parliament. He is not interested in it. He is not interested in its operations. He is not interested in the ideas which are put forward in all sincerity by members of this house.

The first thing I would do to control inflation would be to control the government spending which has doubled in the six years during which this Liberal government has been in power. By so doing, the government could greatly relieve the upward pressure on prices, which is brought about by the increased government spending which has been going up at a phenomenal rate each year since the government took office six years ago. Several times in the past three or four years I have suggested that the government should do this, but on every occasion the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) assured me there was no need to do this, that the government's policy of raising taxes would look after the steadily rising cost of living—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must remind him that the house is now seized of an amendment to a motion to adjourn. I realize it offers a fairly wide scope for debate, but it would be appreciated if the hon. member would relate more to the question of whether the house should adjourn until September 22 or October 22.

Mr. Hees: I shall be glad to do that, but what I am speaking about is the need for parliament both to remain in session and to return much earlier than October 22 because of the great many important matters which must be dealt with by parliament since the government obviously does not have the

answers to the problems, as has been demonstrated day after day in this house. The Prime Minister and other members dealt with these many subjects, and I am sure you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that what I am doing is the same thing. I am outlining the reason parliament should remain in session, and should meet again much earlier than the designated date of October 22.

As I say, the government has always answered that it cannot cut expenditures in the present fiscal year. It has assured the house that it would do so in the forthcoming fiscal year, the next year. But as you and I know, Mr. Speaker, cuts of that kind are the type of routine cuts that every minister of finance makes in the estimates of every department when they are brought before the Treasury Board.

Each minister, as much as he possibly can, always inflates his estimates before they go before the Treasury Board. He knows they will be cut very drastically. By putting in as much as he can, he concludes that he will receive the most workable package possible. Every minister, or every member of this house, who is, or has been a minister will realize that this is true.

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Hees: So the cuts in the next fiscal year have always been simply routine cuts. I suggest that we ask ourselves whether it is possible to make cuts in the present fiscal year. The answer is yes, because it was actually done in 1962 by the then Conservative government. On June 23, 1962 the government of that day was faced with an international monetary crisis. In order to obtain the international credit which we need to keep the country's currency solvent, we were required to cut $200 million in expenditures immediately. Those expenditures were cut within a period of three days. Cutting $200 million on that date, effective during that present fiscal year, amounted to the same thing as cutting $265 million in a full fiscal year.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Therefore, remembering that this can be done, the government should immediately cut one quarter of a billion dollars from its expenditures in the present fiscal year, thereby greatly reducing the upward pressure on prices, and lowering the increasing cost of living. Let us remember the reduction in spending that took place in 1962. If the government cuts $250 million from its expenditure this year, it would be doing little more than the Conservative government did in 1962 when it cut its expenditures by $200 million in that fiscal year, during a period of three days. This can be done, and it is necessary that it be done immediately.

The second suggestion I have for controlling the escalating cost of living is to lower prices by increasing productivity. I urge the government, as I have done on many occasions in the past, to bring in tax incentives in order to interest industry in this country to invest in new plant, machinery, and production systems, necessary to cut the cost of production, materially and lower the selling price of goods. This could be done if the government introduced tax incentives. The cost to the treasury would be more than made up—many times over—in subsequent years as a result of greater sales abroad of Canadian products. The lower cost of production would make possible lower selling prices, and this could be brought about by greater productivity.

The third positive suggestion I make to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is that he approach the provinces immediately at a federal-provincial conference with the objective in mind of persuading the provinces to give the federal government the means to impose consumer credit restrictions. As we all know the public today is being bombarded with advertisements urging it to buy anything from a packet of pins to a red convertible, with little or no down payment, and several years to pay. In other words the public today is spending a vast amount of money it does not possess.

We all agree that credit is very necessary to our economy, and reasonable credit should be made available. What I suggest is that unreasonable or ridiculous credit should be avoided. A down payment of at least 25 per cent should be required on purchases that are reasonable, and a payoff period should be allowed depending on the type of product. Today consumer spending is completely out of control, and vast sums of money are being spent that people in Canada do not possess.

This great increase in the purchasing power of the Canadian people is one of the things pushing up the cost of living. There are inflationary pressures because there is an overdemand for goods resulting from easy credit. As the governor of the Bank of Canada advised the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs a few days ago, consumer credit control would undoubtedly have been imposed by the federal authority

in the past two years if the federal government had possessed the power.

At the present time the provincial governments possess that power, and they are as worried about inflation, and the increase in the cost of living, as we in the federal government. I am sure if the Prime Minister called the premiers together, and asked for the power to bring in credit restrictions, enforcing a provision that credit be advanced on reasonable terms, thereby reducing this upward trend in prices, the premiers would be glad to give the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance this power.

My fourth suggestion to the government is that it should require the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, set up specifically to do this job, to protect the consumer against unfair prices for goods. This department has been in operation for some two years, but its record has been nil; it has not done the job it was set up to do, paid for by taxpayers' dollars. It has not required the producers in this country to keep their prices to the consumer at a reasonable level.

Let me suggest to the Prime Minister, who I am glad to see entering the house, although I am sorry he missed ten minutes of—

An hon. Member: He missed nothing.

Mr. Hees:—very constructive suggestions for which he asked, but which he obviously did not want or he would have been here on time. I say to the Prime Minister, now he has deigned to come into the house, that he should require his bumptious Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to do the job he is now being well paid to do, but is not doing. His only activity today seems to be to sprain his wrist once in a while patting himself on the back, as he has done so often in this house.

A good example of what the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is not doing was referred to during the question period yesterday. He was asked by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales) whether it was the intention of his department to require bakers to pass on to consumers the savings that would immediately be made available to them as a result of the great reduction in the price of wheat. The minister refused to answer the question, signifying very clearly that he intends to do absolutely nothing about this situation, just as he has refused to do anything about requiring importers of goods resold to consumers to pass along the lower prices made possible as a result of tariff reductions brought into effect three years ahead of time. This minister seems to be content with making snide and smart aleck remarks, and doing absolutely nothing constructive.

I hope the Prime Minister will review my remarks in order to ascertain what has been done by this department. I think the members of the house would be interested in hearing an answer to the question regarding that. I think the answer must be nothing, and that the minister has no intention of doing anything.

Those are the four suggestions I put forward to control the increasing cost of living which, as I say, is presently going up at the rate of 10 per cent per year. Statistics indicate an increase in the cost of living month by month. This has been taking place during the last several months.

The recess of parliament is intended for today, and it is proposed that we will not come back until October 22. This means that the processes of parliament will be absolutely worthless for this unnecessary extended period of time. This government attempted to increase taxes and has met with failure on each occasion. It is now attempting to bring in measures that will prevent the opposition from criticizing its actions. The length of the debate now indicates that that policy is not working.

Evidence today demonstrates very clearly that the reduction of tariffs as a result of the Kennedy Round, implemented three years early, is having no results. This is because the minister will not take action requiring importers to pass on these reductions to the consumer. What the government has done has been absolutely useless. The only way we are going to get action from the government is by staying here, requiring the government to answer questions regarding the positive suggestions we put forward, and requiring it to take some action on behalf of the Canadian people.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Another problem that should be dealt with by parliament, and obviously can only be dealt with here because the government refuses to take action, is that of pollution. The President of the United States has set a very impressive example by personally heading their environmental quality council. On

that council he has put all the senior members of his government. This is evidence of the fact that the President of the United States and the United States government consider this to be the No. 1 problem in that country. The problem is just as grave in Canada.

I have asked the Prime Minister on several occasions whether he will follow the good example of President Nixon, and he has simply said no. The Prime Minister could not care less about this problem. The water he uses at Harrington Lake is not polluted, and he does not give a hoot about the holidays and recreation of millions of Canadians being spoiled by pollution. He does not care that the beauties of our countryside are being spoiled because pollution is an extremely grave problem, and is becoming worse.

The government has produced absolutely nothing in the way of legislation requiring pollution to be controlled. It has not called the provincial premiers together to discuss what can be done on a co-operative basis. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the government has done absolutely nothing. I direct these remarks to the Prime Minister, who asks for positive suggestions and then is too occupied to listen to them. He could not care less whether or not parliament meets.

We need a national pollution policy for this reason: It is very difficult for a province to bring in good, tough legislation requiring municipalities to instal the type of machinery costly machinery necessary to deal with pollution. Legislation must be enacted which deals with this problem on provincial borders. For instance if Ontario were to enact a tough law, industries from other countries that might be settling in Canada and looking for a place in which to establish a factory might say, "We shall not go to Ontario because they have tough laws with regard to pollution; therefore we had better go to Quebec, Manitoba, Nova Scotia or somewhere else."

If we are to have the kind of legislation that is necessary to require industries and municipalities to instal the type of machinery that will remove bacteria from waste before it is released into the environment, it must be a national law which applies equally to industries and municipalities in all parts of the country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is responsible—as is President Nixon, who has accepted the responsibility—for calling together the provincial premiers and proposing to them that there be a national law requiring pollution control in their provinces.

The provinces know that a national law is the only thing that will be effective in this area; therefore they would welcome this kind of invitation. But the Prime Minister could not care less. He will not invite the provincial premiers to Ottawa to discuss this matter and put into effect an anti-pollution law. He cannot be bothered. He wants to talk about the constitution and matters of the classroom. As the former deputy prime minister, the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), said before he was forced to resign because he could no longer stomach the sort of thing that occurs in the cabinet, the Prime Minister is not interested in the practical problems that today plague the average Canadian. He is interested only in matters of the classroom, I suggest to the Prime Minister that now is the time to get out of the classroom, to call together the provincial premiers and suggest that they give him the power to pass a national anti-pollution law.

Mr. Trudeau: I am listening.

Mr. Hees: I hope you are. This is the first sign of life that I have seen in the Prime Minister. Perhaps it is not too late, if he is listening. Very seldom does he listen in the house. He likes talking, but not listening. The Prime Minister should do what was done by parliament in wartime to make it easy for industries to get into the production of war materials.

Mr. Trudeau: Declare war.

Mr. Hees: Declare war on pollution, you bet your sweet life. And let us see you do it, instead of sitting in your seat and doing nothing. To make it easy for industries to get into war production the government of the day made available to industry low interest loans, very fast write-offs, and other inducements. The machinery that industry and municipalities must invest in, in order to take the bacteria out of waste, is very expensive. I suggest to the Prime Minister that he make this move as a means of helping industry and municipalities to do something to solve the problem. Nothing will be done if we simply keep talking of pollution the same as we talk about the weather.

The Prime Minister has to do three things. He has to call the provincial premiers together. I see that the Prime Minister is making notes on a little pad. I will give him time to write down that suggestion. I am speaking through you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: The Prime Minister must persuade the provincial premiers to give him the power—they will do this readily because they are anxious to solve the problem—to pass a national anti-pollution law which will make conditions in all provinces the same, and then there will be no question of industry going to another province if the regulations with regard to pollution are not so difficult there. In addition the Prime Minister should make low interest rate loans available to industry and municipalities, and fast write-offs. If he does that, he will be taking a good step forward.

I now wish to speak about the matter of poverty in this country. Last August, nearly a year ago, the Economic Council of Canada made available a very valuable report to the Canadian people and the government. It devoted 38 pages to the question of poverty, which it described as a national disgrace. When the Prime Minister was asked whether he agreed with that description he said yes. So the Prime Minister knows that poverty in this country is a national disgrace. The government admits it is a national disgrace, and it came into power pledged to bring in the just society, which should include the elimination of poverty.

On September 13 of last year I asked the Prime Minister whether he would consider increasing the federal minimum wage as an example and inducement to the provincial governments to follow suit and bring minimum wages up to a reasonable level. This is very necessary because, as the report of the Economic Council of Canada pointed out very clearly, poverty does not exist to the greatest extent with people who are on welfare. Those people are usually maintained just above the poverty level. The report pointed out that those suffering poverty in this country are for the most part living on minimum wages, which vary across Canada from 80 cents an hour to $1.30 an hour.

The Prime Minister is making some motions about the time. I am glad that for once he is paying attention to what we have to say. I ask the Prime Minister not to worry about the time; I will look after that. My time is not up; I have a few more minutes, have I not, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If it is of any help to the house I would inform hon. members that I am watching the time quite closely. The hon. member still has three minutes.

[Mr. Hees.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but I was not drawing the hon. member's attention to the time he had, but to the time I have—and I have no more time to listen to him.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister came into the house for just a short while today. That is quite a concession on his part because he hates the place, as he demonstrated last night. I am glad he came into the chamber for just a short time today. I hope he will accept the very sound, practical suggestions I have made regarding what the government must do in order to solve the problem of pollution.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), who is the self-styled Babe Ruth of the bargaining table, appears on television every once in a while, takes a bow and announces proudly that he has engineered a wage settlement for a strong, powerful union, giving that union about a 10 per cent increase each year. He takes a bow and says that he is very pleased and proud to do so.

But the people on minimum wages for whom this government is responsible, the people in federally controlled industries who work on minimum wages, and of whom there are many thousands, are receiving a wage of $1.25 an hour which was set more than four years ago. Since that time the cost of living has increased by no less than 17 per cent. What does the government expect these people to do, tighten their belts by 17 per cent? That is exactly what it expects them to do. Their idea of the just society is to give fat and well justified raises each year to strong industries because these industries can make trouble for them by going on strike. But they sit back and do nothing for the people who are weak and not organized, who live on minimum wages and who suffer poverty which the Prime Minister agrees is a national disgrace.

All they do is watch the cost of living go up by no less than 17 per cent in four years, and do absolutely nothing about it. That proves what a bunch of phonies they are. So much for their just society. I want to know what the government are going to do about that. I say they should immediately raise the minimum wage so that it would more than compensate for the increase in the cost of living that has taken place in the last four years, and show they mean what they said during the election, namely, that they would bring in a just society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. I know the hon. member is anxious to continue but he can do so only with the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Apparently there is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Hees: I have given you all the lesson you can absorb.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Prior to recognizing the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) I might perhaps express the misgiving I have. It seems to me that we are getting more and more into what amounts to a budget debate or an address debate, and I think all hon. members appreciate the difficulty in maintaining relevance to an adjournment motion. I appeal however to hon. members to try to relate their remarks to the motion before the house.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your admonition that our comments should be relevant to the motion. That is not very difficult. There are all kinds of arguments and reasons why we should assemble again here on September 22 instead of in October. First there is the business of this nation which is crying for attention, and there are economic circumstances that exist in both western and eastern Canada and which can only be described as unfinished business so far as this house is concerned.

We have spent the better part of a month discussing a procedural question, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself charged the opposition with being stupid even to discuss it. So if we were stupid to discuss it, I wonder what one can say about the government which brought it in. As a result this month, which could have usefully been used to deal with some of the real problems that exist, has been lost. What should have been done has been left undone.

Surely the Prime Minister cannot be unaware of the circumstances existing in western Canada. He went out to have a look, and the people there made him very welcome. If he is out there again on September 22 I am sure they will make him welcome again, because I suspect that the government will have done no more in regard to the conditions that face the western farmer by September 22 than they have done up to this day in July. We have had no report from the Prime Minister since we came back. He has not chosen to rise in his place in the house and say, "This is what I saw when I went to visit the people in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta." He did rise today and in the course of his address told the leaders of two opposition parties what he thinks of the kind of shop that they ran when they were in their provinces. I have some sympathy for him and I am sorry that he came to Saskatchewan at the particular time and under the particular circumstances which he did. We have suffered a Liberal government for some five years in that province and what the Prime Minister was seeing were the results of that administration.

All we see is the ineptitude of the federal Liberal government in its marketing policy, as is evidenced in the present situation of western grain farmers. I can understand why his impressions were as they were.

The reason for the real urgency in meeting again a month ahead of the date suggested by the government is that we may have some report on what has been accomplished in regard to the very serious difficulties that face Saskatchewan and western Canada.

Let me point out that as of October 22 we will be about ten days short of a quarter of the new crop year in marketing western grain. We start on that crop year on August 1, and there is no indication from the government, either through the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) or the Prime Minister that they are aware of the depth of the problem in the marketing of western grain. I am speaking not only of wheat. I am speaking also of barley, flax, and rapeseed. There is no indication as yet that the government are aware of the magnitude of the problem they face or that they have put in motion the machinery to deal with that problem. If they have done so, they have not told this house.

The Prime Minister expressed his contempt for the opposition, and for individual members of the opposition. Perhaps this is why he has not felt it necessary to inform people such as myself, who were elected by the voters in Saskatchewan, and who are backbenchers, how the government intends to deal with the problem. He referred to us as nobodies. Fortunately I do not mind it because I know the traditions of this house, and the parliamentary traditions that went before it.

I know to whom I am responsible. I am not responsible to the Prime Minister. Perhaps some of the unfortunate individuals sitting on the other side of the house are, but I am not. I am responsible to the people of Saskatoon-Biggar, and as long as they return me to this house I shall stand in my place and speak on their behalf. I want to tell the government that I have not that much confidence in them that I am willing to wait until October 22 to see what they have done for and to the people of Saskatoon-Biggar.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I have here two reports, one from the meeting between the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and one from his meeting with the National Farmers Union. These reports represent what these two organizations have chosen to send out following the meetings. One would look in vain in either of them for any reference to an in-depth discussion or study of the problems of marketing grain on the world markets of today. This is a time at which the International Grains Arrangement is in danger of collapse. Indeed, it has collapsed as far as minimum prices are concerned. The nations which have signed it, responsible nations which have been content to seize the benefits which they have received under the GATT negotiations, have disowned it. They now say to the Canadian grain growers: It is too bad; yet we are putting up with it and the government is putting up with it.

Why do we not have the courage to stand as a nation and say: A bargain is a bargain? Does the government not have the courage, using the Wheat Board and the other instruments at hand to go into the markets of the world and get our share of those markets? Hon. gentlemen opposite do not have that kind of courage or that kind of initiative. They are willing to let the thing go down the drain. If this is not the situation, this house has been told nothing to the contrary.

Other nations sell wheat and barley. What prices should we sell at? We have asked the minister these questions but have been given no firm answer except that present policy will continue. If we have failed by doing what we are doing at the present time, why do we not set about doing things differently? These are the questions: what prices, what volume, how fast will our stocks move? I do not want to wait until October 22 to learn the answers. When they appeared before the standing committee, the officials of the Canadian Wheat Board were asked about promotion programs, the adequacy of their staff and the countries they intended to approach with a view to sales. The answers were not encouraging. When asked about price differentials between ourselves and our competitors, they had to say we were at a disadvantage. Is this disadvantage being corrected?

I do not mind diversification being discussed with western farmers. Some of us will diversify. A great deal is being done in this direction now. But diversification alone is not the answer. The problem facing western Canada is, first of all, a marketing problem, and it is not being met. At the beginning of the new crop year there is no sign that it will be met, any more than the transportation problem is being met. The transportation of western grain during the past year has been a disgrace to the efficiency of the Canadian nation. We are reaching the end of the crop year when a five-bushel quota will be set up at most of these stations. They are running box cars up and down the country as fast as they can these days, but the situation is still confused. Some farmers will get their quota in, and others will not. Confusion is all we are offered, yet communications are the very lifeline of this nation.

The Prime Minister sneers at Saskatchewan. In 1964 when the Liberal government was elected in Saskatchewan, they took office in a province which had been well governed for 20 years and which understood what communications were about. We had a grid road system through the municipalities and on to the highways. It was modern and up to date. We had placed power in most of the farms. We had provided assistance for the modernization of farms so that living conditions might be comparable to those in the cities.

Mr. Cullen: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gleave: Yes. No, I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gleave: Well, I have changed my mind. It is my time, and I intend to use it. I notice that members on the other side have repeatedly refused the normal courtesy of allowing some of our members to continue their speeches, so I shall not permit a question.

It is this forward look in terms of communication and transportation which the present administration needs.

Last fall, immediately after the election, there was a grain handlers' strike in western

Canada. It was settled on the eve of the date on which this house met. Why? Because if it had not been settled the government would have been obliged to answer questions about a situation which was totally unsatisfactory. One right which still remains in this house despite 75c is the right of the people back home to have somebody representing them here who will speak on their behalf and demand that the government shall answer. This is what parliament is all about.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture made certain recommendations in its report. It might as well have stayed at home. The Minister of Agriculture says we have met these recommendations—that the introduction of cash advances will mean the injection of many millions of dollars into the western economy. Do the Minister of Agriculture and the members of the house not know that not one extra dollar will be available to the individual as a result of these cash advance payments? I could have taken exactly the same amount of money by way of cash advance on August 1, 1968, as I can take on August 1 of this year.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but may I again express some misgivings about the range of this debate. I have been very patient and have listened to him with great interest, but may I remind him that we are discussing an adjournment motion. I would ask him to relate his remarks about agriculture as much as possible to the need for deciding whether the house should reconvene on September 22 or October 22. I appreciate his difficulty but I invite his co-operation.

Mr. Gleave: I would have to admit that I am straying a little from the motion, but these matters are urgent. That is what concerns me about setting back the time for returning. Matters that could have been dealt with before now will not be dealt with until October 22 if this amendment is defeated. Thus there will be this much more delay and time for dallying on the part of the government. This much more time will be lost for taking effective decisions, and time is of the essence under these circumstances.

I have said what I want to say on this adjournment debate. My point is that the needs of the people of this nation, and particularly of those in the area I represent, are not being met. The standing committee on agriculture toured eastern Canada; I am sure the farmers there are only a little better off than western farmers, though some might not even be as well off. Perhaps I should make a plea for them too. My direct concern, of course, is with the area I represent.

I will stop at this point, Mr. Speaker, since I know from the tone of the Prime Minister's address this morning that it is very unlikely that anything I say might cause him to change his mind.

Mr. Osler: Would the hon. member now permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar permit a question?

Mr. Gleave: Yes.

Mr. Osler: It is not a very important question, but when the hon. member was discussing the role of the ex-premier of Saskatchewan, whose government may or may not have been an excellent one, I was not clear whether the hon. member was relating the length of those legislative sessions to the excellence of the government. That seems to me the point that had been discussed earlier. Did the ex-premier acquire excellence only because his legislature had long sessions, or did he acquire excellence as a result of his skill and ability, which have nothing to do with the length of sessions?

Mr. Gleave: I am very pleased that the hon. member opposite concedes that the former premier of Saskatchewan achieved excellence. He achieved that excellence not because of time but because of ability and imagination.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to be provocative today; nor is it my intention to be long. I do not want to prolong this debate, but some statements have been made that should be answered by those of us who occupy the government back benches.

I am sorry the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) is not in the house, because he certainly propounded a new theorem this afternoon in that the profundity of his remarks varied indirectly in ratio to the decibel volume of his voice. We thought this afternoon that we were to be treated to a description of what the policies of the Official Opposition would be were they to be entrusted with the responsibility of government. We were told that the government should cut expenditures and fight inflation, but time did not permit the hon. member to delineate those areas where certain programs

should be curtailed and money saved. Then a few minutes later we were told that more money must be spent on pollution, that we should have a national pollution policy. The burden of the hon. member's remarks rested on those two concepts—first of all, that we have to cut budgetary expenditure, and secondly that we have to spend more money fighting pollution.

I do not think the hon. member made a constructive contribution to the debate, especially in view of the fact that the debate relates to whether or not the proposed recess should extend until October 22. It is unfortunate that when he was a member of a previous government the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings was unable to produce the kind of action that he is advocating today. It is unfortunate that the party whose leader is an exponent of retroactive justice is not as skilful in developing retroactive policies. It is likewise unfortunate that many of the events that occurred between 1957 and 1962 cannot be undone.

I do not want to continue in this vein. Rather, I want to read to the house some quotations from the debates of the Nova Scotia house of assembly when the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was premier. I should like to put on record what he said when answering opposition criticisms that he had failed to develop constructive policies, that he had failed to take sufficient, effective action in time. As reported at page 107 of the 1967 debates he said:

> I am sure that any member of the house can present a list of projects which are desirable and important. Any member can stand in his place and say that this should be done and that should be done, but our resources are limited in comparison to the needs to be met, yes, inadequate in comparison to the needs to be met.

Then when he was accused of failing to provide sufficient programs at the session in 1967, he said:

> Time will tell . . . I suggest that we are certainly not meeting all the needs, but we have tried to allocate the resources that are available toward the most pressing needs in an effort to produce the most beneficial results that we can offer our province and its people.

The hon. gentleman went on to point out that not everything can be accomplished in one short session. Then he continued—and this is a truism of anyone who occupies a position of government:

> —even this government cannot please anybody.

[Mr. Perrault.]

It is clear, I suggest, that when he had the responsibility for government he recognized the need for time for long-range planning. This is what he was asking the opposition to understand in the Nova Scotia house, and he should surely be just as understanding now when he occupies such an important position in the House of Commons.

In the one breath we heard the opposition complain about too short a recess. They alleged we should have recessed a month ago. In the next breath they complain the recess will be too long, that we are obsessed with plans for taking holidays. These are the arguments we have been hearing in recent days. What they do not tell the Canadian people is that almost all of them have had extensive vacations during the rules debate. Their system of triple platooning for vacation purposes would make the Green Bay Packers look like a Little League squad. This talk about selfless dedication to parliament, while many of them have sampled vacation delights around the country, is really quite laughable as far as government members are concerned, and I think the people of Canada will understand.

Speaking about the recess, legions of opposition members rise in their places to remind us that this has been the most productive parliament in the history of Canada. Member after member of the New Democratic and Conservative parties has made orations in this house to this effect. They ask why we need rule 75c since this is the most productive parliament in history. But somewhere down the line their ideological mores have become short circuited. The leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) today accused the government of being a "do-nothing" government, one devoid of ideas. He suggested we were cowering in fear that our legislative nakedness would be exposed if the house were to meet earlier than October 22. These two concepts, of course, are not mutually compatible. You cannot be the most productive government in the history of Canada, with more legislation going through in a given number of days than in the past, and be a "do-nothing" government.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to this bag of fetid wind continuing this kind of speech, but I am not going to allow him to put words in my mouth or in the mouth of any other member of this party. We have said it has been a productive session in terms of co-operation.

We never referred to it as being a productive session in terms of bringing down solutions to problems which face this country.

Mr. Perrault: I could cite numerous references in *Hansard* where specific members of the opposition stated, this has been one of the most productive sessions in the history of Canada. I am prepared to send these quotations to the leader of the New Democratic party before the adjournment of the house. The fact is, of course, that this has been a productive government with more being accomplished in a shorter period of time than in any other period in our history.

A recess does not mean we are going to hang up the sign, "Gone fishing". It does not mean the shop is closed. It means unprecedented work on parliament hill on many of the problems which have been referred to by opposition members today. There will be a great deal of action in the weeks to come. On the one hand we hear the charge that the government is trying to ram through too much legislation on too restricted a schedule. On the other hand, the government is accused of having nothing to advance. I say the poverty of the logic is manifest.

I had the record of the dates of the recesses of parliament drawn a few moments ago. The dates of the recesses and resumption are as follows: 1957, December 21, to January 3, 1958; 1958, none; 1959, none; 1960, April 13 to April 25, and December 21 to January 16, 1961; 1961, July 13 to September 7; 1962, December 20 to January 31, 1963; 1963, August 2 to September 30; 1964, December 18 to February 16, 1965.

Almost all of these were short recesses, yet this government which proposes a longer recess in also the government which the opposition credits with getting more done than any other government in the history of Canada in a given period of time. During the three month recess much will be done by members of all parties, both here in Ottawa and at the constituency level. The argument the opposition provides is one of the most unusual than can possibly be developed with regard to a recess.

Mr. Robert Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, we have viewed quite an exhibition here today. Probably most members have never seen anything like this in many, many years. During my 12 years in this chamber I have never seen such a scurrilous attack make on leaders of every opposition party as that produced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today. One immediately asks the question, why has the Prime Minister adopted such an attitude? I can arrive at two quick and immediate conclusions. The first is that the Prime Minister and his government are running like a bunch of scalded cats because of the attitude they have adopted with regard to Rule 75c. The second is that since they have secured through closure the passage of Rule 75c, they no longer feel they need the co-operation of the opposition parties in order to run parliament. They are going to run it as a one-man show.

We do not believe that parliament is the prerogative and the soul right of the Prime Minister. We are willing to come back here on September 22 and endeavour, on behalf of the people who have sent us here, to secure the kind of action that those people need, must have and have not received to the present time. We are going to see that the government is well aware of our determination to serve our country and serve it well in the House of Commons.

I can well understand the approach of the Prime Minister is this debate. I have before me a copy of today's *Globe and Mail*, Friday, July 25. There is a very significant cartoon in that paper. It shows a picture, that I assume is a picture of the Prime Minister, through the eyes of the cartoonist. He has these words to say. First, "I have silenced my cabinet". This has been done very effectively with the roster system. Then he says, "I have silenced my party". There was never any great doubt about that. Third, "And now, that stupid opposition". Fourth, "Nobody says anything anymore". He is deaf because he will not hear and is not here. Fifth, "In Parliament" and, sixth, "I might as well do away with it". He has been endeavouring to do his best to "do away with it".

There have been a lot of comments about Caesar and Little Caesar. As far as parliament is concerned, I think it is an institution for which Brutus would be better suited than Caesar. In his remarks the Prime Minister made comments about the conduct of both my leader and the leader of the New Democratic Party during their tenure as premiers of provinces of this country. He made some statements about the performance of Robert Stanfield as Premier of Nova Scotia. I will not bother to go into the details of the Prime Minister's argument, but I will say that during the period that Robert Stanfield was leader of the Conservative Party in Nova Scotia,

every time he went to the polls the people gave him a greater endorsation than they did the time before. I am quite willing to leave it to the people of Nova Scotia to determine the kind of performance which Robert Stanfield produced for the people of that province.

• (3:10 p.m.)

If the Prime Minister has any thoughts about Mr. Stanfield's performance in Nova Scotia, he should look at the election results of June 25, 1968, not just in Nova Scotia where one Liberal barely managed to squeak through, but throughout the Atlantic provinces especially Newfoundland which has had a Liberal government for the past 21 years. No, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not enter this debate because he was concerned about the way in which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) performed when he was Premier of Nova Scotia. He entered this debate because he was trying to put some backbone in the backbenchers of his party who will have to go home and during the next three months try to explain to their constituents why this guillotine is necessary in this parliament, and why they sat back and said nothing. I want to say to the Liberal members of parliament that the Prime Minister said members of the opposition do not wish to leave parliament because when they get 50 yards away from the House of Commons they are nobodies. Let me say that he has twisted this statement. Liberal backbenchers cannot even hope to achieve this position because they are faceless, nameless robots. When the button is pushed to support the Prime Minister, who is all but a dictator in every way, shape and form, they jump.

If we are forced to spend three months away from the House of Commons, we will do our work. We will see that the people of this nation are made well aware of the type of performance that has taken place—not throughout this session because this was a good session until July—prior to June 27. It was a good session. It operated in harmony and co-operation. It was a session that moved on whatever legislation the government brought forward. I do not say that the legislation introduced was necessarily the type of legislation that would receive top priority by the opposition parties. What I am saying, however, is that what legislation was proposed was dealt with constructively, reasonably and efficiently.

Never let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that this was the most productive session in the history of parliament so far as the Canadian people are concerned. But it can be said to be one of the most productive sessions in the history of parliament so far as the government is concerned in respect of the legislation to which it gave priority. But there is a great difference. We in the Atlantic provinces would like to come back here on September 22 with the hope this government might take some action that would be of value and benefit to our people. Every day we see statistics which indicate that unemployment is escalating, that the cost of living is escalating and that there is nothing for the people of the area which is better today than it was yesterday. Indeed, almost everywhere we look we see indicators which lead us to believe it will be a pretty tough winter for everybody in this country, especially those hundreds of thousands of people who will not be able to find employment. We should be here endeavouring to pass the type of legislation that will give some hope to the hundreds of thousands of people who will not be able to find employment. But instead, we are to be in our constituencies because the Prime Minister has deemed it so.

I say to Liberal backbenchers that things have not changed a great deal. During the pipeline debate of 1956, when the Liberal government brought in closure, the Liberal backbenchers were singing, "Hail, hail the gang's all here, what the hell do we care". They have not been doing such singing this time. I say to them that when the next election comes along they will be in the same position in which they were in 1956 and 1957. It will be the end of a government that is doing its best to eliminate completely any kind of criticism.

The Prime Minister really has not changed, Mr. Speaker. When he was Minister of Justice in 1968 he rose in this house and told members of the opposition that the members of the government were the masters of this house. Today, he says they are the masters of this house, and even more. He says they will not even bother having a house. He says we will meet as little as possible because, after all in his opinion the debates are stupid and most of the members are either bums or idiots.

The attitude of the Prime Minister is that he would just as soon be away in his ivory tower dreaming dreams of things which might be accomplished in some way other than by having to put up with the inconvenience of parliament. He has now regimented his cabinet ministers so that they only dare appear in the House of Commons on certain days. The Prime Minister said that when the

members of the opposition leave the house they upgrade the I.Q. of this chamber. Apparently he has also reached the conclusion that if he can get some of the cabinet ministers out of the house he can upgrade the I.Q. of the cabinet. He probably believes that, since he has a roster system now the cabinet ministers are not much of a problem, and since he has regional desks the backbenchers are not much of a problem. It is not necessary for him to find out from the backbenchers what is going on in given areas of the country. All he need do is go to his regional desks to find out what is happening and where it is happening.

All I can say to the Prime Minister is that his computers and regional desks did not work very effectively when he made his trip out west. He failed so badly when he went out west that he has not yet recovered, and probably never will. I suppose the Prime Minister believes that since he has the roster system and the regional desks, there is only one thing more he really needs and that is the guillotine. Then he can handle the obnoxious members of parliament who give him difficulty by asking many questions which he cannot answer.

An hon. Member: These nobodies.

Mr. Coates: Yes, these nobodies. Members of the opposition do not need to get 50 yards from the House of Commons to become nobodies; they are nobodies every day.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): What does this make the people who voted for Trudeau?

Mr. Coates: We now have a new kind of parliament for the Canadian people to see, completely different from the parliament that was elected on June 25, 1968. It is different from the parliament the Prime Minister led the people to believe would be in existence after June 25, 1968. It is a parliament devoid of democracy. It is not interested in democracy and is not interested in the type of action that is required for the benefit of the people of Canada. We, from the Atlantic provinces, listened with interest, and more than passing interest, to the comments of the Prime Minister during the election campaign about regional economic disparity and about the just society. We had some hope that when he was elected Prime Minister legislation might be introduced that would be of benefit to the Atlantic provinces and would eliminate the chronic problem that has been with us throughout generations. So, we from the Atlantic provinces came to Ottawa in anxious anticipation of what might be presented to parliament to correct the economic imbalance in this nation.

• (3:20 p.m.)

We heard the throne speech debate. We listened to the grave words associated with the establishment of the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion. We had hopes, but we find now that we had nothing but hopes because no action has been taken in the Atlantic provinces which would make us believe that times might be better tomorrow than they were yesterday. One of the first actions taken by this government was the cancellation of the Northumberland Strait Crossing, a transportation link that has been promised since Confederation. The former Liberal government initiated some construction on this project, but this government cancelled it.

Today, we are beset with concern in respect of the possibilities of the base consolidation program of the Department of National Defence. We do not know what is going to happen. We have been given an assurance by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) that every possible consideration will be given to these people. The minister is a good man, and I personally have faith in his honesty and integrity, but we will not be here to find out what happened. It may be, as the minister indicated in the house, the various members affected by this consolidation program will be informed; but surely this is the type of program which parliament itself should consider. Parliament should be sitting in hopes that some solutions might be proposed to offset the economic hardships that follow a decision of this nature.

The Prime Minister says we will not be here when this decision is made. He says we are going to go home and we are going to stay at home until October 22, like it or not. We suggest that anything which might be discovered in 2½ months should not require another month for consideration. There is no reason for members to be away from the House of Commons for such a long period of time, particularly when some action is required by the country. The hon. member who preceded me referred in his remarks to parliament in recent days. Certainly, in the 12 years I have been a member of this house members have never been asked to take a recess for such an extended period of time.

If there was ever a time in the history of this country when parliament should be here it is now, when the economic difficulties facing this country are so significant. They are so foreboding and frightening that no one could have any confidence in a government that has talked more and done nothing to face up to the realities associated with inflation and economic hardship.

The Prime Minister will accomplish little or nothing for anyone, including the backbenchers—certainly nothing for the office which he holds, or the people of Canada—by the type of performance we witnessed today. Certainly, he did nothing for the dignity of this country. Let him now take notice that there is nothing to be accomplished by getting into the gutter. There is no one in the opposition who is going to get into the gutter with him; if he wants to be there, he will be there by himself. We are not going with him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: I was utterly shocked to hear in this chamber, where there has always been evidence of that degree of respect hon. members have had for each other, the Prime Minister gratuitously and without reason say to a colleague of mine, who is a good man, a tough man fighting for his constituents, that he is no gentleman. That is about as low as anyone can get. We are not willing to get that low or go down into the gutter with the Prime Minister.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): That hon. member also fought for his country.

Mr. Coates: His war record alone stands as something the Prime Minister should consider. This is an indication of the kind of day we have had. I was not here on "black Friday" in 1956, but this is another black Friday in parliament.

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member entertain a question?

Mr. Coates: Sure.

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member tell the house who was the premier of Nova Scotia when the heavy water plant at Glace Bay was started?

Mr. Coates: At that time in Nova Scotia—

Mr. Perrault: I should like the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Wait for the answer.

[Mr. Coates.]

Mr. Coates: If you will sit down I will answer the question.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The Prime Minister doesn't even know him. He is one of his bums and idiots.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it was the present Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) who took credit in all the newspapers in which he could have his name printed for allocating the power plant to Nova Scotia.

Mr. Perrault: I asked the hon. member to tell the house who the premier of the province of Nova Scotia was when the Glace Bay project was implemented.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, being a mere backbencher of a minority party, after hearing the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) harangue today, I hesitate to get to my feet. The only consolation I have is that for some peculiar reason the Prime Minister gives more status to a mere nullity in the House of Commons than a member once he is outside this house. Once I leave this place and I am 50 yards down the street I am according to the Prime Minister a nonentity. Perhaps there is something in favour of being a nullity rather than a nonentity, at least by the Prime Minister's reasoning.

I found the entire speech of the Prime Minister extremely distasteful in tone, even if it contained a series of arguments which have to be taken seriously. Let me refer to one or two of the statements the Prime Minister made. He referred to the period of time we should adjourn for the summer. The tone of his argument in this respect was extremely, intellectually arrogant. His was the kind of argument one should not make during the normal discourse or conversation between civilized adults. Certainly, it should not have been made by the Prime Minister of a democratic country.

The attitude the Prime Minister took in respect of the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) was very reprehensible. It is one thing to disagree with an individual's ideas and say that in your judgment he is mistaken, but it is quite another thing to call that person a fool. I suggest that is exactly what the Prime Minister did today. This attitude, considering the whole history of democracy even back to the times of Athenian Greece, is extremely unpleasant. I hoped that the attitude of the right hon. gentleman

would change when he became Prime Minister. I hoped he would display a little more modesty and a little less of the assumption that he knows all the answers and other people are not likely to know them, especially the backbenchers of his party on mere members of the opposition. I believe that by his speech today he did a disservice to himself, both as an intellectual and as Prime Minister of this country. I shall not say anything more about his attitude because I want to deal with the substance of his speech before making my own comments.

• (3:30 p.m.)

As I understood it, the substance of the Prime Minister's argument was that the government needs a recess of three months in order to prepare legislation for next session. He cited other legislative bodies, namely, those of the provinces of Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, which have in the past had extremely short sessions presumably, he argued, so that their cabinets would have time to prepare legislation. In one sense this is a good argument and should be considered seriously. My answer to it is twofold. One is that, as everyone knows, the sessions of provincial legislatures are becoming longer each year as the responsibilities of those governments become greater. The duration of the sessions of provincial legislatures is not becoming less but is in fact increasing. Therefore, one has to make a practical judgment about the length of time necessary to prepare legislation. The general trend is that the sessions of provincial legislatures are becoming longer.

The Prime Minister is entitled to make a judgment about the length of time this house is required to sit. On the other hand, we are entitled to make a judgment about the length of time required in this respect. Reference to the legislative experience of the provinces or other national governments is not directly relevant to the question. We have to consider the kind of legislation we want introduced in this country, and how much time should be allowed during the summer for its preparation.

The Prime Minister's argument seems to be that only during the summer months can the cabinet get together and work out its legislative program. I think this is ridiculous. Cabinet officials and civil servants work all year. What is true is that during a recess members of parliament are not in the House of Commons to raise serious questions and carry out serious work on legislative committees. That argument was explicitly put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of my party and the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste. Their argument was that the government should be introducing legislation now. It has had, God knows, enough time to prepare legislation. It has had more than a year since the election in which to prepare meaningful legislation. We on this side of the house suggest that rather than taking another three months to dawdle and fiddle around, undertaking more studies, the government should be introducing legislation now. Members on both sides of the house should be dealing with meaningful legislation in our legislative committees.

Before I deal with what has not been done and what could be done if we returned to the house earlier than October 22, I wish to give a small amount of credit to the government for what it has done. During the past ten months we have passed two significant pieces of legislation, and two only. One was the languages bill and the other was the omnibus Criminal Code bill. In the main, both these bills were supported by all members of the house. They were old pieces of legislation in the sense that they were part of the Pearson program. I do not say that in criticism of the present government. The fact is that this is the only significant legislation with which we have dealt during the past ten months.

We have been dealing with legislation covering the kind of things in which the Prime Minister is interested. It is bound up with an area that I believe he takes seriously as a politician and as an intellectual. I refer to legislation dealing with civil liberties. The languages bill and the omnibus Criminal Code bill are very important because they bestow important rights on individual citizens. This is a subject to which the Prime Minister is committed because of his civil liberties orientation.

Since the 18th century all civilized people have had a commitment to civil liberties; there is nothing new about these principles. To some extent such legislation is new to this country, but it has been in existence in other countries for the last 200 years. The languages bill and the omnibus Criminal Code bill were necessary pieces of legislation, but I suggest they will benefit relatively few people. I do not say this to denigrate the legislation, but there are not millions of Canadians who are homosexuals; nor are there millions of Canadians who will be directly affected by

the official languages bill. Those pieces of legislation are important, but they do not affect very many people.

What does profoundly affect the citizens of this country and people all over the world is socio-economic legislation, that is, legislation aimed directly at improving the material well-being of the average income and poor people in society. We have not done a damned thing in that regard. There have been tentative approaches to serious legislation in this area. We all recognize that there is a housing crisis. Every serious Canadian has known that for the past five years there has been a housing problem. What has this so-called progressive Liberal government done about the housing crisis? It has introduced a little tidbit of legislation which will benefit only those people earning more than $8,000 a year. It has not done anything to assist the poor people in our cities. It has not done anything about slum clearance. It has done nothing to assist the average working man who lives, for example, in a city such as mine who although being a prosperous Canadian, relatively speaking, cannot buy a house because of the high interest rates that are in effect. The government has done nothing for housing except effect a marginal improvement for middle class people. So much for the progressive Liberal party and what it has done to solve the housing problem.

What about taxation? The great reformer, Prime Minister Trudeau, introduced one piece of legislation dealing with taxation. He instituted the 2 per cent social development tax which is one of the most reactionary pieces of legislation presented to the House of Commons. We have no capital gains tax. There has been no revision of the tax structure to assist those people with families and earning $4,000 a year or less. So much for what the government has done to assist the poor and the average income man in this country.

The government introduced a good bill dealing with regional poverty. But what happened? The government allocated a pittance of funds for the program, enough to buy a newspaper for every poor Canadian but not much more. So we have a good bill but no meaningful action in terms of allocation of money. Then, there is the wheat situation. I shall not spend any time discussing that problem because in the last few months hon. members of my party and those of the Conservative party have demonstrated what a disastrous year farmers in the prairie provinces have had. Again, we have witnessed a very callous attitude on the part of the Prime Minister to the problem. No one is denying that the problem calls for a serious, long-range program. Statements have been made to wheat farmers, such as, "Look fellow; you will have to change your growing practices. It's too bad, but we don't sell your wheat". This is a callous attitude and should not be adopted towards any citizen of this country. It is one thing to say, "We must work out long-range programs", but quite another to say to a man, "You made a mistake; why don't you do something else, fellow?"

• (3:40 p.m.)

It is foolish and irresponsible to say to such a man: "You have $100,000 in capital equipment so you are not poor". It is absurd, when everyone knows that he can do nothing with that capital equipment. Who is going to buy it? Are there many people in my city or a city in the east likely to move west to buy one of those farms? Of course not! These statements seem to me to suggest an absence of constructive policies on the part of the government as well as a callous attitude.

One other item about which something should be done within the next couple of months is an increase in the pensions of the thousands of veterans in this country. The Woods report has been waiting around for many months now, a report upon which the government has decided not to act. Even some backbenchers in the Liberal party have said that this report should have been sent to an appropriate committee a long time ago and that action should have been taken on it. But this has not happened.

These are the five areas in which the government has either done nothing or has done something to benefit only those who are already well off. It seems to me inconceivable that people on the other side of the house should not see their government for what it is. It is the most conservative government we have had in Canada in 15 years. Any serious political scientist or economist describing the régime we now have would reach that conclusion, I am sure.

It seems to me that we are adjourning much too soon or, if we are to adjourn now we should come back in two months time. If the government is interested in something

other than civil liberties, which are important, if it is interested in dealing with regional poverty, not only in the maritime provinces but also in the heart of our major cities in the so-called prosperous provinces of Ontario and British Columbia, if it wants to redistribute income, if it wants to help pensioners, whether they be veterans or simply our elderly citizens, then why do they not wish to come back here sooner, by the middle of September? This course would enable us to get on with some serious social and economic legislation which would provide substantial benefits for the average and poor Canadians?

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): As a member of this house representing one of the regionally dispossessed areas of Canada I am astonished, as I am sure the people I represent will be, that this parliament is on the verge of adjourning for three months when there are so many serious problems facing the country. We have been through a very critical session and, as has been said by many members who have participated in the debate on the rules, a very productive session. It is true that parliament will never be the same, but surely that is not to suggest that parliament no longer has a role to play.

I sat here today and listened with amazement to the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when, as is often the case, he misconstrued our motives and indeed tried to impute motives. I could not believe my ears when I heard him say that perhaps one of the reasons we were opposing a long adjournment of three months was that we had some doubts about our status when we leave this place. Indeed, the Prime Minister suggested that we would no longer enjoy the distinction of being hon. members when this place adjourns.

In my view, this is indicative of the contempt in which the Prime Minister holds parliament, the utter contempt with which he has treated parliament, because the role of a member of parliament is a long and well established one. There are ample quotations on the record and authorities on this subject. Our responsibilities as members of parliament or as 264 ombudsmen are continuing responsibilities whether or not this house sits. Indeed, we are going to have even more responsibilities during this recess trying to justify to our constituents and to the Canadian people why, in the light of so many serious problems facing Canada, we allow ourselves to take a three months' recess.

The Prime Minister and the government house leader have had their way. We saw them last night as they appeared in the house, complete with white carnations, showing their utter disdain, which has been so characteristic, behaving like two bank robbers who apologize for having shot the teller because they had to get the money. They got their way. What they have done to parliament in the process only time will tell. Today, we witnessed the spectacle of the Prime Minister losing his cool, a quality which has come to be so characteristic of him. Indeed, we saw him representing himself as a great man, a great devotee of General de Gaulle whom he maligned in this house just a short time ago. But now it becomes fashionable for the Prime Minister, who loosely tosses out charges about hypocritical speeches and stupid filibusters, to behave in such a way as to leave himself open to this very type of accusation.

Perhaps it can be said of him that if he gets his way in this instance he will behave like a latter day Nero who is content to fiddle while Rome burns, because while parliament stands adjourned for three months not only do the serious problems facing this nation continue but they continue to escalate without solution. These problems will continue without reference to hon. members of this house who, whether or not the Prime Minister accepts the fact, have the responsibility of continuing to represent their constituents and to protect the national interest in the best way they can. How can I go back to my unemployed constituents and say I have three months off? They will look at me and say: We have 12 months off, the only difference is that you are getting $18,000 a year for it whereas in our case our unemployment insurance benefit expired long ago. We are relegated to having to get on our hands and knees, swallow our pride and beg for welfare from the state. What can I say to them? They are underhoused; in many instances they are under-nourished because of a lack of a proper diet, and they are over-governed. They have no opportunities and they are suffering the consequences of 20 years of unrestricted Liberal dictatorship as well as the type of arrogance that we saw manifested in this house in the last few days.

In the final analysis, these are the people who have to suffer the consequences of the arrogance of a government that has gone mad with power. I should like the Prime Minister to go to Newfoundland or to the Atlantic provinces and talk to the people who are regionally dispossessed, and who suffer the

consequences of regional disparity through no fault of their own.

• (3:50 p.m.)

We are moderate people in the Atlantic provinces. We are reasonable people. But how much are reasonable people expected to put up with? Poverty continues to be a major problem in this country though the government continues to ignore it. Our people continue to suffer the consequences of spiralling inflation, of high interest rates, of the lack of adequate housing, of the lack of ability to buy suitable houses, of the lack of public housing. They are beginning to realize the serious consequences of pollution and the failure of the Government of Canada to meet its responsibilities in this direction. They know from personal experience what the rising cost of living means. The working people of this country and those living on fixed incomes not only in the region from which I come but from across Canada, in the cities and on the farms from coast to coast, know the consequences of the monthly increases in the cost of living index because they experience them on a day to day basis as they go to the store to buy provisions for their families. Can you blame them for thinking: surely, the government must be able to come to grips with these serious problems over which we have no control.

We have a government which is determined to operate in a parliament whose members have been relegated to a position of rubber stamps. Perhaps this is the reason the government insists on proceeding with its plan for a three month adjournment. Under the new rules, perhaps we can get up and make a few speeches but we shall no longer be able to directly influence measures which will be brought forward for enactment. We have already given up our traditional, ancient right to withhold supply to the government. It was a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when that right left us. But at least we gave it up voluntarily. We gave up some of our debating days, too. We gave these things up because we wanted to co-operate with the government in a spirit of goodwill. We wanted to co-operate with the government because at that time we had no reason to suspect that its intentions were anything but honourable. Now, this government stands indicted by its own action.

Sure, we can come back in September and meet in committees. If the committees are anything like the committees were this session, conducted by partisan chairmen and controlled by a government which only accepts reports with which it agrees, this exercise could easily and usefully be dispensed with. Parliament should be asked to come back in September, at least, to discuss even on the basis of the limited power we now have, the serious problems facing the country.

The Atlantic provinces are passing through a crisis unparalleled in the history of confederation. The province from which I come is on the verge of a serious financial crisis. It is a well established fact that the same applies in the province of New Brunswick and in the province of Prince Edward Island. What is this government doing? It suggests parliament should take a three month recess and expects us to go back to our constituencies and defend this action. Members opposite may laugh and jeer because they got their way in this instance but I hope that when they have to face the unemployed, the badly housed and the poor in their constituencies they can find a good explanation for adjourning for three months. If they do, perhaps they will let us in on it, because I do not know what I shall say to the people I represent. What can I say to them? Nothing has been done by the government so far. They have been retrogressive steps. We see fish plants closing all over the place. We see advantages we have enjoyed in the past taken from us. We have lost the salt rebate. The fisheries are in a crisis. Yet the government sits by and does nothing. Perhaps the government wants parliament to adjourn for three months in order that it can prepare the country psychologically for what to expect—

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member. It being four o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, namely, private bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

LONDON AND MIDLAND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY

The house resumed from Thursday, March 13, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-101, respecting London and Midland General Insurance Company—Mr. Lind—Mr. Faulkner in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose on Thursday, March 13, clause 1 of the bill was under consideration.

On clause 1—*Change of name.*

Mr. Lind: Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to change the name of the company concerned from London and Midland General Insurance Company to Avco General Insurance Company. The company does not desire to change its capitalization nor to make any corporate change other than the change in title.

I urge hon. members to accept the bill before us. The company has been doing business in Canada for a number of years, operating not only in Ontario but across Canada and it has rendered good service to Canadians. A few years ago the company was purchased by the Avco Delta Corporation. All the bill seeks to do is to change the name of the company from London and Midland General Insurance Company to Avco General Insurance Company.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, something much more fundamental is involved in this bill than the mere purpose stated by the sponsor. True, on the surface, the intent is to change the name of the company. But what is of much more fundamental importance, something that has been explored on many occasions in the house, is the extent to which parliament is being asked to give formal endorsation to the concept of further inroads made by foreign capital into the Canadian economy, and whether it is desirable to accede to such request.

London and Midland General Insurance Company is not a simple, uncomplicated company with a Canadian structure, as the name would lead us to believe. It is a company that is involved in as large an international or multi-national corporate entity as exists anywhere, especially in the finance or insurance field.

When this bill was first considered before the committee, a Mr. David Alexandor, the parliamentary agent for the company, gave certain evidence. I should like to refer to that evidence to indicate the intricate involvement of London and Midland General Insurance Company in the finance and insurance world.

Mr. Alexandor initially explained, as did the sponsor of the bill, what appears on the surface of the bill to be its purpose. Then, he went on to make reference to Delta Acceptance Corporation, indicating that it was incorporated as a public company under the laws of Ontario on March 26, 1954. Then, in July 1962 Delta Acceptance Corporation Limited acquired all the outstanding share capital of London and Midland General Insurance Company. In other words, since 1962 London and Midland General Insurance Company ceased to be a Canadian company in the full sense of the word, and in fact became a wholly owned subsidiary of Delta Acceptance Corporation. Delta Acceptance Corporation subsequently changed its name to Avco Delta Corporation Canada Limited.

Perhaps, it would be worth while to set out, as did Mr. Alexandor, the extensions that Avco Delta Corporation has in the insurance, finance and other fields, in order to indicate we are not dealing here simply with a proposal to change a name. Perhaps I should read from the text what Mr. Alexandor said:

> In addition to London and Midland General Insurance Company the following companies are also subsidiaries of Avco Delta Corporation Canada Limited. Avco C.F.C. Limited which was formerly C.F.C. Finance Corporation Limited, Avco Delta Dominion Limited which was formerly Delta Acceptance Canada Limited, Avco Delta Quebec Limited, which was formerly called D.A.C. (Quebec) Ltd., Avco Finance Limited, which was formerly The Crescent Finance Corporation Limited, Avco Highland Plan Limited, which was formerly called Highland Trial Plan Limited, Avco Delta Realty Limited, which was formerly Grand Prairie Investments Limited, Adanac General Insurance Company of Canada, Avco Delta Realty, Manitoba, Limited, which was formerly called the North West Mortgage and Finance Company Limited, Consolidated Finance Western Limited, Empire Acceptance Corporation Limited, General Finance Company Limited, Lorne-Bruce Motors Limited and Waverly Finance Company Limited.

The latter company, Waverly Finance Company Limited, wishes, or at least wished at the time of the committee hearings, to make an application to change its name to Avco Security Canada Limited. Adanac General Insurance Company, which we are told by Mr. Alexandor conducts a very limited operation, will be wound up in a short time.

Then, Mr. Alexandor goes on to indicate further involvement of the other companies. He says:

> Four out of the last five companies named which were Consolidated Finance Western Limited, Empire Acceptance Corporation Limited, General Finance Company Limited and Lorne-Bruce Motors Limited are non-operating and it is intended to wind most of them up in the near future pending, for example, the distribution of a designated surplus, the maturing of debentures and the transferring of any old business still remaining. One or two of these companies are just corporate shells. Therefore, in effect, there are ten companies in this group which are operating at this time. All of these ten operating companies bear the name "Avco" in their corporate name except for Adanac General Insurance Company of Canada and London and Midland General Insurance Company.

I would like to point out that prior to the change of name of Delta Acceptance Corporation Limited to Avco Delta Corporation Canada Limited that Company became an almost wholly owned subsidiary of Avco Delta Corporation which is a Delaware company. This occurred in 1964. In turn, Avco Delta Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of Avco Corporation of New York. There is one other Canadian company using the name "Avco" which is not a subsidiary of what we call the parent company,—

Then, Mr. Alexandor goes into more detail. From that recitation of the company's corporate involvement we see very clearly that the purpose of changing the name of the company from London and Midland General Insurance Company is to tie the company more closely in a psychological way to the massive Avco Delta finance structure. In other words, the present name of the company is detrimental to Avco Delta, which seeks not only the continuation of the subsidiary position of what was at one time a Canadian company, but in addition to that to give the company the stamp of Avco's own corporate international or multi-national structure.

• (4:10 p.m.)

This brings us to the question of government policy as it relates to foreign ownership in the field of finance, in the field of insurance and to Canadian economic activity in general. London and Midland General Insurance Company is simply one facet of it. There has been ample dialogue in the country, ample discourse of ideas and ample expression by many people in Canada, about the necessity of taking some steps to halt and eventually reverse the trend toward a greater and greater domination of our Canadian economy by foreign interests. We all know that while foreign ownership presumably carries with it certain benefits, mainly the benefit of investment money in the nation, it also carries with it a far greater number of detrimental effects.

One of these is the siphoning out of the country by way of dividends part of our national wealth expressed in terms of dollars. Another awkward feature is the tendency of these multi-national foreign companies resident in another nation to concentrate a great part of their research activities and the like in the structure of the company in the foreign country. In other words, they disregard the Canadian section of their activities in so far as research, engineering and other matters are concerned. This is detrimental to us.

There is a tendency to do a certain amount of the total administrative research and engineering work in the parent company. There is also a tendency to offer an inducement to Canadians to leave Canada and work in the head office of the parent company in the United States. This trend is also detrimental to Canada.

There is a tendency for the parent company, and this has happened on a number of occasions, to make decisions about what it will do economically based on the political and economic considerations in the foreign country rather than on the necessities that may exist in Canada. In other words, as has been shown in a number of instances, not in the finance field but in the manufacturing field, the decisions of the United States Congress, the laws of which are applicable to resident companies within the United States, have extra territorial effect and are detrimental to Canadian interests.

The more we sell out our economic interests to foreign capital, the more we sell out the possibility that we ourselves can use our national resources and our own wealth for the greatest possible advantage of Canada. There has been ample public conversation and discussion about this. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), apropos of what he said this afternoon, does not really need any great period of time for an interchange of ideas in the cabinet. He does not need a lot of cabinet committees to understand and appreciate the difficulties attendant upon Canada in so far as foregoing ownership in concerned.

We had a very extensive royal commission to examine all these prospects, the report of which was made and subsequently hidden in some recesses of a government office. The government has had an opportunity to do something about this. In so far as the insurance industry is concerned, representatives of the Canadian government told the insurance industry in a private way, not in public conversation, not to worry about the objections being raised in Canada about the incorporation of foreign insurance companies. The government would take steps to protect the interests of foreign investors in Canada.

Representatives of the insurance companies went home contented and happy, knowing they were going to receive that protection. They knew they would no longer have to explain their activities by way of the private bill process in parliament. They knew they would no longer have to come before a public body, such as the standing committee, to ex-

plain what they wanted to do. The Canadian government told the insurance and finance industries in the United States, because that is where most of the owners are, not to worry and fret because their interests would be protected.

The government lived up to its word. It sold out Canadian interests and introduced bills in order to carry out that commitment. There are a number of pieces of legislation on the order paper designed to amend the Canada Corporations Act, The Foreign Insurance Companies Act, the Loan Companies Act, the Trust Companies Act and the Canadian British Insurance Companies Act. A reading of those companion pieces of legislation shows that the government has not considered the views of Canadians about foreign ownership and the detrimental effects of it. It has considered the vested interests of the foreign corporations and has come down four-square on the side of foreign domination of our industry.

These bills are certainly not having any trouble in the other place, with all the boards of directors endorsing everything that is protective of foreign investment. If those bills subsequently become law, it will mean companies like the Avco Delta Corporation, Seaboard Finance—which has appeared before parliament and has not a very good relationship with its borrowers—and other similar companies who have a large chunk of the Canadian economy in their grasp will be able to walk into the office of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) and offer him whatever is necessary to obtain a charter. They may get a change of name, an alteration in their capital structure or a stock-spilling arrangement. Such companies will be able to obtain whatever alteration they need with the complete sanctions and blessing of the Canadian government. All this will be done in the close confines of the minister's office.

These companies will no longer have to come before the Canadian public, the standing committees of the House of Commons, to explain why they want the particular changes, why they want to split their stock. They will be able to engage in all sorts of relatively underhanded corporate activities to preserve their own position and increase the ownership they have of the Canadian economy. The government studied the matter carefully, weighed the interests of the foreign owners of the United States corporate entity against the interests of Canadians, opted for the foreign owners in the United States and disregarded the interests of the Canadian public. This is a preposterous insult emanating from the government of Canada. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs have talked publicly about the value of Canadian companies. They talk publicly about the necessity to protect our whole national economy and the various interests of Canadians, but privately, quietly and secretly they act in the opposite way. This, of course, is typical not only of this government but of previous governments which have been stamped with the same label, namely that of being two-faced about most matters; they say one thing and do another.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, it had occurred to me that members of the house at this hour on Friday afternoon, rather than listen to me talk, might prefer to observe a period of 20 minutes' silence to reflect upon the body blow that was delivered in this house to the freedom and rights of members of this parliament. But, on reflection I was afraid the Chair might say such a silence would not be relevant to the subject matter of the bill which is now before us. I did think of another alternative. I thought that perhaps the 20 minutes' silence might be used to observe the symbolic death of what I understand was once a genuine Canadian company and which, according to the sponsor of the bill, enjoyed the respect and confidence of the community in which it originated. I am not sure whether the hon. member sponsoring the bill would be prepared to agree that that is the kind of observance he would want, inasmuch as he is prepared to sponsor a bill of this nature in this house.

This is the first time I have spoken on the subject matter of Bill C-101. When I read through its provisions, it seemed to me I was meeting once again an old friend or old enemy whichever way one might prefer to describe it, because there was a similarity to certain other bills which were before us in previous parliaments. The explanatory note is very similar. It states that the sole purpose of the bill is to change the name of the company to Avco Insurance Company from London and Midland General Insurance Company. This may seem to be a very simple and

innocuous proposal to which there should be little dissent. However, I believe it is necessary that we give some detailed attention to what is being asked by the bill. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) gave us some of the details in respect of the proposed new Avco Insurance Company. Under its present name this company is involved in what is known as the Avco group.

When this matter was before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) asked the obvious question. He asked what does Avco stand for. The witness before the committee replied that it is an abbreviation of the names of aviation companies, and through the years has dwindled down to Avco. I suggest that while the name may have dwindled down, the activities of the corporation have not dwindled down. Indeed, the company would appear to have enlarged to the proportion of a giant octopus. The president of the London and Midland General Insurance Company said that the parent company in New York has become something along the lines of what might be called a conglomerate, involved in such things as aeroplane parts and extensive research and development, including the mechanical heart.

One can see, Mr. Chairman, that what is now the London and Midland General Insurance Company is something which is quite large indeed, and that the funds gathered through the corporate side may be directed into a great many different fields including indeed, if I may say so, what is sometimes referred to as the military industrial complex in the United States of America. I suppose one might develop a line of reasoning which would indicate that through this kind of mechanism the people who buy insurance through this company are directly or indirectly assisting in the financing of the United States war effort in Viet Nam. So, Mr. Chairman, it is not very difficult to indicate to the house that when the explanatory note says the sole purpose of this bill is to change the name, it is not as simple as that.

It may be true that the passage of this particular bill will not greatly affect the corporate structure of the company, but I submit that members of the house must give consideration to the fact that if they lend their assent to this proposal they are in effect putting their stamp of approval on something which I suppose, for practical purposes, has already taken place, namely the drawing into the United States conglomerate of some of the financial institutions of Canada.

[Mr. Barnett.]

This bill was under consideration by the committee of the whole on March 13 last. Not having participated in the debate on that occasion, I have looked at some of the remarks which were made during that particular part of the consideration of the bill. I notice that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) saw fit to intervene in the debate. I shall read, in part at least, the remarks he made. On examination of those remarks, I have concluded that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is almost as adept at turning the truth upside down as the Prime Minister, who demonstrated his capabilities during the discussions that have taken place in this house in the last couple of days.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I thought I might make one or two comments about the arguments presented on that occasion by that hon. member. He said:

> No one can argue this case better than do the hon. members who, throughout their history in the House of Commons, have been confined to the far left hand corner of the house—

I should like to correct the hon. member's statement. There was an occasion when we sat in the far right hand corner of the house and he and his colleagues were sitting on this side of the chamber. I realize that may not be significant or relevant to the argument the hon. member has advanced, but I am sure he would not want that inaccuracy to remain unnoted.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was talking about Canadian companies. In reference to our theories about the desirability of having foreign ownership and investment in Canada, he said, as reported at page 6589 of *Hansard* for March 13:

> —hon. gentlemen opposite, who have held up these bills, have constantly argued that foreign capital militates against the progress of the Canadian economy and industry. We do not believe that on this side of the house.

The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) is recorded as having said at that point:

> That is not true.

The manner in which the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was presenting the argument indicates that the hon. member for Timiskaming was quite correct on that occasion. The argument presented by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra obviously had nothing to do with the subject matter of this

bill, because the nature of his remarks indicate that he was talking about the kind of company which puts investment into natural resources in Canada and brings about industrial development.

This is a subject matter on which various people in Canada have differing views at this time. I agree that the hon. member was correct in that regard. This is an important question, but it is not the question which was being discussed in relation to this bill. It is quite apparent that this bill has to do with a financial institution, the function of which is to gather the funds of the Canadian people into a pool. Our submission is that this is an area of debate very different from that being pursued by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. The argument which applied in one connection did not necessarily apply to the other.

I am one who believes we have been very foolish in the manner in which we have allowed industrial development and exploitation of natural resources to take place in this country. We have allowed foreign companies to gain control through the investment of a very small amount of equity capital and, in many cases, allowed that control when the actual capital investment has been raised from Canadian sources in non-equity form. This process should be reversed. As I have sometimes said, if we had taken a leaf from the book of the United States in the way it has drawn foreign capital, we would be in a much more sound position than we are today. Unless I am very much misinformed, the United States drew in large blocs of investment capital from abroad—in a large part from the United Kingdom—and most of that capital inflow was in the form of borrowed funds which the United States paid back with interest.

What we have in this bill is something completely different. In fact, what we are acquiescing to is the idea of a United States company being able to gain control of a Canadian financial institution and, through that mechanism, invest Canadian funds wherever it sees fit. I submit this makes the argument advanced on March 13 by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra completely irrelevant to the subject matter of the bill. I say that while emphasizing again that his remarks on that occasion were completely inaccurate in portraying the position he alleges we in this party have taken.

The whole question involved in some of the debates that have taken place during this particular procedure has a significance which is much greater than the subject matter of the particular bill we are discussing today, or the subject matter of some of the similar bills we have had under discussion in this and preceding parliaments. I think it has been made clear time and time again by some of us who have spoken—some might say at length and some would say at great and undue length—that the bill represents an opportunity to attempt to draw the attention of the government to what we consider to be a very serious trend in our society. This trend is going to militate seriously against the future economic viability of the Canadian economy.

We have been adopting this course not because we have any particular vendetta against this particular company, or against its United States parent corporation, but rather because we feel we should draw the situation to the attention of that country. We feel that we should control our own economic and political destiny. It is for that reason I do not want to see this bill passed. I feel that somewhere along the line some Canadians ought to take a stand to reverse this trend which has been so apparent in recent years in Canada, and one which has been accelerating more and more. This trend is not new.

I believe I am right when I recall that the first essay I wrote as a first year university student was entitled "The Americanization of Canadian Life". I do not mind admitting to hon. members that I was a member of the arts class of 1931 at the University of British Columbia. As a young university student, I had some concern about what was happening in Canadian life and to the Canadian economy. That concern is something which has been with me through all the years since then, a concern about which I have become increasingly aware during the time I have been a member of the Canadian House of Commons.

I must say that most of the arguments which have been advanced by those of us who have spoken during these debates on this bill, and others like it, appear to have been falling on deaf ears in this house. There certainly does not appear to be recognition by the Canadian government of the fact that steps should be taken to prevent us from having to deal with situations such as the one alluded to in this particular bill.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Adjournment of the House

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the committee would be agreeable to rising and reporting progress. I think there might be a possibility of disposing of the business that was before the house earlier today.

The Chairman: Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) moves that I rise and report progress.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, the President of the Privy Council can move that motion if he wishes. There would not be unanimous agreement otherwise.

The Chairman: Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) moves that I rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ADJOURNMENT TO OCTOBER 22, 1969

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, could we have the consent of the house to revert to motions for the purpose of calling the amendment and also my motion, which were under consideration earlier today? I think there might be disposition to dispose of them at this time.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable to that being done. I shall say nothing more than that having made the case which we set out to make, we are prepared to let the house come to a decision on the issue at this time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is substantially our position, Mr. Speaker. I think I can speak for all of us when I say that one of the reasons for the kind of agreement that we have reached is our concern for the staff.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, as the official opposition and the New Democratic party have done, we agree to the proposal of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald).

[The Chairman.]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The house having reverted to motions:

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield.

That when the house adjourns for its summer recess it shall stand adjourned until October 22, 1969, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's government, that the public interest requires that the house should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the house shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the house.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the amendment to the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: Is the amendment carried?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment to the main motion is negatived, on division.

Amendment (Mr. Stanfield) negatived on division.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house wish the Chair to put the main motion at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: Carried, on division.

Motion agreed to on division.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. McIlraith:

That this house do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Order, please. Before adjourning the house I should like to take one moment to thank hon. members for the excellent and heart-warming co-operation which they have extended to the Chair during this long session. The last two or three weeks have been trying for hon. members and perhaps for the Chair also.

I hope hon. members will, in a gesture of good will, join the Speaker; there will be the usual friendly meeting for a few moments in a room which is not room 75 but is still room 16.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 4.48 p.m. until Wednesday, October 22, at two o'clock p.m. pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 22, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

[*Translation*]

Twenty-sixth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau).

[*English*]

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs—Mr. Francis.

[*Translation*]

Thirteenth and fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in French and English—Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle).

[*English*]

Third report of Special Committee on Statutory Instruments—Mr. MacGuigan.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*Translation*]

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

STATEMENT ON ACTIVITIES

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, during the past two weeks there have been numerous allegations concerning some persons associated with the Company of Young Canadians.

According to the act adopted by parliament in 1966, the basic objective of the Company of Young Canadians is to support, encourage and organize programs for social and economic community development in Canada through voluntary service. The Company may engage in community development work, in urban and rural areas in Canada, and it may organize programs designed primarily to widen the social and economic opportunities of Canadians. The result is that inevitably the Company of Young Canadians works with urban renewal, rural poverty, and other less privileged groups of society.

Because of the nature of these activities, the government must expect to receive from time to time requests for investigation of alleged indiscretions committed by volunteer members of the Company of Young Canadians.

The most recent requests have been disturbing. Allegations of criminal activities which are substantiated should be dealt with before the courts in the normal manner.

However, usually responsible sources, without producing evidence, have alleged the utilization of the Company of Young Canadians to cover the furtherance of subversive activities. If these allegations are accurate, the Government stands ready to recommend to parliament necessary action, either by way of amendment to the act or establishment of a trusteeship to oversee the activities of the Company. If, on the other hand, these allegations are not substantiated, it will be necessary to reaffirm the good name of the Company of Young Canadians.

This house unanimously established the Company of Young Canadians as an organization which is uniquely independent. Ten of the fifteen members of its governing council are elected by the volunteers. The Company is not an agency of the Crown or in any way subject to direction by the government or any minister.

Parliament insisted upon this degree of independence. Therefore it would appear appropriate that any fundamental review of the Company's activities be undertaken by this house.

[*English*]

For the aforesaid reasons, Mr. Speaker, the government proposes that this whole matter be examined by a committee of the House.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since I have suggested that at least a committee of the house should be established in order to inquire into the charges made, I must welcome the change

in the government's attitude as expressed by the minister this afternoon.

Serious charges have been made. The original attitude of the minister seemed to be that a police inquiry and a government inquiry would be adequate. This seemed to me to be a most inadequate and unfortunate response to the serious charges made by persons in very responsible positions at the federal and other levels of government.

I want to make it clear that I certainly support the original aims and purposes of the Company of Young Canadians. It is important that parliament and the public receive answers in respect of some of the charges, and the only satisfactory method under the circumstances appears to be a public inquiry. I trust that the terms of reference of the committee will be broad enough to permit a full review of the Company's activities, thus ensuring that the house will be fully informed as to whether or not the Company and its members are conforming to the purpose for which it was established or whether, on the other hand, they are departing from these purposes.

It is natural, and I understand this, that a company established for the purpose of assisting the underprivileged is bound to create a certain amount of controversy. However if members of the Company have gone so far as to engage in activities designed to undermine municipal governments, as has been alleged, then of course that is a very different story.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do welcome the change in the minister's attitude and I support the establishment of this committee.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the minister has intimated to the House that it is the government's intention to ask that a committee of this House investigate the Company of Young Canadians. If the purpose of appointing such a committee is to examine and evaluate the program which the Company of Young Canadians is endeavouring to implement then, of course, we would welcome this statement.

However, if one reads the minister's statement carefully, one cannot but gather the impression that the purpose of appointing the committee is to look into the fact that, and I quote the minister's own statement:

> —usually responsible sources without producing evidence, have alleged the utilization of the Company of Young Canadians to cover the furtherance of subversive activities.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

I suggest that if that is the purpose of appointing a committee, then we are setting a very dangerous precedent and embarking upon a path that could do irreparable damage. This parliament is not a court of law. This parliament ought not to be used for witch hunting. If there are individuals who have conducted themselves in a manner that is unbecoming to the role of the Company of Young Canadians, then they should be dealt with by turning over specific complaints about the individuals concerned to the executive director. If the executive director does not take disciplinary action then the director, who is appointed by order in council, can be dismissed by the government.

If there are members of the Company of Young Canadians who have been guilty of illegal acts, then of course it is in the courts of the country that they should be tried. But if a committee of this House is to be asked to investigate alleged utilization of the Company of Young Canadians in the furtherance of subversive activities, which the minister himself says have not been corroborated by any evidence, then I submit it is only a matter of time until other public agencies will be subjected to this kind of sweeping indictment. I submit that to indict an agency is a dangerous procedure. If there are specific complaints, the persons responsible should be named and disciplinary action should be taken. I hope this House is surely not prepared to emulate the sinister witch hunts which were set in motion in the United States by the late and unlamented Senator McCarthy.

All of us have had some concern about the effectiveness of the program of the Company of Young Canadians. Some of the projects that have been undertaken have been excellent; some have not been successful. Part of the responsibility for this lies with the government. This organization was set up as part of the window dressing for the war against poverty. The role of the Company of Young Canadians has never been clearly defined. It has never had either the personnel or adequate resources to do the job allocated to it. The permanent council was set up only at the beginning of this month. All this time the Company has been operating with a provisional council.

Certainly, an examination of whether or not this organization is fulfilling any useful function is important. I submit that if we are going to investigate unsubstantiated charges that the organization is a front for subversive activities, there is a proper place for that to be done and it is not in parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, following the remarks made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) about the Company of Young Canadians, I must say that the conclusion he has arrived at is somewhat disappointing to us on this side of the house, because it does not follow the recommendations and wishes of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal, who is an important figure, and who has made some very serious charges. Mr. Saulnier has asked the federal government to set up a royal commission of inquiry to clarify the whole matter, but the minister concerned has not seen fit to follow up this request made by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal where the trouble occurred a few weeks ago, creating a very dramatic and serious situation.

Considering the circumstances, a committee of the house would, to my mind, be a tool in the hands of the federal government, a tool that it would use to minimize the importance of an investigation in such a serious and important matter.

For instance, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal states that the Company of Young Canadians has become the tool of revolution, that it promotes revolution, disorder, dictatorship, resistance to the police and criminal activities such as the use of firearms or potassium cyanide.

Mr. Speaker, considering the circumstances, and since very serious charges have been made, parliament would be well advised to establish a royal commission, free from all control by the house, to investigate thoroughly the activities of the Company, and its finances in particular, in order to prove definitely that the charges are unfounded or to find the guilty parties.

• (2:20 p.m.)

As, for instance, we presently know of some newspapers which are encouraged by the Company of Young Canadians, it would be important to know where the money to finance such newspapers comes from, since they spread the idea of revolution and advocate subversion.

In view of the accusations made by the chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal, we think it would be preferable that a royal commission be established to inquire into every aspect of the matter, because a committee of the house might not have the powers needed to scrutinize the accounts of the Company of Young Canadians and determine what funds were spent each year—in the range of about $2 million—to support this Company.

There are good elements within this Company, and we should not only strive at uncovering the guilty ones, but rather at straightening up an attitude, a way of thinking and the procedures that have been used. I have here the August 1969 issue of *Pouvoir Ouvrier*, the workmen's newspaper in St. Jerome, in which the Company of Young Canadians published the following advertisement on page 2, and I quote:

Visit:

Livres et Périodiques Progressistes Ltée.

Marxist-Leninist and anti-imperialist literature, as well as revolutionary papers from around the world. "People, and people alone, are the generating power, the makers of history".

Mao Tse Tung

Such literature is spread around and we would set up a parliamentary committee, with extremely limited means, to change the policy the Company of Young Canadians has been following for some time.

No other solution was found except to refer the problem to a committee of the house. The committee would not have enough powers and would be too directly dependent on parliament. It would then be difficult to find those who are really responsible. The public wants explanations and a serious inquiry into this matter, because after all it has been financing the Company of Young Canadians until now.

It is our duty to ask for a judicial inquiry into this matter in order to meet the demands of the taxpayers and to punish the agitators. We must do justice to the good elements in the Company who have been affected by the bad publicity their association has received these last few weeks.

[*English*]

CANADIAN COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

TABLING OF REPORT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections.

Questions

PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the annual report of Panarctic Oils Limited for 1968.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AUTHORITY FOR POWER TO ADOPT REGULATIONS

Question No. 1,080—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. At the present time, under what authority is power to adopt regulations granted to (a) the Cabinet or the Governor in Council (b) Ministers (c) any other body, individual or government agency?

2. Over the past five years, what federal regulations have been rescinded, in whole or in part by a jurisdictional body, with reference in each case?

3. Before a regulation is adopted, what steps are taken to ensure that it does not go beyond the delegated authority limits agreed to by Parliament?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. and 3. The answers to this question have been furnished in general terms in the government's response to questions posed by the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments. As to the actual regulatory powers they are set out in the Statutes which are public documents.

2. There has been no comprehensive record kept of the instances where a regulation has been nullified.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION—APPLICATION OF STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER

Question No. 1,546—**Mr. Matte:**

Is it the government's intention to avail itself of the provisions of the Statute of Westminster-1931 in order to resolve problems now being faced in constitutional matters?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The government, in its constitutional discussions with the provinces, pays heed to all statutes of a special constitutional nature in force in Canada.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

MINIMUM LIVING STANDARD—STUDY OF ESSENTIAL FACTORS

Question No. 1,655—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the government undertaken or will it undertake a study in order to define the essential factors of a satisfactory minimum living standard and, if so, when will the report be available?

2. Who are the members of the Task Force working on such study?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretay to Prime Minister): 1 and 2. At the present time there is no study underway at the federal level to define and identify minimum standards for satisfactory living. However, a proposal for such a study has been made and consideration is being given to this matter.

REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING THE LABRADOR QUESTION PRIOR TO 1964

Question No. 1,658—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. With regard to the answer to Question No. 979, concerning Labrador, what correspondence, briefs or other documents did the government receive relating to this matter, prior to 1964?

2. What was the substance of these documents, and with whom did they originate?

3. Will these documents be made public, and if not, for what reason?

4. Has the government studied, or will it study, the Labrador question?

[*Translation*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 1 and 2. In 1907 the Governments of Canada and the Colony of Newfoundland agreed to submit the question of the Labrador boundary between Canada and Newfoundland to the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Department of Justice records on this subject consist of sixteen volumes and numerous large storage pockets, containing correspondence and memoranda with reference to the conduct and preparation of the case, exchanged between the Department of Justice and various other government departments and the governments of Newfoundland and Quebec, all of which are privileged documents. The latter part of the file consists of correspondence from interested parties and libraries requesting copies of "The Labrador Boundary Case", a small number of which were available for free distribution. The case consisted of twelve volumes. Sets were distributed to libraries throughout Canada, the United States and Europe.

3. The documents have been made public in the form of "The Labrador Boundary

Case", as mentioned above. A set of the volumes was supplied to the Parliamentary library.

4. Newfoundland became a Province of Canada pursuant to negotiated Terms of Union that defined the boundaries of the new province in terms of the Judicial Committee's report of March 1st, 1927 in relation to the coast of Labrador. The Terms of Union were given the force of law by the British North America Act, 1949. In the circumstances the Government is not aware of any current question in this connection that requires study.

[*English*]

EXPO CANAL BOATS

Question No. 1,792—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Were the eight canal boats built for and used at Expo (which were used last summer to ferry passengers across the Detroit River to Peche Island by the Sirrah Company), put on the open market for sale by the department responsible for Expo?

2. What was the original cost of the boats?

3. What was their selling price to the Sirrah Company?

4. Was the selling price published in any newspaper or other periodical in the Windsor area?

5. What percentage did the federal government pay towards the construction of the four ferries?

6. Does the Sirrah Company receive a federal ferry subsidy and is it a condition of this subsidy that these ferries shall operate on regular half-hour schedules notwithstanding weather conditions and, if there was such a subsidy, in what amount?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Transport as follows:

1, 2, 3 and 4. The canal boats referred to in Part 1 were not owned by the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. There was no subsidy paid for the construction on these canal boats by either the above corporation or the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

The purchase and sale of these boats and the arrangements related thereto, were between private interests. No knowledge is available on the original cost, selling price or the terms.

5. The Sirrah Company did construct four ferries in 1968 which were eligible for subsidies by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Total costs for these ferries amounted to $441,000 for which a subsidy was paid amounting to $110,250.

6. No.

29180—737

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Question No. 1,848—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Does the CNR operate an exclusive communication service and, if not, under what arrangement is this service offered the public in the name of the CNR?

2. Did the CNR's telegraph service operate at a profit in 1968 and, if so, what was the amount of profit to the company?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Pursuant to Section 26 of the Canadian National Railways Act being Chapter 29 of the Statutes of Canada 1955, the CNR is empowered to establish, construct or acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise and to maintain and operate telecommunication facilities systems and services in Canada and elsewhere. In addition, it may carry on a public telecommunications business and may enter into arrangements with other telecommunication companies or Her Majesty for the exchange and transmission of messages or for the maintenance or working, in whole or in part, of the telecommunication systems of the respective companies or Her Majesty. However, it does not possess an exclusive franchise anywhere in Canada for the provision or operation of such services. Certain telecommunications properties or works in the Yukon Territory, in parts of Northern British Columbia and in Newfoundland which are vested in or owned, controlled or occupied by Her Majesty, pursuant to various Orders in Council have been entrusted to the Railway for management and operation. In addition, Canadian National provides the only public telecommunication services in parts of the Northwest Territories.

2. In addition to a telegraph message service provided to the public the Company engages in a diversity of telecommunications activities including the operation of local and long distance commercial telephone services, the provision of private wire circuits, a Telex Network, and facilities for radio and TV network transmissions. The telegram constitutes less than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the commercial communications business handled by the Company and is not compensatory. However, as shown on Page 37 of the Company's Annual Report for the year 1968 which was tabled in the House of Commons on April 24, 1969, the net income realized from the overall operations of the Telecommunications Department during the year 1968 was $8,654,140.

Questions

INVESTIGATION OF REGIONAL MONETARY POLICY

Question No. 1,917—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or the Department of Finance or the Bank of Canada investigating the question of regional monetary policy in Canada and, if not, for what reason?

2. If so, what specific research projects have been undertaken and when are they expected to be completed?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. The Bank of Canada has investigated the question of regional monetary policy in Canada over a lengthy period commencing with its establishment in 1935 and its conclusion on this question has been indicated on a number of occasions over the years, in particular in the Bank's annual reports, in evidence to the Royal Commission on Banking and Finance and to the House Committee on Trade, Finance and Economic Affairs and in speeches by the Governor. The Bank's conclusion, and that of the Royal Commission on Banking and Finance, has been that it is not possible to have a different monetary policy in different parts of an area which has a common currency, a unified banking system and a unified capital market. Problems of different rates of economic activity in different regions were considered to be dealt with more appropriately by specific measures.

In the study "Economic Development and the Atlantic Provinces" sponsored by the Atlantic Provinces Research Board, Professor A. K. Cairncross concluded that:

"if monetary measures are to be used in future to regulate activity throughout Canada, it will be desirable to supplement these measures by more selective instruments of control designed to procure a more even pressure of demand in the various parts of the country;

These instruments of control might include: (a) pressure on the commercial banks to exempt selected areas from the full force of credit rationing; (b) the freer provision of mortgage funds through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or in other ways, in under-employed areas where there is an unsatisfied demand for new houses; (c) increased disbursement by the federal government either in public works or through higher grants-in-aid;

Monetary policy is not an appropriate means of dealing with the long-term problems involved in differential rates of growth in different parts of Canada."

[Mr. Jamieson.]

A variety of fiscal and other economic measures, including those referred to by the Cairncross Study, have been instituted to deal on a selective basis with regional economic disparities.

2. Answered by 1.

INDUSTRY MODERNIZATION LOANS TO COMPANY

Question No. 1,919—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What is the name of the company referred to in the Auditor-General's report that received $457,000 in federal industry modernization loans?

2. During which fiscal years, what were the respective amounts which the above company received in loans from the government?

3. When was the Crown-owned foundry at Haley Station near Renfrew sold to the company for $165,000?

4. Was this foundry sold under competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

5. If so, what were the names of the other companies bidding and their respective amounts?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Supply and Services as follows:

1. The name of the company referred to in the Auditor General's report is Haley Industries Limited, Haley, Ontario.

2. In 1969 Haley Industries Limited was awarded a contract for capital assistance support for production equipment under the Industry Modernization for Defence Exports Program valued at $457,000. Under this program 50 per cent of the acquisition cost of the equipment is provided in the form of a grant and the remainder in the form of an advance repayable over a five year period. Total payments to date are as follows: FY 1968/69, $252,243.32; FY 1969/70, $127,865.73.

3. The Crown-owned foundry at Haley Station near Renfrew was sold to Bartaco Industries Limited of Orillia, Ontario, in December 1967.

4. The Foundry was not sold under competitive tender. As explained by the Minister of Industry on March 19, 1968, at page 7819 of *Hansard*, the Department of Defence Production solicited 28 companies in both Canada and the United States with the result that only one firm showed sufficient interest to make a definitive offer. To achieve its objective of finding a buyer who would continue the Foundry operation, the Department's inquiries to the prospective buyers were kept on a confidential basis to minimize the possibility

of key customers losing confidence in the Foundry as a reliable supplier.

5. See answer to Part 4.

5. See answer to part 4.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN CHARTERED BANKS

Question No. 1,936—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Does the Government of Canada leave large sums on deposit with the chartered banks in non-interest bearing accounts and, if so, under what authority or statute?

2. If so, why did the Government of Canada receive no interest on government deposits totalling $100 million in the chartered banks as reported by the Auditor-General in his annual report?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Section 16(2) of the Financial Administration Act as amended provides that the Receiver General shall establish, in the name of the Receiver General, accounts for the deposit of public moneys with such banks and fiscal agents as are designated by the Minister of Finance. Section 93(3) of the Bank Act provides that nothing in subsection (2) of the same section (which prohibits the banks from making specific charges for cashing cheques drawn on the Receiver General) shall be construed to prohibit any arrangement between the government of Canada and the banks concerning interest to be paid on any or all deposits of the government of Canada with the banks.

Under the authority of these statutes, balances are held in accounts with the chartered banks as well as in accounts with the Bank of Canada.

These balances vary considerably over time depending on daily revenue and expenditure patterns and on debt and cash management operations. In line with normal business practice, the government maintains on deposit with the chartered banks non-interest bearing current balances to meet daily cheque encashments. There are no undertakings to leave specified amounts on deposit. On the other hand, chartered banks have agreed that they should pay interest on an agreed basis on any amounts in excess of $100 millions held in these accounts. This arrangement permits the government to earn interest on investible funds without having to withdraw balances from the banks in order to buy treasury bills or other government of Canada securities or to sell such securities in order to replenish its bank balances. The movement of funds by the Government in such a way could have a disturbing influence on the money market and should be avoided.

29180—737½

RCMP—ROLE IN MARCH ON MCGILL

Question No. 2,070—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many RCMP were involved in police work during the recent march on McGill University?

2. What was the cost to the federal government of the police service provided?

3. Was any other service provided, apart from police services and, if so, what service and what was the cost to the federal government?

4. Will the Government of Quebec make any financial contribution toward the cost of the RCMP services provided and relevant to the recent march on McGill University?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1 to 4. It is not in the public interest to disclose this information.

*NATIONAL MUSEUM—PROVISION OF NEW BUILDING

Question No. 2,108—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has Dr. A. W. F. Banfield resigned as Director of the National Museum of Natural Sciences and, if so, what is the reason for his resignation?

2. Has there been an increase in the budget of the National Museums for the fiscal year 1969-70 and, if so, what is the amount of the increase?

3. When will the new Museum building announced by Prime Minister Diefenbaker in 1961, deferred by Prime Minister Pearson in 1965 in favour of the National Centre for the Performing Arts, be proceeded with?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows: 1. Yes. Dr. A. W. F. Banfield resigned as Director of the National Museum of Natural Sciences, and stated in his letter of resignation, submitted to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees that his decision to resign was "purely personal and related to achievement of career goals".

2. I am informed by the National Museums of Canada that the National Museums' budget was increased by $1,500 for the fiscal year 1969-70 over the preceding fiscal year 1968-69.

3. No decision has been reached with respect to a new Museum building.

[*English*]

RCMP—EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Question No. 2,111—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What is the minimum educational requirement to join the RCMP in Ontario and when was this standard last changed?

Questions

2. What is the minimum educational standard recommended by the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs?

3. Is the Canadian Government considering the raising of the minimum standard of education for RCMP and to what level?

4. How many members of the RCMP have, at the present time, the following education according to Ontario standards (a) grade 8 (b) grade 9 (c) grade 10 (d) grade 11 (e) grade 12 (f) grade 13 (g) Bachelor of Arts or equivalent degree (h) Post-Graduate Degrees (i) Post-Graduate training (j) other qualifications such as Ontario Police College, FBI courses and other?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. An applicant is required to produce proof of having satisfactorily completed Grade XI in the province in which he completed his education. The Grade XI requirement has been in effect since August 17, 1963.

2. This question should be directed to the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police.

3. The minimum standard of education and other basic qualifications are constantly under review by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and studied in conjunction with manpower requirements. At present the most acceptable minimum standard of education to ensure that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is kept up to strength is Grade XI although 50 percent of those now engaging have in excess of this standard.

4. Records maintained by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police do not equate educational qualifications according to Ontario standards. (Refer to Answer 1 above).

PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS BOARD—CHAIRMAN'S NAME AND SALARY

Question No. 2,153—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the name and salary of the Chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as the Public Service Staff Relations Board is concerned: J. Finkelman—$28,750 per annum.

[Mr. Robinson.]

LAND SETTLEMENT—OVERCOMING OF PROBLEMS

Question No. 2,143—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. What government departments are involved in overcoming problems arising from mistakes in settlement, particularly the settlement of land since proved unfit for arable culture?

2. What legislation and what programs have been initiated to correct this situation and on what date was this legislation initiated and affecting what areas?

3. To what extent are individual provinces participating in these programs?

4. What has been the cost to the federal government to this date for each individual program in each of the three Maritime Provinces (New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia)?

Hon. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

2. Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act (1935), applicable to the three Prairie provinces; Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act (1962) and Agricultural and Rural Development Act (1966), applicable to all provinces. Federal-Provincial Rural Development Agreements (1965-70) made under the ARD Act with all the provinces of Canada; Fund for Rural Economic Development Act (1966), so far applied to certain areas in the provinces of Manitoba, Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

3. The provinces share in the planning of all programs and they share in the costs, to varying extents, of many of them.

4. Cost to the federal government during the period April 1, 1962 to March 31, 1969 was:

	First ARDA Agreement	Second ARDA Agreement	FRED Agreements
Prince Edward Island	$238,168	$ 981,447	Not applicable
Nova Scotia	540,904	4,478,574	Not applicable
New Brunswick	482,303	2,580,083	$422,831

PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 2,216—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Justice have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What is the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned:

1. No.

2. Nil.

PUBLIC RELATIONS—INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 2,268—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What is the total cost of the public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Publicity Branch of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is engaged in developing publicity, industrial promotion, and sales promotion activities around the world as part of the Department's program of industrial and trade development. The Canadian Government Travel Bureau carries out information and publicity services as part of the Departmental activity of travel promotion. Most of the work involved for the Department and the Travel Bureau is not of a character normally associated with the term "public relations". Staff figures of officials classified as Information Service Officers are listed in the reply to written question No. 2,018 made an Order for Return in the House of Commons on July 14, 1969.

2. Expenditures of the Trade Publicity Branch and the Information and Promotion Branch of the two former Departments, as well as for the Canadian Government Travel Bureau, are listed in reply to written question No. 2,291.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—SALE OF SHARES TO PUBLIC

Question No. 2,434—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider selling shares in Crown Corporations to the public?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The Government has no present intention to make available shares in Crown Corporations for purchase by the public.

MONTREAL—PORT ADVISORY BOARD

Question No. 2,451—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the government intend to set up an advisory board for the Port of Montreal?

2. Does the government intend to appoint a representative of the City of Montreal as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Harbours Board?

3. Has the government studied the Merineau Report which calls for the establishment of a harbours board for Canada but giving more independence to local authorities and, if so, at what stage is such study?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Parts (1), (2) and (3) of Question No. 2,451 concern specific aspects of the administration of Canadian ports. The government has currently under review the matter of administrative systems of all harbours and will on completion of this review, consider such changes which are deemed to be desirable.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT COMPANIES OPERATION ACT

Question No. 2,453—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the Government Companies Operation Act presently apply to Polymer Corporation Limited and, if not, for what reason?

2. Does the government intend to adopt the same approach toward (a) Eldorado Nuclear Limited (b) Eldorado Aviation Limited, and (c) Northern Transportation Company Limited?

3. If not, for what reason?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No. Polymer Corporation Limited is in keen competition with publicly owned companies throughout the world and it is essential for its continued success that it be free to act quickly in response to changing business conditions and have the same relative freedom of action as its competitors.

2 and 3. No consideration has been given to adopt the same approach at this time.

TOBACCO ADVERTISING—STUDY BY CRTC

Question No. 2,455—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Has the Canadian Radio-Television Commission studied, is it studying, or will it study the possibility of banning tobacco advertising and, if not, for what reason?

2. Does the government intend to issue directives in that respect?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of National Health and Welfare as follows: 1. The Canadian Radio-Television Commission has studied the matter of tobacco advertising,

since under the Broadcasting Act (Section 16(1)(b)(ii)) the Commission has the power to regulate "respecting the character of advertising and the amount of time that may be devoted to advertising".

In view of the fact that other government agencies are making studies of the effects of tobacco on health, the Commission has reached the conclusion that no action would be taken on this matter at the present time.

2. No.

VANIER INSTITUTE OF THE FAMILY—FEDERAL SUPPORT

Question No. 2,476—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has the Government of Canada withdrawn financial support from the Vanier Institute of the Family?

2. If so, what is the reason for this withdrawal of financial support?

3. What financial contribution has been made each year by the federal government to the Vanier Institute since it was established?

4. What contribution will be made in the fiscal year 1969-70?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Not yet. The Federal Government will continue its financial support in the form of grants to match contributions from other sources received before April 1, 1970 by the Endowment Fund of the Institute. The Institute has been informed, however, that matching grants will not be made in respect of contributions received after March 31, 1970.

2. It is considered that the work of the Vanier Institute of the Family now is sufficiently known and appreciated that Federal Government grants can be terminated at the end of this fiscal year, leaving to other sources any further necessary financial support of the continuing operations of the Institute. The termination of federal contributions to the Endowment Fund under these circumstances is part of the government's general program of restraint in expenditures.

3 and 4.

Fiscal year	Financial contribution ($000)
1965-66	100
1966-67	2,167
1967-68	700
1968-69	425
1969-70	Nil
1970-71	450 (Estimated)

[Mr. Forest.]

"LA CORRESPONDANCE DE POLITIQUE ÉTRANGÈRE"

Question No. 2,483—**Mr. Dumont:**

1. Is the periodical *La Correspondance de Politique étrangère* published by the Press Department of the Foreign Ministry of the German Democratic Republic considered as first, second or third class mail?

2. What is its total number of copies distributed by the Post Office Department in Canada and what amount is paid annually for such delivery?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. The Canadian Post Office Department has no information respecting the publication in question, which is not registered as second class mail in Canada.

2. Not known.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Question No. 2,498—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. How much money has been appropriated for the Prices and Incomes Commission?

2. What is the anticipated size of the staff of the Commission?

3. How many members of the staff have been hired to date?

4. Has there been any difficulty recruiting professional staff?

5. If so, what are the reasons for this difficulty?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have been informed by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as follows: 1. Prior to the establishment of the Commission, the Treasury Board approved an initial allotment of $500,000 for the Prices and Incomes Commission for the fiscal year 1969-70. A more precise determination of the financial requirements of the Prices and Incomes Commission for the fiscal year 1969-70 will be submitted to Parliament at the time of supplementary estimates.

2. The Commission is now engaged in formulating its work program and necessary staff requirements in order to carry out the mandate that has been given to the Commission. It is, therefore, not possible at this time to provide an estimate of the staff requirements of the Commission.

3. At the time that the question was tabled, there were five persons on the staff of the Commission. As of September 24, 1969, the Commission was composed of 25 persons including the four Commissioners.

4 and 5. Yes. There is a severe shortage of highly qualified staff everywhere, and all agencies both public and private have been encountering recruiting problems.

TREASURY BOARD INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,515—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Treasury Board provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. The answer to Part 1 has already been provided by the Treasury Board in reply to Question Number 2,175 (*Hansard,* June 4, 1969, page 9722).

2. (a) Publications: nil; (b) Periodicals: nil; (c) Information Sheets: nil; (d) Press Releases:

Year	Number	Estimated Cost
1960-64	nil	$.....
1965	4	331.00
1966	15	499.00
1967	12	227.00
1968	38	1,567.00

3. The number of copies of each press release averages 850. Distribution is to the Parliamentary Press Gallery (by hand) and to Heads of Agencies and Deputy Ministers and their Directors of Personnel (by mail).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—CUTBACK IN CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 2,518—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has there been any cutback in the planned construction of federal public buildings as originally announced for the 1969-70 fiscal year?

2. If so (a) how many buildings are involved (b) in what cities were they to have been built (c) what is the total sum of money saved by the cutbacks in each province?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,532—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3 How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. 1960-66.

2. The department has no central record of all publications for the period mentioned. An inventory of publications is being prepared but will not be ready for several months.

However, available figures show that the number of publications has increased from 193 in 1966-67 to 235 in 1967-68 to 311 in 1968-69, and 182 publications have been published since the beginning of 1969-70, or by extrapolation, to a total of approximately 412 for the full year. Between 1966-67 and 1969-70, the circulation of all departmental scientific reports and of publications related to industrial development in the North has increased by 500 per cent, National Parks by 200 per cent and all others by 30 per cent.

3. To provide a reply to this question would take several months and as the Department has no central record for the period in question, the accuracy of the reply would be questionable.

As mentioned in the reply to part 2, an inventory is being prepared which will take several months to finalize.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ADVERTISING

Question No. 2,548—**Mr. Harding:**

1. What is the public relations and/or advertising budget for the National Arts Centre for the fiscal year 1969-70?

2. Up to June 10, 1969, what have been the actual public relations expenditures for the National Arts Centre?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Arts Centre as follows: 1. $589,576.

2. The Centre's accounting methods do not permit a reckoning of expenditures to June

Questions

10 but expenditures to June 30 were approximately $406,000.

NATIONAL DEFENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,550—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. See *Hansard* dated July 23, 1969, pages 11518-9.

2. Prior to 1964, the Royal Canadian Navy published The Crowsnest, and the Royal Canadian Air Force, Roundel. All three services issued press releases. Costs prior to 1965-66 were not maintained in a manner which would permit this data to be readily identified. Since 1964, the Canadian Forces information publications consist of The Sentinel, La Sentinelle and, since 1966, the Canadian Forces' Bulletin, as well as press releases. Publication costs:

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
The Sentinel La Sentinelle	$ 35,118.13	$117,867.93	$128,581.44	$125,876.53
Canadian Forces' Bulletin	——	$ 14,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00

Press releases are prepared by the information offices in Ottawa and in the field as a part of their information duties. Records are not kept in a manner which permits the cost of producing press releases to be isolated.

3.

	1965	1966	1967	1968
The Sentinel	96,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
La Sentinelle	14,000	70,000	70,000	70,000

Published ten times a year, these magazines are distributed to the Canadian Forces, on the basis of one for every five persons serving in the Regular Forces, one for every ten in the Reserve Forces, and one for every 20 in the Cadet Services. Copies are also distributed to the military associations and to Canadian news media. In addition, there are over 7,000 paid subscriptions through the Queen's Printer.

Canadian Forces' Bulletin—English	32,500	110,000	316,000
French	7,500	21,300	37,100

Variation in number published is due to the production, from time to time, of special editions which are issued to each member of the Canadian Forces (these editions contain detailed information on major changes in service conditions & terms of service). Normally one copy is distributed to each Commander, and one copy for each five persons serving in the rank of Sergeant and above.

Press Releases	2423	2561	2649	3433

These are distributed nationally, regionally to news media depending on the subject.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—COST OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Question No. 2,555—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Finance have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. The Department of Finance does not have a public relations staff as such. Relations with news media and the public are handled by

the Information Office, and by other departmental officials.

2. The costs attributable solely to public relations cannot be identified, but see the answer to question No. 2,572.

RESEARCH ECONOMISTS, PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Question No. 2,556—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What are the names of the research economists who have accepted positions with the Prices and Incomes Commission and on what dates did they indicate their acceptance?

2. How many economists in academic institutions have been offered positions on the staff of the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have been informed by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as follows: 1. The names of the research economists who have accepted positions with the Prices and Incomes Commission and the dates they indicated their acceptance are as follows:

Mr. D. Brazier, May 23, 1969;
Mr. H. Bubeck, July 30, 1969;

Questions

Mr. J. Cragg, June 15, 1969;
Mr. W. Dymond, July 11, 1969;
Mr. J. Hague, June 25, 1969;
Mr. T. Houston, August 6, 1969;
Mr. L. Reed, June 22, 1969.

2. The Commission does not maintain a record of preliminary approaches to economists in academic institutions.

FOREST FIRES IN CANADA

Question No. 2,562—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many forest fires were reported in Canada in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many acres of forest were destroyed by fire in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. What was the estimated value of the timber lost as a result of forest fires in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

4. What percentage of the forest fires in terms of (a) acreage (b) timber value, were the result of (i) natural causes (ii) careless hunters and fishermen (iii) careless campers and tourists (iv) other?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
1. Number of Fires	8,881	8,655	6,285	7,670	6,944	7,238	7,468	8,650	6,933
2. Acreage burned	1,616,344	9,313,479	863,495	470,001	2,993,290	521,148	1,144,439	2,211,954	(Estimated) 2,052,000 (Estimated)
3. Estimated Value	10,409,625	69,125,608	6,977,748	4,265,926	6,522,947	8,314,546	3,970,283	18,191,893	Not available
4. (*a*) (i) Natural causes		56.5	38.5	51.2	79.7	57.5	56.5	73.5	
(ii) and (iii) Careless hunters, fishermen, campers and tourists (records not kept separately)		10.1	22.9	16.8	6.5	13.0	1.2	4.2	
(iv) Others		33.4	38.6	32.0	13.8	29.5	42.3	22.3	

NOTE: Records for 1960 and 1968 are not available.

(*b*) Data not available in this form.

[Mr. Whelan.]

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—INFORMATION SERVICE

Question No. 2,572—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Finance provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Yes. An information office was established in 1966. Prior to 1966 information duties were performed by officers of the Department as part of their other duties, and the costs attributable solely to information duties before 1966 cannot be identified. The costs since then, including salaries, are: fiscal year 1966-67, $53,714; 1967-68, $96,244; 1968-69, $45,638.

2. Accurate information is not available with respect to fiscal years 1960-61 to 1965-66 inclusive. Numbers and total costs since then are as follows. Costs attributable to individual publication cannot be identified.

	1966-67		1967-68		1968-69	
	No.	Cost	No.	Cost	No.	Cost
Publications and/or Information Sheets	9	$30,930	13	$74,950	8	$23,474
Periodicals		NIL		NIL		NIL
Public (Press) Releases	118	$ 7,538	176	$ 5,001	175	$ 4,800

3. During the period 1966-67 to 1968-69: distribution of information relating to budgets has averaged 2,500 copies per year; distribution of material relating to government guaranteed loans has averaged 335,000 copies per year of brochures, 119,000 copies per year of guidelines, 4,700 copies per year of annual reports and, in 1967-68 only, 6,500 copies of the consolidation of one of the acts; distribution of public (press) releases has ranged from 50 to 3,000 copies depending on the subject matter, with an average distribution of 700 copies.

Information relating to budgets, guaranteed loans administration publications, and public (press) releases are distributed to the news media, to Members of Parliament and Senators, to interested libraries and embassies, and to interested officials and individuals in the fields of government, banking, industry, commerce and educaiton. Copies of brochures, guidelines or acts relating to government guaranteed loans are sent in bulk to those agencies empowered to make loans under the relevant acts and, through those agencies, are distributed to prospective borrowers.

Distribution is mainly by mail but departmental messengers are used in the case of some local recipients.

ROBERTS BANK—PROTECTION OF DELTA RESIDENTS FROM POLLUTION

Question No. 2,574—**Mr. Goode:**

What steps will be taken by the railways, Kaiser Steel Corporation and National Harbours Board to protect the residents of the Municipality of Delta from the following sources of pollution stemming from the development of Roberts Bank Superport (a) railway cars carrying coal at high speeds (b) oil slicks and other hazards from ocean vessels (c) spillage and dust from loading operations?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Minister of Transport is concerned:

The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Regarding pollution arising from railway car operations, no problem of this nature is foreseen at this time due to the speed at which coal trains will operate and the normal load level of cars and location of the loading area.

The National Harbours Board advises as follows: Pollution will be controlled by Section 4 of the Board's By-Law A-1 which states:

"4. (1) No person shall cause or do or omit to do anything which may cause in any manner (a) an encumbrance of the water or shore of the harbour; or (b) an obstruction or danger to navigation in the harbour.

(2) Nothing shall be thrown, drained or discharged in the water, allowed to come in contact with the water, or deposited anywhere within the limits of the harbour, which may in any manner (a) damage vessels or property; or (b) cause any nuisance or endanger life or health; Provided that ballast or rubbish may be placed, left

or disposed of at such places in the harbour as may be assigned by the Board.

(3) Every encumbrance, obstruction, nuisance, or possible cause of danger or damage, in contravention of the provisions of this section, may be removed by the Board at the risk and expense of the person who so contravenes such provisions."

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DIRECT AND GUARANTEED DEBT

Question No. 2,582—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What was the total of the federal government's outstanding direct and guaranteed debt at the end of May 1967, May 1968, and May 1969?

2. What was the cost in each of those years of interest and other public debt charges?

3. If statistics are available indicating the outstanding direct and guaranteed debt of the provinces and the annual cost thereof, what are the totals for the same periods?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. As published in Bank of Canada Statistical Summary:

1967	$21,286 million
1968	21,763 million
1969	23,171 million

2. As determined from the government's regular monthly statement of financial operations:

1967	$ 1,119 million
1968	1,339 million
1969	1,507 million

3. Gross amount of provincial direct and guaranteed bonds outstanding as at December 31 is published in the Supplement of the Bank of Canada statistical summary. These amounts were as follows:

as at December 31, 1966:	$13,410 million
as at December 31, 1967:	$15,484 million
as at December 31, 1968:	not yet available

The corresponding figures for May 1967, 1968 and 1969 are not published. The annual costs of the direct and guaranteed debt of the provinces are not available.

INFORMATION SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Question No. 2,583—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Fisheries provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost of each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Yes. Expenditures are as follows: 1960-61, $188,659; 1961-62, $216,412; 1962-63, $240,703; 1963-64, $222,667; 1964-65, $253,738; 1965-66, $334,029; 1966-67, $421,469; 1967-68, $531,037.

These figures represent total costs for supplies, services and salaries for both headquarters and regional establishments.

2. Title of Publication	Expenditures 1966-67	1967-68
Fisheries of Canada and La Pêche (12 issues)	$12,000	$15,000
Canadian Fish Culturist (2 issues)	6,000	3,500
Canadian Fisheries Reports (2 issues)	8,000	4,500
Annual Report	7,000	5,500
Press Releases	2,000	2,100
Consumer Publications	14,000	17,000
Information Sheets	12,000	18,000

Expenditures for the years 1960-65 are not available.

3. Fisheries of Canada, 6,200 English, 2,300 French copies; Canadian Fish Culturist, 3,500 copies; Canadian Fisheries Reports, 2,000 copies.

Distribution of the above publications is made by mail. They are sent to fisheries research institutions, universities, libraries, officials of fish and game departments, editors and representatives of trade organizations, Canadian embassies and trade commissioners, fishery training institutions, conservation magazines, fishermen, processors, industrial concerns, Members of Parliament and honourable Senators.

Press releases are distributed by hand and by mail to Canadian Press and to all Canadian daily and weekly newspapers, radio and television outlets, fishery magazines, Members of Parliament and other interested parties.

PROVISION OF INCENTIVES TO REHABILITATE PEOPLE ON WELFARE

Question No. 2,584—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of providing incentives to rehabilitate people from the welfare rolls of municipalities?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The federal government does provide financial incentives, by way of cost-sharing, to the provinces for rehabilitation programs, for example, work activity projects under the Canada Assistance Plan. In addition, through the on-going consultative services of the Department of National Health and Welfare and through federal-provincial working groups, increased attention is being given to the rehabilitative aspects of welfare services.

REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING THE RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Question No. 2,585—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. Has the Canadian Government received letters, telegrams or resolutions from Canadians or from Canadian associations objecting to the recognition of Communist China?

2. If so, how many has the Government received?

3. Has the Government received Notes or indications from foreign governments opposing Canada's recognition of Communist China?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes, the Canadian government has received letters and telegrams from Canadian citizens and from Canadian associations objecting to our proposal to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Canadian Government has also received letters from Canadian citizens and associations supporting the proposed recognition of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

2. Since May 29, 1968 when the Prime Minister made his initial statement concerning the intention of the Canadian Government to enter into negotiations toward recognition with the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Office of the Prime Minister and the Department of External Affairs have received 183 letters objecting to this proposal.

3. Yes. Two protest notes have been received from the Embassy of The Republic of China. The U.S. State Department press officer, Robert McCloskey, commenting on the Canadian proposal to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China said on February 11, 1969, "We are very much concerned over the possible implications of such moves for the position of the Government of the Republic of Nationalist China, which is a responsible and co-operative member of the international community and with which the Government of Canada maintains diplomatic relations". A small number of other governments have indicated confidentially that they have certain reservations about the decision of the Canadian Government to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China. Several governments have similarly indicated that they welcome the Canadian initiative.

[*English*]

SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY RIOT

Question No. 2,596—**Mr. Hales:**

1. With regard to the riot at Sir George Williams University, how many people were arrested?

2. What was their Country of origin?

3. How many were in possession of Visas and what status did each one who was from another Country have?

4. What fines were levied?

5. How many were deported as a result of this riot, and to what Countries were they deported?

6. How many of those arrested were receiving student loans, grants, or scholarships from the Canadian Government?

7. Were any of those involved receiving grants from the Canada Council and, if so, how many and what was the total amount of the Canada Council grants?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the departments of Manpower and Immigration and External Affairs and the Canada Council as follows: 1. Ninety-seven.

2. Forty-nine were Canadian citizens. The breakdown by citizenship of the remaining 48 people is as follows: Trinidad, 10; Jamaica, 4; Guyana, 2; Barbados, 2; Bahamas, 1; Dominica, 1; Haiti, 1; Other West Indies, 10; Belgium, 1; Algeria, 1; Israel, 1; New Zealand, 1; U.S.A., 5; Portugal, 1; Morocco, 1; France, 1; Italy, 1; Great Britain, 2; Germany, 2.

3. The status of the aliens is as follows: Landed Immigrants, 26; Applicants for Landing, 2; Students, 18; No status, 2.

4. Only one person has so far been fined under the Immigration Act in connection with this matter. Information on other fines which may have been levied under the Criminal Code or Juvenile Delinquency Act would have to be obtained from the courts in Montreal.

5. Until at least such time as the courts have dealt conclusively with the charges against the individuals awaiting trial in this matter, the Department of Manpower and

Immigration has no basis for instituting deportation proceedings against any of the aliens.

6. One.

7. No.

ACRES INTERTEL LTD.—EMPLOYMENT AS CONSULTANT

Question No. 2,606—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1 Has Acres Intertel Ltd. at any time acted as a consultant to the Department of Communications in the preparation of reports for the Department?

2. If so, at what cost to the Government of Canada?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to Table these reports?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Yes.

2. The cost to the Department of Communications for services provided by Acres Intertel Ltd. is as follows:

Fiscal year 1968-1969, $49,187.86; 1969-1970, (to date) $31,000.00 (committed).

3. Acres Intertel Ltd. has been providing professional consultants to assist the Department of Communications in interference studies related to radio spectrum utilization. These professional consultants also provide specialized advice to Departmental personnel in their day-to-day operations. This assistance and advice is not normally incorporated in reports for publication, however, a special report on Communications in the Canadian North, being prepared with their assistance, will be tabled at a conference on Telecommunications and the North, scheduled by the department for mid-1970.

"PUT YOUR NAME IN SPACE"—PAYMENTS TO CONTEST JUDGES

Question No. 2,611—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How much is to be paid to (a) Marshall McLuhan (b) Gratien Gelinas (c) Leonard Cohen, for their services as judges in the "Put Your Name in Space" contest?

2. What is the cost of advertising this contest?

3. For what reason is this contest being sponsored by the Minister of Communications rather than by Telesat Canada?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. $200 including expenses.

2. Direct advertising costs were $750. Total costs including printing, promotion, and sorting of entries was $12,000.

[Mr. Forest.]

3. At the time the contest was initiated, Telesat Canada did not exist.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN TAKEOVERS

Question No. 2,612—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What are the terms of reference of the internal group in the Department of Finance reviewing and investigating the question of foreign takeovers of financial institutions in Canada as stated by the Minister of Finance in Parliament on July 2, 1969?

2. Who are the individuals in the Department of Finance investigating this area?

3. When is it expected that this review will be completed?

4. Are representations being solicited on the subject from the Canadian public?

5. If so, when is the deadline for submitting such representations?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Officials have been asked to review the significance for the national interest of foreign takeovers of firms in the securities industry, keeping in mind the following considerations: (i) the broad interest of the Canadian public including the responsiveness of the securities industry to official Canadian economic and financial policies, and the contribution of firms in this industry to the efficient channelling of savings into the most productive Canadian investments; (ii) The interest of Canadians who seek to raise investment funds, including their need for efficient and competitive financial institutions through which to raise the required funds at the most economical cost; (iii) The interest of Canadian investors seeking profitable and appropriate investment of their funds; (iv) The interest of the Canadian firms in the securities industry in the growth of international financial business which is a reflection of the growth in international economic relations.

2. Officials in the Department of Finance with responsibilities in the areas of financial institutions and capital markets in consultation with officials of other interested Departments and the Bank of Canada.

3, 4 and 5. Arrangements have not been made for formal representations on the subject by the Canadian public. The Minister of Finance would welcome receiving the views of interested groups and individuals. A study of foreign ownership and control of member firms is being carried out within the securities industry itself. The government wishes to take into account the views of interested groups and hopes to be in a position to make

a statement on the subject of the review within the next few months.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES

Question No. 2,613—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. What facilities or services of the National Arts Centre are only available to "important" or "very important persons"?

2. What steps have been taken to insure the participation in the benefits of the National Arts Centre by all cultural and income groups in Canada?

3. Does the National Arts Centre have any regulations about the dress or appearance of its patrons?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. There are no facilities or services of the National Arts Centre which are restricted to important or very important persons.

2. Under the National Arts Centre Act in object of the corporation is to develop the performing arts in the National Capital region and to assist the Canada Council in the development of the performing arts elsewhere in Canada. The Centre has an obligation to encourage talent and provide entertainment for all income groups through an artistic policy which provides quality performances on every level from classical to popular. In keeping with this, ticket prices for respective performances are kept as low as possible. The Centre conducts week day public tours and weekend popular events on adjoining terraces during the summer months which are free to the general public. The programming to date reflects as many aspects of Canadian culture as possible.

3. No.

PUBLICATION GRANTED SECOND CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,615—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the name of the publication which has been granted second class mailing privileges under registration number 1965?

2. Who publishes the periodical in question?

3. What is the periodicity of the publication?

4. Who are the subscribers?

5. Is it sold to the public on newsstands or otherwise?

6. What is (a) the sale price of individual copies (b) the subscription rate?

7. On whose application was the second class privilege granted?

8. What was the basis of the decision to grant second class privileges in this case?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. Up to the Neck.

2. Up to the Neck, 3553 St. Urbain, Montreal 130, P.Q.

3. 12 issues per year.

4. This information is not known to the Post Office Department.

5. This information is not known to the Post Office Department.

6. (a) This information is not known to the Post Office Department. (b) This information is not known to the Post Office Department.

7. Mrs. M. Destounis.

8. This publication met the criteria outlined in the regulations respecting second class mail made pursuant to Section 12 of the Post Office Act as amended by Chapter 5, of the Statutes of Canada 1968.

LONG HARBOUR, NFLD.—POLLUTION BY ELECTRIC REDUCTION PLANT

Question No. 2,618—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Following the answer by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry to part (6) Question No. 2,470, by what authority and under what regulations was this decision made?

2. If it is found that the Electric Reduction Company of Canada is responsible for paying the cost of reclaiming Long Harbour, Newfoundland for fishing, who is responsible for paying compensation to the fishermen for income lost while the bay was polluted?

3. How much compensation has been paid so far and in what form?

4. What is the total estimated cost to the federal government of such compensation?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):

1. The decision was made by the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Limited at the request of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry.

2. The matter is now before the court in Newfoundland.

3. This information would have to be secured from the company.

4. Nil.

POSSIBLE CONTAMINATION OF THE EARTH BY RETURNING SPACE VEHICLES

Question No. 2,619—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Is any Department or Branch of the Canadian Government making studies of the possibilities of contamination of the earth by returning space vehicles?

Questions

2 Is the government aware of any such studies being made under the auspices of the United Nations?

3. What procedures, if any, have been incorporated for decontamination of returning space vehicles to protect the human and natural resources of the earth before further vehicles are sent into space?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No.

2. No. However, the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has taken note of such studies made by the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR) of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU).

3. The United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has recently passed to the Canadian Embassy in Washington, as a matter of routine, a copy of NASA Press Release No. 69-83K of July 6 1969 which contains information on decontamination procedures for the return of Apolo 11 (pages 64-67 and 181-190). The United States Embassy in Ottawa has indicated it would be pleased to provide copies of these or other pages of special interest from the above release upon request.

REVIEW OF BASIC WAR PENSION RATES

Question No. 2,620—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to making a review of the basic war pension rates every two years, as is being done in the United Kingdom, for the purpose of compensating recipients for price increases?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yes, consideration is being given to this and to various other methods.

DOT FLIGHTS FROM OTTAWA, JULY 6 AND 7

Question No. 2,621—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. How many Department of Transport flights left Ottawa on July 6 and July 7, and at what times did these flights leave?

2. What aircraft were used for each of these flights?

3. What were the names of the passengers on board each of these flights?

4. What were the destinations of each of these flights?

5. What was the purpose of each of these flights?

Mr. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Fourteen Department of Transport flights left Ottawa July 6 and July 7. These were training, ministerial and operational flights. The following aircraft were utilized: July 6—CF-GXK at 9:10 p.m.; CF-DOL at 10:00 a.m.

July 7—CF-CGE at 6:35 a.m.; CF-DTA at 9:05 a.m.; CF-DTF at 8:10 a.m.; CF-CGZ at 8:40 a.m.; CF-CGY at 9:10 a.m.; CF-CAQ at 4:45 p.m.; CF-CAY at 1:55 p.m.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM A. G. HEAKES

Question No. 2,622—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Did the Prime Minister received letters dated June 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 from Mr. A. G. Heakes?

2. Did these letters enclose letters to the Solicitor General dated June 4, from the Correspondence Secretary to the Prime Minister dated June 5 and June 9?

3. Have these letters been acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

4. Did the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's Parliamentary Secretary receive any protests following the tabling of an answer to Question No. 1,930?

5. Did these protests have any connection with the announcement on June 5 that there had been a change in the Prime Minister's Correspondence Secretary?

6. (a) Did the Minister of Manpower and Immigration receive a letter dated June 5 from Mr. Heakes (b) has it been acknowledged (c) has the Minister of Manpower and Immigration or the Office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration directly acknowledged any letter from Mr. Heakes (d) was a communication from the Montreal Office of the Department of Manpower and Immigration sent by registered mail on May 27 to Mr. Heakes and the reply to him by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration as the result of the intervention of the Prime Minister and, if so, was it signed and, if not, for what reasons?

7. Has the Minister of Communications received correspondence from Mr. Heakes, what is the nature of this correspondence, has any letter from Mr. Heakes to the Minister of Communications in the current calendar year been acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

8. Did the Solicitor General receive a letter of June 4 from Mr. Heakes, has it been acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

9. Did the Prime Minister receive a telegram on June 15 from Mr. Heakes, has it been acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

10. Have the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Minister of Communications received any letter from Mr. Heakes since June 16, have they been acknowledged and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1. June 3, yes. June 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16, no.

2. No.

3. No.

4. No.

5. Not applicable.

6. (a) No; (b) Not applicable; (c) No; (d) Yes; it is not known whether or not it was signed.

7. Yes; request for an investigation of the actions of various persons in respect of Mr. Heakes' proceedings in bankruptcy; no.

8. There is no record on file of a letter to the Solicitor General from Mr. Heakes dated June 4, however, a copy of an undated letter from Mr. Heakes to the Solicitor General was received at that time and is probably the letter referred to; the foregoing letter was not acknowledged.

9. Yes; no.

10. Yes; some of this correspondence has been acknowledged by the Office of the Prime Minister and by the Office of the Solicitor General. The Ministers mentioned above have been the recipients of a constant flow of correspondence from Mr. Heakes in recent months, often of a repetitious nature and often at a rate of several letters a day. This correspondence refers mainly to the problems experienced by Mr. Heakes as a result of a bankruptcy in which he was involved several years ago but contains as well allegations by him of conspiracy and libel, of mail tampering and of police harassment. It has been pointed out to Mr. Heakes that his problems are essentially within the jurisdiction of the provincial government. For these reasons much of the correspondence received has been unanswered as it would appear to serve no useful purpose to continue to do so.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—PERCENTAGE OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT ALLOCATED THERETO

Question No. 2,624—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the Government of Canada or the President of the Treasury Board set a goal regarding the percentage amount of the Canadian Gross National Product that should be allocated annually toward scientific research and development expenditures as stated by the Science Council of Canada in their Third Annual Report?

2. If so, what is that percentage and what criteria was used in its determination?

3. Has any target year date been set regarding the above percentage allocation of research and development expenditures?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

SCIENCE COUNCIL—ANALYSIS OF THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

Question No. 2,625—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Which government agency or department is analyzing the recommendations of the Third Annual Report of the Science Council of Canada?

2. When is it anticipated that the above analysis on the Science Council's recommendations will be made public?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1 and 2. The Third Annual Report of the Science Council of Canada will be reviewed by the Privy Council Office. Government statements which arise will be announced at the appropriate time after consideration of the opinions of other interested groups.

CANADIAN FILM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—LOANS FOR PRODUCTIONS

Question No. 2,628—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many film productions have the Canadian Film Development Corporation lent money to or invested money in and what are such productions and the amounts involved in each case?

2. What proposals for film productions have been turned down by the Corporation, and what was the amount involved in each case?

3. What criteria does the Corporation use to establish significant Canadian creative content?

4. Does the Corporation require that films be mainly based in Canadian settings?

5. Does the Corporation require that films be restricted to plots dealing with Canadian themes?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Film Development Corporation as follows: 1. Applications for assistance for loans and investments reach the Corporation by way of requests for financing in: (a) complete feature film productions; (b) versions and other post-production assistance; (c) pre-production (scripts and related expenses).

As of July 9, 1969, the Corporation had lent money to or invested money in three feature film productions: "The Act of the Heart", "The Blast" ("Explosion"), and "La Chambre Blanche".

Due to the confidential nature of negotiations between the applicants, distributors, and other financing parties, the Corporation does not disclose financial details of the films or projects in which it is involved.

2. Eleven proposals for film productions have been refused. The Corporation does not disclose financial details of its negotiations with producers.

Questions

3. The purpose of the Canadian Film Development Corporation is to foster and promote the development of a feature film industry in Canada. In the view of the Corporation, this means developing film writers, directors, directors of photography, and producers, all of whom make major creative contributions to feature film production. The corporation does not, however, exclude from consideration, especially during the early stages of the development of the feature film industry in Canada, film productions in which there is an important non-Canadian contribution provided there is the opportunity for Canadians to participate along with non-Canadians.

4. No.

5. No.

AIR CANADA STEWARDESSES

Question No. 2,629—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many stewardesses have been hired by Air Canada since January 1, 1965?

2. Were all the stewardesses hired bilingual and, if not, what proportion were bilingual?

3. How many of those hired were resident in the Province of Quebec, how many from the remaining nine provinces and how many were non-Canadians?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. 2,352.

2. No; 1300, or 55 per cent were bilingual.

3. Resident in Province of Quebec, 990, 43 per cent; Resident in other 9 provinces, 1147, 49 per cent; Non-Canadians, 215, 8 per cent.

PUBLIC SERVICE—SALARIES OVER $12,000

Question No. 2,630—**Mr. Coates:**

How many individuals in the Public Service of Canada receive a salary of $12,000 annually or more?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 12,735.

MINISTERS' OFFICES—INCREASES IN STAFFS

Question No. 2,631—**Mr. Coates:**

What has been the increase in the personnel staffs in the offices of the Prime Minister and of his Cabinet Ministers since April 1, 1969, and in each instance, what has been the increase in the cost of operation of the offices of the Prime Minister and of his Cabinet Ministers?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):

	(a)	(b) $
The Right Honourable the Prime Minister	4	31,745 per annum
The Hon. the Minister of Communications and Postmaster General	1	5,727 per annum
The Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry	1	6,202 per annum
The Hon. the Minister of Justice	1	3,988 per annum
The Hon. the Minister of Transport	3	17,918 per annum
The Hon. the Minister without Portfolio (Humbolt-Saskatchewan)	1	6,182 per annum
The Hon. the Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the Government in the Senate	2	20,211 per annum

All other ministers have submitted nil returns.

CABINET MINISTERS' OFFICES—RENOVATION AND FURNISHING

Question No. 2,633—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many offices of Cabinet Ministers, either in the Parliament Buildings or in their departmental offices have undergone renovations and received new furnishings since April 1, 1969?

2. What are the names of the Cabinet Ministers who have had new furnishings and renovations carried out to their offices and what was the cost in each instance?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 and 2.

Name	Amount
Parliament Buildings	
The Hon. Otto E. Lang	$ 80
The Hon. Ron. Basford	413
Departmental Offices	
The Hon. Eric W. Kierans	$ 6,600
The Hon. Allan J. MacEachen	1,280
The Hon. John N. Turner	1,062
The Hon. E. J. Benson	1,208
The Hon. Bryce Mackasey	109

NATIONAL DEBT, MARCH, 1967, 1968, 1969

Question No. 2,635—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What was the total of the National Debt at March 1967, 1968 and 1969?

2. What was the total of the annual interest and debt charges on the National Debt at the same periods?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. 1967, $15,965 million; 1968, $16,760 million; 1969 (Preliminary), $17,326 million.

2. 1967, $1,190.6 million; 1968, $1,300.8 million; 1969 (Preliminary), $1,479.0 million.

CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF BRITISH WIVES OF CANADIAN WAR VETERANS

Question No. 2,636—**Mr. Marshall:**

Are British wives of Canadian War Veterans considered as Canadian Citizens in application for passports to travel to foreign countries?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): No, unless they have acquired Canadian citizenship in their own right.

NEWFOUNDLAND WAR VETERANS' WIVES—CITIZENSHIP STATUS

Question No. 2,637—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What is the status of citizenship of wives of Newfoundland War Veterans who married overseas during World Wars I and II?

2. Are they considered Canadian citizens in application for passports to travel to foreign countries?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Citizenship does not derive automatically from marriage to a War Veteran. However, the great majority of wives to whom the question refers are Canadian citizens and would be issued passports.

ANNUAL BUDGETS, CBAF AND CBAFT, MONCTON, CBZ, FREDERICTON

Question No. 2,638—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. What were the annual budgets (a) of radio station CBAF (b) of television station CBAFT of the Société Radio-Canada in Moncton for each year since they were opened or began operations including building, rental and operating costs?

2. What was the annual budget of station CBZ in Fredericton (including the CBD relay in Saint John) of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for each year since it was opened or began operations, including building, rental and operating costs?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): It has not been customary to require the CBC to disclose information which could adversely affect the Corporation in the competitive business in which it is engaged.

INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS—LOCATION OF INSTALLATIONS

Question No. 2,641—**Mr. Marshall:**

Are any of the 29 instrument landing systems (ILS) recently purchased by the Department of Transport to be installed at the Airports at Stephenville and Deer Lake, Newfoundland?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The intention of the Department of Transport is to install an (ILS) in support of the operation of jet aircraft into Deer Lake.

An (ILS) is presently installed at Stephenville.

CANADIAN PREFERENCE IN CHARTERED BANK LOANS

Question No. 2,648—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What machinery has been established in the Department of Finance to ensure that the Chartered Banks in Canada will be following the guidelines put forward by the Minister of Finance regarding loan preference to Canadian rather than U.S. customers and loan preference to lesser developed Canadian areas and small businesses as stated by the Minister in *Hansard* on page 11,019, July 9, 1969?

2. Was there any correspondence between the Minister and the Chartered Banks regarding these guidelines?

3. If so, will this correspondence be Tabled in the House?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. None, but the Governor of the Bank of Canada, when he appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, stated that at recent meetings with executives of the chartered banks the Bank of Canada had expressed the view, as it has in earlier periods of tight credit conditions, that the banks should have special regard for the needs of borrowers in less prosperous areas of the country and of small businesses that do not have alternative sources of credit. In addition, very recently when it became apparent that in view of the higher bank loan rates in the United States U.S. corporations would have an incentive to borrow here directly or through Canadian subsidiaries, he had suggested to the banks that they should give priority in the use of their total loan resources to the credit-worthy demands of their Canadian customers. The Minister of Finance stated in the House on

July 9 that he had expressed the same views to the banks.

2. No.

3. Answered by 2.

POLICY RESPECTING TRADE WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Question No. 2,649—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. Is it the policy of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to stimulate trade opportunities between Canada and the Republic of South Africa, in spite of Canada's expressed opposition to South Africa's racial policies?

2. If so, have any special activities been undertaken in the last year to stimulate such trade?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes, normal trade promotional activities are conducted.

2. Canada has maintained trade posts in Cape Town and Johannesburg, South Africa for many years which process trade enquiries from both the Canadian and South African business communities. During fiscal year 1968-69 two trade missions visited South Africa as well as other countries.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PURCHASE OF FALCON AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,650—**Mr. Deakon:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence recently purchased eight Falcon aircraft?

2. If so, for what purpose?

3. What was the cost of these aircraft?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1 and 2. Seven Falcon aircraft have been purchased to provide faster and more economical transportation, as replacement for older, larger aircraft being withdrawn from service.

3. $13,200,000 including support requirements.

FARMERS' AVERAGE INCOME, QUEBEC, PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Question No. 2,651—**Mr. Deakon:**

1. What was the average income of farmers in the Province of Quebec for the years 1967 and 1968?

2. What was the average income of farmers in each of the Prairie Provinces for the years 1967 and 1968?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1 and 2. The average net income of farmers from farming operations for Quebec and each of the three Prairie Provinces is as follows for 1967 and 1968 in thousands of dollars:

Province	1967	1968	Average
Quebec	193,233	209,016	201,125
Manitoba	155,889	170,043	162,966
Saskatchewan	361,122	479,167	420,145
Alberta	280,459	381,724	331,092

These estimates of farm income are calculated by adding together farm cash receipts from farming operations, value of farm perquisites, value of changes in farm inventories of field crops and livestock, and deducting farm operating expenses and depreciation charges.

CANADIAN ARMY—ELIGIBILITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND PHARMACISTS

Question No. 2,652—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Are persons registered and qualified as pharmacists in the Province of Newfoundland eligible to enter the Canadian Army as Pharmacist Officers without the requirement of additional training?

2. Is there a requirement of additional training and, if so, for what reasons?

3. If persons qualified and registered as pharmacists in the Province of Newfoundland are not eligible to enter the Canadian Army as Pharmacist Officers without additional training, is there a prohibition against civilian pharmacists qualified and registered in Newfoundland prescribing for Armed Forces personnel in Newfoundland?

4. Are qualified and registered pharmacists in the Province of Newfoundland considered eligible for appointments in the federal Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare?

5 Are qualified and registered pharmacists employed in the federal Food and Drug Directorate in Ottawa eligible for entry into the Canadian Forces as Pharmacist Officers?

6. Are the standards of qualification for Newfoundland pharmacists considered equal in both the federal Food and Drug Directorate and the Canadian Armed Forces and, if not, for what reasons?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of National Defence and the Department of National Health and Welfare as follows:

1. A person registered and qualified as a pharmacist in the Province of Newfoundland is eligible for enrolment in the Canadian Forces without additional training if he: a. holds a degree in pharmacy granted by a university or recognized school of pharmacy; and b. is in good standing with the Newfoundland Pharmaceutical Association.

2. Applicants without a degree in pharmacy would require additional training to obtain such a degree before becoming eligible for enrolment. The academic and professional enrolment standards were established as the minimum professional requirements for pharmacists entering the Canadian Forces. In addition to assuring a minimum academic entry standard, these criteria permit equal opportunity for progression in rank, post graduate training, and general professional responsibility for all Canadian Forces' pharmacists. Pharmacists enrolled without a degree would be at a distinct disadvantage in competing with their colleagues and would undoubtedly be restricted in career advancement.

3. The ineligibility of persons qualified and registered as pharmacists in the Province of Newfoundland to enter the Armed Forces as pharmacist officers does not preclude their dispensing drugs in a civilian capacity to Armed Forces personnel in Newfoundland.

4. Pharmacists who apply for employment with the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare must possess the basic qualifications for entrance to the Pharmacy Group. These qualifications are at least university graduation in pharmacy, or eligibility for registration as a pharmacist in a province of Canada. Additional qualifications and experience may be required, depending on the classification level of the position for which an individual is being considered.

5. Pharmacists employed in the Federal Food and Drug Department in Ottawa are eligible for entry in the Canadian Forces as pharmacist officers if they have a degree in pharmacy and are a member in good standing as a practising or non-practising member of the Pharmaceutical Association, Society, or College of a Canadian province.

6. Insofar as the federal Food and Drug Directorate is concerned see answer to part 4.

The minimum academic and professional qualifications established for pharmacists entering the Canadian Forces are a degree in pharmacy and membership in good standing as a practising or non-practising member of the Pharmaceutical Association, Society, or College of a Canadian province.

EMPLOYMENT OF NEWFOUNDLANDERS IN LABRADOR

Question No. 2,653—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How many applicants from Newfoundland have obtained employment in Labrador as listed at Canada Manpower Centres (a) Labrador City (b) Wabush (c) Churchill Falls?

2. How many applicants are listed at the following Manpower Offices in Newfoundland (a) St. John's (b) Gander (c) Grand Falls (d) Corner Brook?

3. How many applicants from the Province of Quebec have received employment in Churchill Falls through applications made through Canada Manpower Centres?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) and (b), 23; 1. (c), 32.

2. (a), 2,058; (b), 79; (c), 170; (d), 361.

3. 39.

CANADIAN ARMY—ISSUE OF NEW UNIFORMS

Question No. 2,654—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. When is it expected that issue of the new Canadian Army uniform will be made?

2. What will be the estimated cost of the new uniforms?

3. What is the value of present stocks of Army, Navy and Air Force uniforms and accessories on hand, in (a) Ordnance Stores (b) anywhere else?

4. With the cutbacks in strength of the Canadian Forces is it intended to decrease the orders for new uniforms with regard to economy?

5. How is it intended to dispose of present stocks of Army, Navy and Air Force uniforms and accessories after delivery of new uniforms?

6. When is it expected that the issue of new uniforms will be made to the Reserve Forces?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. and 2. See reply to Question No. 994, *Hansard* page 4307, dated January 15, 1969.

3. $6,000,000.

4. Yes.

5. By phasing the issue program over a 3 year period, present stocks will be reduced through normal usage. Stocks remaining on completion of the issue of the new uniforms to members of the Regular Forces, will be used by the Reserves, until they in turn are converted to the new uniform, and by the Cadet organizations. Any surplus beyond these requirements will be issued to the Emergency Supply Planning Branch of the Department of Supply and Services, for the Canada Emergency Measures Organization or National Health and Welfare for future emergencies, or will be declared surplus to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation.

6. No firm date has been established and issue will not commence until after completion of the Regular Force issue program.

Questions

CANSO, NOVA SCOTIA—APPROVAL BY TOWN OF PLANS FOR FEDERAL BUILDING

Question No. 2,655—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Have site and building plans for a new federal building at Canso, Nova Scotia, been approved by the Town of Canso?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Yes.

NEWFOUNDLAND—EMPLOYMENT OBTAINED BY STUDENTS THROUGH MANPOWER CENTRES

Question No. 2,657—**Mr. Marshall:**

How many students have secured employment during the months of May and June, 1969 through Canada Manpower Centres at Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander and St. John's, Newfoundland?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The number of students who secured employment during the months of May and June 1969 through Canada Manpower Centres at Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander and St. John's Newfoundland was as follows:

	May	June
Corner Brook	144	171
Grand Falls	22	12
Gander	17	35
St. John's	78	130

RESERVE FORCES—CONSULTATION WITH CONFERENCE OF DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS AS TO CUT-BACKS

Question No. 2,658—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Has the Conference of Defence Associations been consulted with regard to cutbacks in the Reserve Forces?

2 If so, when was the meeting held?

3. If not, is it intended that they will be consulted?

4. What are the reasons for the cutting back of the reserves?

5. What is the strength of the Reserve Forces of Canada under (a) the Militia (Army) (b) the Naval Reserves (c) the Air Force Auxiliary?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, see *Hansard* dated 15 July, page 11220, and 16 July, page 11284.

2. 11 July, 1969.

3. Not applicable.

4. The limitations imposed by a fixed budget have involved a reduction in the over-all size of the Canadian Forces, and this reduction applies also to the Reserves.

5. (a) 23,237; (b) 2,799; (c) 807.

[Mr. Groos.]

ESTABLISHMENT OF MILITARY BASE IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 2,659—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Will consideration be given to the establishment of a military base in the Province of Newfoundland as requested by the Newfoundland Command of the Royal Canadian Legion?

2. What steps are being taken to make a study of the factors surrounding the establishment?

3. Under whose responsibility in the Department of National Defence does such a study fall?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1, 2 and 3. The proposal submitted by the Newfoundland Command of the Royal Canadian Legion for the establishment of a Canadian Forces' base in Newfoundland was given careful consideration during the recent review of defence policy by the Chief of Defence Staff and his advisors. However, it is not intended to establish such a base in Newfoundland at this time.

TAX REFORM—PERSONS INVOLVED IN PREPARATION

Question No. 2,660—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Have there been any individuals, other than civil servants, who have been involved in the preparation of the Government's White Paper on Canadian Tax Reform?

2. If so, who are these individuals and on what basis were they selected?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Yes. Two categories of individuals who are not civil servants have been involved in the preparation of the government's White Paper on Canadian Tax Reform. Those in the first category are members of the government, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. The second category includes three individuals; Mr. D. Andison, a lawyer working full time on contract with the Department of Finance, and Messrs. P. M. Farwell and M. C. F. Gillan, full time Special Assistants to the Minister of Finance. A third group have not been involved in the preparation of the White Paper as such, but did take part in the analysis of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Taxation and of the views on tax reforms put forward by the provincial governments, national associations and others. These individuals were on contract to the Department of Finance. Their names are: Mr. R. J. Bertrand, Mr. R. Bourassa, Mr. J. R. Brown (presently a civil servant), Mr. R. W. Collins, Dr. R. W. V. Dickerson, Mr. D. G. Hartle (presently a civil servant), Mr. D. R. Huggett, Mr. E. G. Miller, Mr. A. Raynauld, Mr. L. M.

Read, Mr. A. E. J. Thompson (presently a civil servant), Mr. J. B. Tinker.

Also in this third group would be a number of economists who collaborated on the six studies prepared for the Department of Finance by the Institute of Quantitative Analysis of Social and Economic Policy (University of Toronto), referred to in question No. 1,111 on page 5310 of *Hansard* for February 10, 1969.

2. Mr. Andison and those in group three are accountants, economists or lawyers with particular experience in tax matters or in economic analysis. They were selected by the Department on the basis of that experience.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES—PARTICIPATION BY MAYORS

Question No. 2,661—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Is it the intention of the federal government to accede to the resolution of the 32nd Annual Conference of the Canadian Federation of Municipal Mayors at the meeting on "Local Communities and the Constitution" (a) to invite selected delegates to attend meetings or to participate in matters relating to federal, provincial or municipal interests as they feel are desirable, and (b) to invite selected delegates, wherever possible, to future Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conferences?

2. If the answer is 'no' for what reasons?

3. If the answer is 'yes' is it intended to invite such delegates to the next Federal-Provincial Conference?

4. If municipal authorities are not invited to participate directly, will the government request that provinces include municipal representatives in provincial delegations?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. The government will give careful consideration to any resolutions of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities that the Federation wishes to present to it. No resolution of the sort referred to in the question has been submitted to the government.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. It is the view of the government that such a request on its part would not be appropriate.

SHIPMENTS OF CODFISH TO NIGERIA—BIAFRA

Question No. 2,663—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Which department and/or agency arranged for the shipments of codfish sent to Nigeria/Biafra in 1968?

2. Which firms performed the work connected with shipment of this fish including the work of receiving, loading and overseeing shipment?

3. In each case, were tenders called for this work and, if not, for what reason?

4. In each case, how much was paid to these firms?

5. Was codfish transhipped from Newfoundland to Halifax before being shipped to Africa and, if so, for what reason and at what cost?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The Canadian International Development Agency in conjunction with the Fisheries Price Support Board, and the Department of National Defence.

2. 1st Consignment—Fisheries Price Support Board and Department of National Defence.

2nd Consignment—Keel Shipping Ltd., Fisheries Price Support Board, Canadian International Development Agency.

3. 1st Consignment—First consignment shipped by air on Department of National Defence aircraft at a cost of $27,000.

2nd Consignment—Second consignment shipped by chartered vessel which carried not only fish but other foodstuffs as well as hospital supplies. Total cost of charter: $149,021.44.

4. 1st Consignment—In view of urgency, first consignment purchased directly from Fisheries Price Support Board without tender call.

2nd Consignment—Tenders were called by Fisheries Price Support Board on behalf of the Canadian International Development Agency for the second consignment, and contracts were awarded to lowest bidders.

5. The fish supplied by the Fisheries Price Support Board from stocks held in Newfoundland was transported to Halifax for loading on board the chartered vessel as it was more economical to bring the fish to Halifax than to arrange for the vessel to call and load in Newfoundland. Total cost of transporting the fish from Newfoundland to Halifax amounted to $52,732.27.

CANADIAN FIRMS PARTICIPATING IN U.S. ROCKET CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 2,665—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. How many Canadian corporations participated directly or indirectly in the manufacture of parts used in the construction of American rockets since 1960, and for each of the years since?

2. What is the name of each?

3. How much money was earned from such participation?

Questions

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows:

Although a number of Canadian firms have participated in the United States space programs, no information is available on any Canadian firms participating in the manufacture of parts used in the construction of American rockets, per se.

CHANGE IN RUN OF M.V. "LUCY MAUD MONTGOMERY"

Question No. 2,667—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is it intended to transfer the *M V Lucy Maud Montgomery* from the Borden-Tormentine ferry service to the Wood Islands-Caribou run?

2. If so, when is such transfer to be made?

3. What alterations or extensions to dock and harbour facilities would be necessary to accommodate this ship?

4. What would be the total cost of such extensions or alterations?

5. If such transfer is not to be made, is it the intention of the government to assist in providing a third ship at Wood Islands-Caribou?

6 When is it intended to augment this service?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. Active consideration is being given to adding a third vessel to the Wood Islands-Caribou run, but no decision has yet been taken as to the identity of the vessel.

2. See Answer to 1.

3. See Answer to 1.

4. See Answer to 1.

5. See Answer to 1.

6. See Answer to 1.

RIVERS SUBDIVISION, CNR—INVESTIGATION OF ACCIDENT

Question No. 2,669—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Has the Canadian Transport Commission completed their investigation into the mishap on the C.N.R. Rivers Subdivision on April 28, 1968, where three employees were killed when the engine went through the bridge and, if so, what were the findings of the investigation?

2. If the Canadian Transport Commission has not completed its investigation into this mishap, how long does it expect to take?

3. Will the report be made public upon completion of the investigation and if not, for what reason?

4. How many man-hours have been spent, to date, in attempting to determine the cause for such mishap?

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

5. How many investigators have been assigned by the Department, to date, in determining the cause of such mishap?

6. Have any reports been received or requested from accredited representatives from the running trades and the Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees into the cause of such a mishap?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. The investigation is completed and the report thereof is being considered by the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission. The findings of the investigation are dealt with in three below.

2. Not applicable.

3. The application of the Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees and of certain running trades for the report to be made public is now before the Railway Transport Committee.

4. Man-hours estimated at 170.

5. Eight.

6. Answered by three.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINEES

Question No. 2,671—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What is the total number of Foreign Service Officers or Administrative Trainees now employed by the Department of External Affairs?

2. How many persons designated as a Foreign Service Officer resigned from the Department for reasons other than retirement (a) in 1969, to date (b) in each of the last ten years?

3. How many persons designated as Administrative Trainee resigned from the Department for reasons other than retirement (a) in 1969, to date (b) in each of the last ten years?

4 Of those now in the service, how many in each category were stationed in Ottawa in June 1969?

5. Of those stationed in Ottawa, how many in each category were assigned directly to the office or the staff of the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

6. Are persons so assigned in addition to Special Assistants, Executive Assistants or Private Secretary not drawn from normal resources of the Department?

7. What are the funtcions of each Foreign Service Officer or Administrative Trainee assigned to the staff of the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

8. What are the special functions in the office or on the staff of the Secretary of State for External Affairs which require a Foreign Service Officer or an Administrative Trainee to perform them?

9. On the basis of what criteria is a Foreign Service Officer or an Administrative Trainee assigned to the office or the staff of the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. 495 Foreign Service Officers and 9 administrative trainees.

2. (a) 15. (b) The number of separations for reasons other than retirement or death for each of the last ten fiscal years is as follows: 1959-60, 8; 1960-61, 12; 1961-62, 8; 1962-63, 7; 1963-64, 10; 1964-65, 18; 1965-66, 11; 1966-67, 9; 1967-68, 10; 1968-69, 14.

3. (a) 3. (b) The Administrative Trainee Programme was begun in 1967. There was 1 resignation in 1968.

4. 223 Foreign Service Officers and 11 Administrative Trainees.

5. 3.

6. Such persons are drawn from normal resources of the Department.

7. The Departmental Assistants to the Secretary of State for External Affairs share a number of functions. These are: scanning the flow of reports from Canadian missions abroad and making selections and summaries for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister; following proceedings of Parliament with particular reference to items relating to the Department of External Affairs; coordinating the preparation of replies to parliamentary questions and returns; assembling material from Departmental sources for statements and speeches by the Secretary of State for External Affairs; preparing replies to correspondence on Departmental matters addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs; and generally acting as liaison officers between the Minister's office and the various divisions of the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian International Development Agency.

8. See answer to part 7.

9. An attempt is made to provide officers who have the qualities required for the effective performance of the duties mentioned in the answer to part 7 and who will benefit from the general experience provided by such duties.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—EXPENDITURES FOR NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

Question No. 2,672—**Mr. Peddle:**

1. What is the total expenditure for advertising on behalf of the CBC in papers belonging to the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association or Les Hebdos de Langue Française du Canada, in each of the ten provinces in the fiscal year 1968-69?

2. What was the total expenditure for advertising on behalf of the CBC in each of the following newspapers in the fiscal year 1968-69:

Canadian Middle East Journal, Bielaruski Holas, The Chinese Times, The Chinese Voice, The New Republic, Shing Wah Daily News, Bratstvo, Glas Kanadskih Srba, Hrvatski Glas, Kanadski Srbobran, Nas Put, Slovenska Drzava, Kanadsky Slivak, Nase Hlasy, Novy Domov, Slovensky Hlas, Modersmaalet Convinist-Contact, Compass-Onder Ons, Duca-Post, Goed Nieuws, Hollandia-News, De Nederlandse Courant, De Nederlandse Post, Pioneer, Meie Elu, Vaba Eestlane, Canadian Uutiset, Vapaa Sana, Der Courier, Dies und Das, Hamilton Journal, Ihre Brigitte. Kitchener Journal, Mennonitische Rundschau, Montrealer Nachrichtex, Montrealer Zeitung, Der Nordwesten, Torontoer Zietung, Die Zeit, Estia, Greek Canadian Tribune, Hellenic Echo, Hellenic Free Press, The Hellenic Postman, Hellenic Tribune, New Times, New World, Fuggetlen Magyarorszagot, Kanadai Fuggetlen Hirlap, Kanadai Magyar Ujsag, Kanadai Magyarsag, Kepes Vilaghirado, Magyar Elet, Magyar Hirlap, Menorah-Egyenloseg, Sporthirado, Logberg-Heimskringla, Il Cittadino Canadese, Corriere Canadese, Corriere Illustrato, Corriere Italiano, L'Eco d'Italia, La Famiglia Christiana, Il Giornale di Toronto, Il Mondo, L'Ora di Ottawa, La Tribuna Italiana, The Continental Times, The New Canadian, Canadian Jewish News, Canadian jewish Weekly, Chronicle Review, The Daily Hebrew Journal, The Jewish Eagle, The Jewish Post, Jewish Western Bulletin, The Yiddish Press, Latvia-America, Liaudies Balsas, Nepriklausoma Lietuva, Teviskes Ziburiai, The Malta Herald, Norrona, Czas, Glos Polski # Gazeta Polska, Zwieazkowiec, Correio Portugues, O Jornal Portugues, Lusitano, Luso-Canadiano, O Mesageiro, Voz de Portugal, Correo Hispano-Americano, Canada Svensken, Canada Tidningen, Nya Svenska Pressen, Batkivshchyna, The Canadian Farmer, Homin Ukrainy, Moloda Ukraina, My I Svit, Nasha Meta, Novi Dni, Novy Shliakh, Postup, Promin, Svitlo, Ukrainsky Holos, Ukrainsky Visti, Vilne Slovo, Yevanhelsky Ranok, Yunak, Zhinochy Svit?

3. What was the total expenditure for advertising on behalf of the CBC in daily newspapers in each of the provinces in the fiscal year 1968-69?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. Newfoundland, Nil; Maritimes Provinces, Nil; Quebec, $5,900; Ontario, Nil; Prairie Provinces, $316; B.C., Nil.

2. CBC spent a total of $127 on advertising in the ethnic press. It has not been customary to require the Corporation to disclose individual payments since such specific details could adversely affect business relationships.

3. Newfoundland, $3,900; Maritime Provinces, $8,085; Quebec, $56,448; Ontario, $12,433; Prairie Provinces, $50,664; B.C., $2,000.

Note: The above figures represent cash expenditures only. The bulk of CBC advertising is in daily newspapers on a contra-account basis.

Questions

POST OFFICE—EFFECT OF MAILING COSTS ON PERIODICALS

Question No. 2,674—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. To the knowledge of the Post Office Department, how many periodicals have had to cease their distribution because mailing costs are too high?

2. Is the government considering granting a special rate to periodicals which are concerned directly with educational information?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. The number of periodicals which have had to cease publication because mailing costs are too high is not known to the Post Office Department.

2. No.

*CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—ENGLISH PROGRAMS AMONG TOP TEN

Question No. 2,675—**Mr. McCleave:**

Of the regularly scheduled programs telecast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on its English network during mid-season 1968-69, which ones made in Canada were among the top 10, and which of such was not renewed?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows:

If, by the "top ten" among CBC-TV network programs is meant the ten programs with the biggest average audience, four such programs in mid-season 1968-69 were made in Canada—"Tommy Hunter", "Saturday Night Hockey", "Don Messer" and "Front Page Challenge". Of these four, one was not renewed—"Don Messer". There are, however, various ways of evaluating the performance of network programs: ranking by size of total audience to produce a "top 10" is only one of them.

POST OFFICE—RESCINDING OF FEE FOR SECOND CLASS PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,676—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to rescind the $15.00 application fee for second class postal privileges for publications in favor of an initial registration valid for the life of the publication?

2. How many publishers have received refunds of the $15.00 fee?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. No.

2. Up to the 9th September, 1969, 1091.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS, ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER (OPERATIONS)

Question No. 2,677—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Was the position of Assistant Deputy Minister (Operations) in the Department of Communications filled by regular Public Service Commission procedures and competition?

2. Was this position advertised and, if so, in what manner?

3. If this position was open to competition, what was the number of that competition and who applied in the competition?

4. If this position was not open for competition, for what reasons was no competition held?

5. Who currently is Assistant Deputy Minister (Operations) for the Department of Communications, what salary does he receive, and what are his qualifications?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. The position of Assistant Deputy Minister (Operations) in the Department of Communications was filled by process of selection provided for in Section 10 of the Public Service Employment Act.

2. The position was not advertised.

3. Not applicable.

4. An executive search was carried out by the Executive Program of the Public Service Commission. No candidates were identified, either within or outside the Public Service, whose qualifications and experience were equal to or better than those of the candidate selected.

5. Mr. Gilles Bergeron. His salary is in the range $23,000-$29,000. Mr. Bergeron holds a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mining Engineering from the University of Montreal and a Master of Science Degree in Business Administration from the University of Toronto. The Commission considered that his experience in the private sector, and as an executive with the Quebec provincial public service and the federal public service, together with his educational qualifications, provided appropriate background and experience for his appointment to the post of Assistant Deputy Minister (Operations), Department of Communications.

POST OFFICE—REDUCTION OF THIRD CLASS RATES

Question No. 2,678—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to reducing the third class postal rates presently charged to association periodicals to bring them into line with the rates being charged second class commercially-published periodicals?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: No.

MID-CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORRIDOR FOUNDATION

Question No. 2,679—**Mr. Harding:**

1. How much has the federal government contributed to the Mid-Canada Development Corridor Foundation since its inception?

2. What will be the extent of the federal government's participation in the Mid-Canada Development Corridor Conference planned for August 18-22?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Nil.

2. Two officials, Mr. André Saumier, Regional Economic Expansion and Mr. R. R. Cope, Canadian Transport Commission, attended as observers.

*PROVISION OF AID TO AMATEUR SPORT

Question No. 2,680—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. Has there been any consideration given to the requested increase of administration funds to all sports governing bodies under the Amateur Sports program?

2. What other grants, if any, have been approved?

3. What payment, if any, has been made to the Canadian Water Ski Association of the 50 per cent travel grant to the General Meeting which was held in Halifax, Nova Scotia?

4. What grants specifically have been promised to the Canadian Water Ski Association?

5. What number of grants have been paid to the Canadian Water Ski Association and what number are being considered?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows: 1. Yes. Consideration has been given to the requested increase of administration funds to all sports governing bodies under the Amateur Sports program.

2. Other grants approved are for the purpose of assisting the holding of national championships, participating in international competitions and world championships, and conducting training programs for coaches, officials and athletes.

3. The Canadian Water Ski Association has been awarded a grant of $2,800 to assist in covering its administration costs as well as providing 50 per cent of travel assistance to its annual and one executive meeting during the 1969-70 fiscal year.

4. Other grants awarded to the Canadian Water Ski Association are as follows: Assistance to hold the 1969 national men's and women's championships: $6,898. Assistance to conduct a national coaches clinic in 1969: $3,844. Assistance to participate in the 1969 world championships in Denmark: $4,530. Pretraining of national team prior to world championships: $3,671.

5. All grants, as listed under Part 4 above, have been paid to the Canadian Water Ski Association, and none are presently being considered.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—GOODS SOLD AT CANEX STORES

Question No. 2,682—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What is the policy of the Department of National Defence regarding the variety of goods sold at Canex stores?

2. Has the Department received complaints from civilian retailers and, if so, what is the nature of complaints?

3. What happens to any surplus realized by Canex stores?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. The policy is to ensure that a Base Exchange will offer for resale the range of goods and services necessary to meet the needs of its patrons.

2. Yes. Prior to 1968, the three services operated their own resale activities. Subsequent to unification, CANEX was the name chosen for the consolidated non-public fund resale outlets of the Canadian Forces, and a number of merchants and operators of services located near some of the military bases thought a new activity was being introduced which would be harmful to their own particular business. When it was explained that this was not so, apprehensions prompting these complaints appeared to be dispelled.

3. Any profits realized are used to provide social, recreational and welfare benefits to the military community.

FINANCE—PLACING OF NEW MONEY IN CIRCULATION

Question No. 2,683—**Mr. McCleave:**

By what process is new money put into the financial bloodstream of Canada, over and above the replacement of worn out currency?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The Bank of Canada, through its monetary operations, is able to determine broadly the

rate of increase in the combined total of currency outside banks and chartered bank deposits.

The proportion of this total which is held in the form of currency, however, is determined by the public. Anyone having a balance in his account at a chartered bank may withdraw all or any part of it in the form of Bank of Canada notes and anyone holding such notes may deposit them for credit to his account.

The chartered banks, of course, keep sufficient holdings of Bank of Canada notes in their vaults and tills to meet demand by their customers, and obtain them from the Bank of Canada by paying for them out of deposit accounts maintained at the Bank. They may also return excess notes in their possession for credit to their deposit accounts at the Bank of Canada. A chartered bank's holdings of Bank of Canada notes in its own tills, along with its deposit at the Bank of Canada, constitute the statutory cash reserve which it is required to maintain under the Bank Act.

NUMBER OF EUROPEAN STUDENTS WORKING IN CANADA

Question No. 2,684—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. How many European workers, students or others came to Canada during the years 1966-67-68-69 to work on fruit or tobacco farms in Ontario or other provinces under an agreement with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

2. (a) What were their nationalities (b) under what conditions did they work?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. European students have been admitted for employment on tobacco farms in Ontario under special arrangement with the Department of Manpower and Immigration. In the years 1966, 67 and 68, there were respectively 506, 1295 and 1174 students admitted for such work in Canada. In 1969, 802 European students were admitted for work on the tobacco harvest.

2. (a) Nationalities of students—British, French, German, Austrian, Dutch, Belgian. (b) Conditions of employment are the same as those for Canadian workers and students are paid the prevailing wage rates for the industry.

3. Figures are not available for students who came to work on fruit farms, as there is no formal program for this group of employers.

[Mr. Benson.]

[*English*]

ESTABLISHMENT OF WAGES INDEX

Question No. 2,687—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the advisability and/or feasibility of setting up a wages index along the lines of the consumer price index and, if so, will it be made retroactive in order to be more meaningful?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: In the Dominion Bureau of Statistics monthly publication "Man Hours and Hourly Earnings" (publication no. 72-003), Table 12 shows the average weekly wages for production workers in the manufacturing industry adjusted for changes in the consumer price index. This table also contains an index of weekly wages in the industry mentioned on a 1961 base. The same table is included in the monthly DBS publication "Prices and Price Indexes" (publication no. 62-002).

As the majority of production workers are located in manufacturing, there are no plans to extend the published data to other industries.

IMMIGRATION—ENTRY APPLICATIONS BY FOREIGN ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,689—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many applications have been received from members of the Armed Forces of other countries for permanent entry to Canada and how many have been received from each country for which an application was made?

2. How many have been (a) accepted (b) rejected (c) are still being considered?

3. Are aplications considered from applicants (a) within Canada (b) outside Canada and are they both given the same consideration and, if not, what is the difference in the consideration given?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1 and 2. Because an immigrant's membership in the armed services of another country has no bearing on his admissibility to Canada, information on this subject is not recorded on immigration documentation.

3. Applicants whether in Canada or outside who are eligible to apply for landed immigrant status under the Immigration Act and Regulations, must meet the same basic requirements in order to qualify for admission with one exception. Those applicants who are in Canada cannot obtain any units of assessment under the selection criteria for arranged employment. This exception applies to all applicants in Canada and is in accordance with paragraph 4 of Schedule A of the

Immigration Regulations as revised by Order in Council P.C. 1967-1616 with effect from October 1, 1967.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ORDER FOR OFFICERS' UNIFORMS

Question No. 2,691—**Mr. Hees:**

1. Was there an order placed in recent weeks for 14,000 or more officers' uniforms for the Department of National Defence?

2. If so, what was the name of the company which received the order?

3. Was the order placed after tenders had been called?

4. If so, what were the other firms or companies that were asked to tender on this order?

5. If the order was awarded without a call for tender, what was the reason?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Department of Supply and Services is concerned: 1. No.

2 to 5. Not applicable.

ASSISTANCE TO NEW BRUNSWICK FOR PARK DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,692—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the federal government granted assistance to New Brunswick under the ARDA program, for the purchase of land for park development?

2. If so, where are the parks for which land was acquired between April 1, 1963 and March 31, 1969?

3. During this period, what was the total expenditure on land acquisition and park development?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes.

2. Gloucester, Caraquet, Belledune, Val Comeau; Northumberland, Sandy Point; Kent, Jardine; Queens, Waterborough; Kings, Pine Grove; Charlotte, New River Beach.

3. Federal expenditure, $238,063.

[*English*]

NEW BRUNSWICK—SUBSIDIES TO COMPANIES BY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Question No. 2,693—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. What companies in the Province of New Brunswick have received financial aid under the Regional Development Agency's subsidy program since the inauguration of this program and what amount did each company receive?

2. What is the address of each company?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):

Questions

1. Name of Firm	Grant Paid	2. Address
Atlantic Business Forms Ltd.	$ 19,741.29	Dieppe
Crystal Beverages (1963) Ltd.	191,069.84	Moncton
Maritime Agencies Ltd.	7,687.70	Moncton
New Brunswick Wire Fence Co. Ltd.	22,503.08	Moncton
Hub Meat Packers Ltd.	45,929.07	Moncton
McCready Foods Ltd.	87,322.93	Sussex
Sussex Refrigerating Mfg. Co. Ltd.	24,447.09	Sussex
Craig's Machine Shop Ltd.	4,295.46	Hartland
Canadian Industries Ltd.	42,926.00	Hartland
Eagle Fisheries Div. of National Sea Products Ltd.	280,453.52	Shippegan
United Maritime Fishermen Ltd.	128,936.74	Lamèque
Restigouche Abattoir Ltd.	35,288.29	Campbellton
Caraquet Ice Co. Ltd.	25,669.25	Caraquet
The Anglo-British Columbia Packing Co. Ltd.	209,728.25	Caraquet
Industrial Cab Co. Ltd.	47,200.00	McAdam
Raoul Coutourier Lumber Ltd.	26,288.00	Edmundston
Bishop Sawmills Ltd.	46,413.92	Canaan Forks
Oscar Belanger Lumber Co. Ltd.	823.00	St. Arthur
Southampton Contractors Ltd.	22,070.00	Nackawic
Mason & Risch Ltd.	137,353.34	Woodstock
Long Fertilizers Ltd.	20,000.00	Clair
Highland Hardwoods Ltd.	52,141.60	Veneer Siding
Normandie Wines Ltd.	47,130.96	Scoudouc
Emile J. Bourque	6,822.46	Lower Cape Bald
Atlantic Industries (NB) Ltd.	81,357.66	Dorchester Cape
S. W. Bell Ltd.	41,250.63	Stickney
Charles V. Bartlett	4,473.89	St. Andrews
McCain Foods Ltd.—Carleton Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	304,221.54	Florenceville
Belledune Fertilizers Ltd.	2,602,855.17	Belledune Pt.
George Burchill & Sons (Plywood) Ltd.	163,181.54	South Nelson
British Canadian Pitwood Ltd.—Millerton Wood Products Ltd.	20,423.75	Newcastle
Nadeau Poultry Farms Ltd.	51,527.89	St. François
Salaison Gauvin Ltée	47,338.69	Paquetville
Christopher Mills Ltd.	37,841.00	Christopher Siding
Canadian Tuna Company	900,000.00	St. Stephen
TOTAL	$5,786,713.55	

STEPHENVILLE, NEWFOUNDLAND—ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES

Question No. 2,694—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What industrial enterprises in the Stephenville area, Newfoundland have received federal government assistance?

2. How much did each receive in the years 1968-69, 1967-68, 1966-67, 1965-66, 1964-65?

[Mr. Honey.]

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. As of July 15, 1969: West Coast Dairy Limited; Lundrigans Limited; Atlantic Brewing Co. Limited; Aluminum Co. of Canada Limited.

Questions

2.	1969-70	1968-69	1967-68
West Coast Dairy Limited	$ 1,531.00	Nil	$4,291.00
Lundrigans Limited	66,984.49	"	
Atlantic Brewing Co. Limited	170,682.38	"	
Aluminum Co. of Canada Limited	131,032.00	"	

No payments made prior to 1967-68.

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—PERFORMANCES HELD, COST OF PUBLICITY

Question No. 2,695—**Mr. Harding:**

1. What performances have been held at the National Arts Centre to date?

2. What was the expenditure on publicity in each case?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Arts Centre as follows:

1. Date	Performance	Number of Performance	Auditorium
June 2-5	National Ballet	6	Opera
3-7	Montreal's TNM, French Theatre	6	Theatre
6	Toronto Symphony	1	Opera
8	Gordon Lightfoot	1	Opera
4-7	Party Day (theatre)	5	Studio
4 & 5	Manitoba Consort (Music)	2	Salon
8 & 9	Orford Quartet (music)	2	Salon
9-14	Vancouver Playhouse (theatre)	8	Theatre
10-14	Studio-Opera (Orpheus)	6	Studio
10-12	Montreal Symphony	3	Opera
13	Monique Leyrac (singer)	1	Opera
14	Pop Electronic (variety)	1	Opera
13 & 14	Cassenti Players (music)	2	Salon
17-28	Charlottetown (Festival)		
	"Ann of Green Gables"	7	Opera
	"Johnny Belinda"	6	Opera
23-28	Underground Film Festival	6	Theatre
June 30 to July 5	Instantheatre	7	Theatre
3	Montreal Symphony	1	Opera
6	Duke Ellington (jazz)	1	Opera
7-12	Montreal's TNM (Fr. Theatre)	7	Theatre
8-18	Love & Maple Syrup (variety) (Held over after the 18th)	13	Studio
9	Juliette Greco (singer)	1	Opera
10	Montreal Symphony	1	Opera
14-19	Harry Belafonte (variety)	6	Opera

2. It has not been customary to require Crown Corporations to make public information of this kind, which in the case of the National Arts Centre would affect negotiations with impresarios and artists.

ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE—DISAPPROVAL OF PORTUGUESE POLICY

Question No. 2,697—**Mr. Nystrom:**

With reference to Question 2,599, has Canadian disapproval of Portuguese policy in Angola and Mozambique been expressed in the NATO council or any NATO meeting?

Questions

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As was noted in reply to question No. 2,599, the Canadian attitude towards Portuguese policy respecting Angola and Mozambique has been expressed at the United Nations General Assembly and directly through the Canadian Embassy in Lisbon, which we considered to be the appropriate channels. We have not raised the matter in the NATO Council or other NATO meetings.

DR. MARY WADDINGTON—EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,698—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development employ either on a part-time basis or a contract basis, Dr. Mary Waddington of London, England?

2. What duty was Dr. Waddington asked to undertake, and for how long?

3. What payments have been, or will be made to Dr. Waddington in the form of salary, *per diem* allowance, expenses, etc.?

4. Was an attempt made to engage anyone in Canada, particularly any Canadian Indian, to undertake the task assigned to Dr. Waddington?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Dr. Mary Waddington was employed by the Department on a contract basis.

2. Dr. Mary Waddington was hired on a two month contract to assist in designing and evaluating training programs for kindergarden teachers and Indian teacher aides sponsored by the Department in the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario. She was also asked to observe similar programs sponsored by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the United States.

3. Dr. Waddington was paid a contract salary of $334 per week for a period of 11 weeks.

4. No.

STUDY OF INDIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT

Question No. 2,699—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development engaged, on a contract basis, someone to do a study on Indian self-government?

2. Who is the person employed, what is his name, what are his qualifications and what payments will he receive?

3. If the person employed is not a Canadian, from what country does he come?

4. Was any attempt made to find a Canadian, and more particularly a Canadian Indian, qualified to do this kind of special study?

[Mr. Nystrom.]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. The Department has no knowledge of anyone who has been engaged to do a study on Indian self government.

2. Non Applicable.

3. Non Applicable.

4. Non Applicable.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—COMPLAINTS RESPECTING PROGRAM CHANGES

Question No. 2,700—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has the CBC at any time in the past received as many complaints about a program change as was the case with the Don Messer Show?

2. What program changes in CBC programming in the past have resulted in a strong public reaction, what were the names of the programs and on what dates were these programs cancelled?

3. Has the CBC ever reinstated a program previously cancelled as a result of public reaction?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Many programs and program changes have prompted strong favourable or unfavourable reaction. Over the years, there have been several instances in which strong reaction came as a result of cancellation of an established network series, such as the Don Messer program, but no complete list is available. Examples that come to mind are the cancellation of "Life is Worth Living", with Bishop Sheen, in 1957, and the decision not to renew contracts of the hosts of "This Hour Has Seven Days", in 1966.

3. No cancelled CBC network program has been reinstated as a result of public reaction alone. However, this factor is considered in arriving at various program decisions or reviewing program schedules.

LOCKHEAD L-1011—CONTRACTS AWARDED TO CANADIAN FIRMS

Question No. 2,701—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many contracts have been awarded to Canadian firms who work on the Lockheed L.1011 and what was the amount of each of the contracts awarded to Canadian firms?

2. Was Enamel and Heating Products Limited considered by the government for any of the contracts awarded firms in Canada and, if so, for what reason has any not received any of the work involved on this aircraft?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1 and 2. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has

provided the Lockheed Aircraft Company with advice, guidance and assistance on the placement of contracts with Canadian firms for the Lockheed L1011; however, the ultimate selection of Canadian sub-contractors and the awarding of contracts is the responsibility of the aircraft company itself.

The total number and value of all contracts is not known at this stage. However the initial value of major contracts awarded to date is estimated at approximately $58 million.

RADIO AND TELEVISION POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

Question No. 2,702—**Mr. Broadbent:**

With reference to the reply to Question No. 1,901, Part 1(b) and 2(b) for the period of time tapes or script are kept, for (a) CBC radio, and (b) CBC television, how many members of each political party have been interviewed on the National News?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows:

As stated in the reply to Question No. 1,901 no continuing record of individual news interviews is maintained. However, it has been possible to meet the original request to some extent through a review of scripts and tapes. In the case of English networks, total figures for the original six month period requested, October 1968-March, 1969, could be established but, in the case of French networks, totals for the same period could not be ascertained and have been tabulated for a more recent two-month period, May-June, 1969. As requested, the figures listed below refer to the number of members of parliament interviewed, and do not necessarily indicate the number of occasions on which each appeared.

Number of Members of Parliament Interviewed On CBC Network News Programs

English Radio Network		English TV Network	
(October, 1968-March, 1969)			
Liberal	76	Liberal	32
P.C.	35	P.C.	21
NDP	19	NDP	11
R. Cr.	4	R. Cr.	1
French Radio Network		**French TV Network**	
(May and June 1969)			
Liberal	14	Liberal	25
P.C.	2	P.C.	5
NDP	—	NDP	1
R. Cr.	2	R. Cr.	6

29180—739

Questions

AUTOMOBILE COMPANIES—NATURE OF INFORMATION SUPPLIED

Question No. 2,703—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. With reference to the reply to Question No. 2,587, what categories of confidential information are supplied by the automobile companies?

2. Without releasing specific numbers, what indicators were referred to to conclude Kaiser Jeep fully complied with the terms of the program in question?

3. What steps were taken to verify confidential information supplied to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce by the various business concerns it deals with?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Companies participating in the Automotive Program supply confidential reports to the Government on their activities related to the Automotive Program. The data in these reports relates to production, sales and trade. From this information the Government is able to determine the performance of the company relative to its commitments under the Automotive Program.

2. The indicators referred to in determining the performance of any company relative to its qualification requirements are Canadian value added in vehicle production the net sales value of Canadian vehicle production relative to the net sales value of vehicle sales in Canada and the growth of the value of Canadian sales.

3. In the case of confidential information supplied by vehicle producers participating in the Automotive Program, the Department of National Revenue conducts an audit of the company's records and reports for each production year and determines the performance of the company relative to its obligations.

TRAINING OF ITALIAN AIR CADETS

Question No. 2,704—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Has the Italian Government requested the Canadian Government to train Italian air cadets?

2. Has the Canadian Government agreed to such a proposal and what are the arrangements as to numbers, payment for training, etc.?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1 and 2. No. However, informal enquiries concerning the possibility of training academy pilots in Canada were made by the Military Attaché at the Italian Embassy in Ottawa in July. Thus far, no formal request has been made by the Italian Government concerning this subject.

Questions

NORANDA, ROUYN—CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROJECTS

Question No. 2,705—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What amount is the federal government contributing to the cost of constructing a new hospital in Noranda?

2. (a) Is the federal government subsidizing the construction of the "Maison Pie XII" home for the elderly in Rouyn and, if so, in what amount (b) is Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation granting a loan for the construction of this establishment and, if so, in what amount and at what rate of interest?

3. Is a large polytechnical school to be built in Rouyn and, if so (a) will the federal government contribute to the cost of this project (b) in what amount will this contribution be made under the terms of a federal-provincial agreement and what particular agreement?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. No project has been received requesting federal assistance towards the cost of constructing a new hospital in Noranda, P.Q., under the terms of the Hospital Construction Grant.

2. (a) No. (b) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has granted a loan to the Quebec Housing Corporation for the construction of "Maison Pie XII" in the amount of $730,071 at an interest rate of 6¾% per annum.

3. Not applicable.

INVESTIGATION OF MERITS OF METRIC SYSTEM

Question No. 2,706—**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):**

1. Is the government investigating the merits of the Metric System?

2. If not, are there any plans to do so?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The interdepartmental committee responsible for studying present, prospective and ultimate applicability of metric measurement in Canada has prepared a report which is being presented for the consideration of the government.

2. N/A.

*NATIONAL PARKS—LEBRETON FLATS, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,707—**Mr. Mather:**

Is the Government of Canada giving favourable consideration to the establishment of a national park at the LeBreton Flats area in Ottawa?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is no.

[Mr. Sharp.]

ACTIVITIES OF SOVIET VESSEL "TAJMYR"

Question No. 2,708—**Mr. Anderson:**

1. Has the Department of External Affairs recently been in touch with the Soviet Embassy concerning the activities of the Soviet vessel *Tajmyr*?

2. Has this vessel been challenged in recent weeks by Canadian Armed Forces vessels about her intentions on the B.C. Coast?

3. Has this vessel refused to answer such requests for information?

4. Was this vessel boarded by Canadian Government officials in Vancouver Harbour?

5. For how long has this vessel been under surveillance by Canadian Armed Forces units?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Department of National Defence as follows:

1. No.

2. No. The Soviet vessel TAJMYR conducted all operations outside the limits of Canadian territorial waters.

3. Not applicable.

4. Yes. All foreign vessels entering a Canadian port are subject to inspection by Customs and Immigration officials. In addition Department of Transport Radio Inspectors board foreign vessels upon request. In those cases where a diplomatic request for permission to visit a Canadian port has been received on behalf of a naval-associated ship, and has been approved, an officer of the Canadian Forces also goes on board.

5. Since June 1, 1969.

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY—EXPENDITURE ON RESEARCH

Question No. 2,709—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How much money does the federal government put into research in muscular dystrophy?

2. How, much by province, is made available for help to victims of muscular dystrophy and what is the formula?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No specific projects in the field of research in Muscular Dystrophy have been submitted to the Department of National Health and Welfare by the provinces or National Muscular Dystrophy Agencies.

2. Despite the fact that specifically designed projects have not been submitted by the provinces in support of muscular dystrophy victims, assistance is made available and rendered to the provinces for such purposes under a number of federal-provincial programs, such as the Medical Rehabilitation and

Crippled Children's Grant, the Child and Maternal Health Grant, and the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Program.

DIVORCE ACT—SEX OF PETITIONERS

Question No. 2,711—**Mr. McCleave:**

How many petitioners were male and how many female in the first year of the new Divorce Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): 14,309 male, 23,807 female.

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO WATER DIVERSION PROGRAM

Question No. 2,712—**Mr. Penner:**

1. What has been the total cost of a study entitled "A Proposed Water Diversion Program out of Northwestern Ontario into Lake Superior" presented in June 1964, and the six progress reports which have followed up to November, 1968?

2. How much has been spent on this study since November, 1968?

3. What amount of this sum was provided by the federal government and what amount came from the Province of Ontario?

4. Did any other group, organization or private concern make funds available for this study?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. The study entitled "A Proposed Water Diversion Program out of Northwestern Ontario into Lake Superior" presented in June 1964, was not prepared by this Department or by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. No copy of any study or report by this name and with this date is available in this Department.

The six progress reports are those of the co-ordinating Committee on Northwestern Ontario Water Resources studies established in accordance with announcements made by the Prime Ministers of Canada and Ontario in the latter part of 1965 indicating that studies of Ontario's natural water resources and related economic development would be undertaken by each Government; and that these studies would be co-ordinated by a committee representing the two Governments to avoid duplication of effort. Expenditures for the studies done by Canada which are referred to in the six progress reports mentioned in the Question are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Cost ($)
1966-67	147,000.
1967-68	616,000.
1968-69	755,000.
1969-70	685,000. (estimated)

2. Expenditure figures not broken down as at November 1968. See (1) above.

3. All sums referred to in (1) provided by the Federal Government. Ontario's expenditures on its investigations are not known.

4. No.

"MAN AND HIS WORLD"—DISPLAY PORTRAYING MONTREAL AIRPORT

Question No. 2,713—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What has been the total cost of the special display portraying the new Montreal International Airport at Sainte-Scholastique that has been established at "Man and his World"?

2 What will be the cost of maintaining this exhibition at "Man and his World"?

3. What has been the cost of the supporting ceremonies associated with the special display?

4. How many individuals will be directly involved in the showings at "Man and his World", what are their names, what work do they ordinarily carry out within the departments they are associated with and what salary does each receive?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): 1. The total cost of the New Montreal International Airport Exhibit at "Man and His World" has been $18,622.34.

2. The exhibit is being maintained without cost to the Department of Transport; maintenance and operation is being provided by the "Man and His World" organization.

3. Cost of the ceremony associated with the opening of the exhibit, insofar as the Department of Transport was concerned, was under $1,000.

4. No Department of Transport personnel are involved in the daliy showings at the "Man and His World" display. The presentation is self-explanatory; projectionists and hostesses are provided by the "Man and His World" organization.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—FEES PAID TO JOHN LENNON, YOKO ONO AND OTHERS

Question No. 2,714—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. What fees were paid by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono for their appearances on CBC television and/or CBC radio during the period May 20, 1969 to June 10, 1969?

2. What fees were paid to any other person in respect of the appearances of John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono on CBC television and/or CBC radio by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation during the period May 20 to June 10, 1969?

3. Did the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation contribute in any financial way in respect of the appearances of John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono on CBC television and/or CBC radio?

4. What are the full names and addresses of any party and/or parties receiving financial contributions from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

in respect of the appearances of John Lennon and/or Yoko Ono on CBC television and/or CBC radio?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1 and 2. Nil.

3. No.

4. Not applicable.

LEGAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES, P.E.I.—PAYMENTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,715—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. (a) What is the total amount which has been paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs in Prince Edward Island for legal services for each of the last five fiscal years (b) to whom were such fees paid and what is the total amount in each case?

2. (a) What is the total amount which has been paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs in Prince Edward Island for medical fees for each of the last five fiscal years (b) to whom were such fees paid and what is the total amount in each case?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. (a) 1964-65, $9,474.31; 1965-66, $7,879.89; 1966-67, $7,995.60; 1967-68, $10,187.49; 1968-69, $8,323.40.

(b) F. A. Large, $15,715.39; G. B. MacDonald, $19,052.38; J. B. Nicholson, $9,092.92.

2. (a) 1964-65, $40,010; 1965-66, $43,699; 1966-67, $60,893; 1967-68, $50,857; 1968-69, $45,722.

(b) Dr. M. N. Beck, $15,360; Dr. M. L. Bonnell, $17,784; Dr. W. E. Callahan, $2,240; Dr. L. S. Cox, $16,716; Dr. R. D. Drysdale, $40,140; Dr. E. M. Found, $6,690; Dr. S. Hellmich, $2,258; Dr. G. G. Houston, $27,708; Dr. T. A. Laidlaw, $16,716; Dr. J. B. Lantz, $18,460; Dr. A. A. MacLeod, $9,937; Dr. F. A. MacMillan, $16,716; Dr. M. J. Putnam, $16,716; Dr. G. E. Robinson, $2,544; Dr. J. C. Sinnott, $23,880; Dr. J. C. Theriault, $3,104; Dr. F. W. Tidmarsh, $4,212.

Note: In answer 2. (a) and (b), amounts under $2,000 are not available.

MINISTER OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES—POSITION IN RELATION TO PSSRB

Question No. 2,716—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Was the Hon. James A. Richardson appointed Minister through whom the Public Service Staff Relations Board reports to Parliament, in order that the Minister reporting for this Board not be a Minister involved as a disputant in any grievance?

2. Now that the Hon. James A. Richardson has assumed departmental responsibilities, is it the intention of the government to make another Minister responsible for reporting on behalf of the PSSRB?

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

CANADA—WIDE POSTAL CODE—CONTRACT TO DESIGN

Question No. 2,719—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. When was Samson Belair Riddell Stead Inc. awarded the contract to recommend a design for a Canada-wide postal code?

2. When is the final report regarding this postal system expected?

3. How much is it anticipated this study will cost?

4. Is the report to be tabled when completed?

5. Will the zone codes now in use in Toronto and Vancouver be studied by this group?

6. Will the codes recently established in these cities be retained in a new national code system?

7. What other cities will have their present codes retained?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. July 7, 1969.

2. Near the end of 1969.

3. Approximately $63,500.

4. Consideration will be given to tabling this report when it is received.

5, 6, 7. Yes, the terms of reference of the study call for consideration of the present postal zone numbering system. In the design of any national postal code for Canada, full consideration will be given to integrating present postal zone designators.

POST OFFICE—SUBSIDIES TO PERIODICALS

Question No. 2,720—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is the Post Office considering a program of subsidies or other aid to periodicals seriously affected by reclassification and/or raises in postal rates?

2. Is the Post Office specifically extending aid to *Le Devoir* and/or *L'Evangeline* as was suggested as being needed by the Postmaster General on May 22, 1969, during the television program "Tirez au Clair"?

3. Are there two or three English language newspapers being considered for assistance, following on the Postmaster General's suggestions in this regard during the same television program and, if so, what are the names of these newspapers?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

PERIODICALS—ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 2,721—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is the Secretary of State considering a programme of subsidies or other aid to periodicals seriously affected by reclassification and/or raises in postal rates?

2. Is the Secretary of State specifically extending aid to *Le Devoir* and/or *L'Evangeline* as was suggested as being needed by the Postmaster General on May 22, 1969, during the television programme *Tirez au Clair*?

3. Are there two or three English language newspapers being considered for assistance, following on the Postmaster General's suggestions in this regard during the same television programme and, if so, what are the names of these newspapers?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

PUBLICATIONS GRANTED SECOND CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,722—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many of the publications listed in the answer to Question 2,311 of the honourable Member for Wellington have since been granted second class mailing privileges?

2. Before the granting of second class privileges, what was the name and publisher of each of these publications and what is now the name and publisher in each of these cases?

3. Which of these publications were granted second class privileges by virtue of the fact that they are now published by private interests which are eligible for second class privileges, but were formerly published by associations ineligible for these privileges?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned:

1. Twenty six.

2. List attached.

3. Canadian Boy.

Title	Publisher Before Registration	After Registration
Humanist in Canada	Pacific Northwest Humanist Publications	Same
The Grain Grower	United Grain Growers Ltd.	Same
Ontario Report	Canada Law Book	Same
Bible Deliverance Fellowship	Theodore Ruud	Same
The Northern Beacon	K. D. Campbell	Same
Student's Letter	Millar Memorial Bible Institute	Same
Liste Loi Lacombe	J. C. Lussier	Same
Liste Actions Judicaires	J. C. Lussier	Same
Open Bible Bulletin	New Brunswick Bible Institute Inc.	Same
Full Gospel Bible Institute Bulletin	Full Gospel Bible Institute	Same
Rivers of Living Water	Nipawin Bible Institute	Same
Out of the Storm	The Yonge Street Mission	Same
Dimes on the March	Rehabilitation Foundation for the Disabled	Same
The New Life	Rev. Dr. and Mrs. Frank Uhlir	Same
V.I. Catholic News	Mr. E. J. Flynn	Same
Dominion Outreach	Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada	Same
Philippines	The Brothers of the Sacred Heart	Same
Maritime Messenger	Maritime Christian College	Same
Le Nouveau Progrès	Le Progrès du Comté de Terrebonne Inc.	Same
Reflection	United Church of Canada	Same
Ontario Naturalist	Federation of Ontario Naturalists	Same
The Young Naturalist	Federation of Ontario Naturalists	Same
The John Howard Society of B.C. Newsletter	John Howard Society of B.C.	Same
Le Naturaliste	Les Cercles des Jeunes Naturalistes	Same
Educational A.B.C.'s of Industry	Educational A.B.C.'s of Canadian Industry	Same
Canadian Boy	Boy Scouts of Canada	Canyouth Publications Ltd.

BROADCAST BY CBC OF POEM DEDICATED TO CHE GUEVARRA

Question No. 2,723—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Was the poem dedicated to Che Guevarra and written by Michele Garnot broadcast by CBC Radio as a part of Sunday Supplement under the title "Che" on July 20, 1969?

2. Was the same poem featured in Sunday Supplement on January 26, 1969?

3. If so, what is the reason for this double exposure?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. A poem entitled "Che", concerning Che Guevara and written by Michel Garneau was broadcast by Sunday Supplement July 20, 1969.

2. Yes.

3. Many outstanding items are rebroadcast in order to effect summer budgetary economies. This poem was one of the most favourably received of all the items broadcast in the program since it began in October, 1968.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CONSULTANT STUDIES—GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Question No. 1,323—**Mr. Skoberg**—Supplementary

1. For the fiscal years 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69, what outside consultant studies have been undertaken or are presently in progress sponsored by the following Departments and Agencies (a) Agriculture (b) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (c) Consumer and Corporate Affairs (d) Defence Production (e) Energy, Mines and Resources (f) External Affairs (g) Fisheries (h) Forestry and Rural Development (i) Indian Affairs and Northern Development (j) Justice (k) Labour (l) Manpower and Immigration (m) National Defence (n) National Health and Welfare (o) National Revenue (p) Post Office (q) Prime Minister's Office (r) Privy Council Office (s) Secretary of State (t) Solicitor General (u) Trade and Commerce (v) Transport (w) Treasury Board (x) Veterans Affairs?

2. What was the cost for each outside consultant study prepared for each department and agency and were the contracts from each department or agency awarded by competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—ASSISTANCE TO GROUPS IN CANADA

Question No. 1,662—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

[Mr. Kierans.]

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

LEGISLATION—USE OF OUTSIDE ADVISERS

Question No. 1,989—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. On which bills introduced or to be introduced in this session has the government organized committees of outside advisors to consult on the bill prior to its introduction in the House?

2. On which bills introduced or to be introduced were outside experts paid expenses or honoraria or fees for consultations prior to the introduction of said bills in the House?

3. In each case, what are the names, addresses and occupations of those consulted?

4. What was the amount in honoraria, expenses or fees paid to each individual consulted?

Return tabled.

MILITARY AID TO PORTUGAL, THE NETHERLANDS, GREECE

Question No. 1,990—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. For each year from 1960 through 1968, what is the amount of military aid supplied to (a) Portugal (b) the Netherlands (c) Greece?

2. Has the Government of Canada sold, arranged or approved the sale of military materiel to (a) Portugal (b) the Netherlands (c) Greece and, what is the amount of these sales to each country for each year from 1960 to 1968?

Return tabled.

EXPROPRIATIONS OF LAND BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 2,045—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many acres of land have been expropriated by the federal government during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive in each of the provinces and territories of Canada?

2. What was the cost of such acquisitions of land in each province and territory of Canada for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE—PROVISION OF SUBSIDIES

Question No. 2,090—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

DEFENCE RESEARCH BOARD—CONTRACTS AWARDED TO R.C.A. VICTOR

Question No. 2,171—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Who are the present members of the Defence Research Board?

2. What criteria was used in the selection of members of the Board who are not government officials?

3. Is Mr. J. D. Houlding, President of R.C.A. Victor, a member of the Defence Research Board?

4. For the fiscal years 1962-3, 1963-4, 1964-5, 1965-6, 1966-7, and 1968-9, how many D.N.D. contracts and the respective expenditures, were undertaken by R.C.A. Victor and for what purposes?

5. For each of the above contracts, was there any competitive tendering and, if so, what were the names of the tendering firms?

6. If not, for what reason?

CONTRACTS AWARDED BY DEPARTMENTS OF FORESTRY AND ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Question No. 2,180—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Since January 1, 1964, what persons have been awarded contracts for consulting or professional services to the Department of Forestry and Rural Development or the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

2. (a) What were the purposes of these contracts (b) for what length of time were these contracts (c) at what cost (d) were some contracts renewed, extended or modified, and (e) which ones?

3. What contracts are presently in operation and when is it expected they will be completed?

Return tabled.

ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,271—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What specific anti-poverty programs have been in effect since 1963?

2. When were they instituted?

3. What amount of money was expended?

4. Who were the senior staff people responsible for these programs?

5. Have these programs been continued and, if not, for what reason and which ones have been discontinued?

6. What steps are presently being considered with regard to anti-poverty programs?

Return tabled.

INFORMATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Question No. 2,273—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State provide an information service and, if so, what is the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

ATLANTIC PROVINCES——ASSISTANCE FOR RESEARCH FACILITIES

Question No. 2,275—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What research facilities or activity did the Atlantic Development Board assist in 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969?

2. What research facilities or activity has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion assisted or contemplates assisting?

3. What applications are currently pending for research facilities or assistance in the Atlantic provinces?

Return tabled.

INFORMATION SERVICE—INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 2,291—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 2,307—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many students were employed by the federal government in all departments during the summer months for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many students will be provided with summer jobs during the year 1969 with all departments of the federal government?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 2,343—**Mr. Beaudoin:**—Supplementary

1. What is the number of international organizations to which Canada belongs?

2. What is the annual cost to Canada for participation in each of these organizations?

Return tabled.

TASK FORCES APPPOINTED

Question No. 2,349—**Mr. Burton:**

1. What is the name of each Task Force or body with equivalent status to a Task Force appointed by the government since June 25, 1968?

2. With respect to each such Task Force or equivalent body (a) on what date was it appointed (b) what is the name of the Chairman and other members (c) what are its terms of reference (d) has it reported to the government and, if so, on what date was the report submitted (e) if the report has been submitted, has it been made public and on what date was it made public?

Return tabled.

INFORMATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 2,351—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Labour provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

TRADE AND COMMERCE ADVISORY GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY COMMITTEES

Question No. 2,390—**Mr. Rose:**

1. What are the terms of reference and functions of each advisory government-industry committee established by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

2. Who are the members of each advisory committee and what criteria was used in the selection of each member of the respective committee?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Robinson.]

CANADA LABOUR CODE—REQUESTS FOR DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION

Question No. 2,393—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. What Canadian employers have requested a delay in implementation of the Canada Labour Code as it affects their enterprises?

2. What reasons have such employers advanced in support of their requests for extensions of the time allowed for implementation?

3. Have all such requests been granted?

4. If not, what are the names of the employers whose requests have been refused?

Return tabled.

COST OF FRED PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,395—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What FRED programs are presently in effect?

2. When was each agreement signed?

3. What is the general purpose in terms of each plan?

4. Over what period of time will they be in effect?

5. What amount of federal money is committed?

6. What amount of provincial money is committed?

7. When will each of these plans be up for renegotiation?

8. How much has already been expended by the federal government and by provincial governments?

9. What machinery exists for evaluating the effectiveness of the various FRED programs?

Return tabled.

SHARED-COST PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,400—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many shared-cost programs does the federal government contribute to with the provinces?

2. When did the shared-cost programs start?

3. How much has been paid per year under shared-cost programs since the inception of each program?

4. What is the total estimated federal contribution to shared-cost programs for 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972 and 1973?

Return tabled.

AREA DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Question No. 2,417—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. (a) How much money has been spent on and by the Area Development Agency to date (b) how many new jobs were created as a result of aid by the Agency (c) what was the average salary of the jobs created (d) what are the present positions of the senior officers of the Agency, as well as their salaries, both present and while they were with the Agency?

2. (a) Which firms received aid from the Area Development Agency (b) how much financial aid was received by each (c) how many new jobs were created by each?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NUMBER AND COST

Question No. 2,421—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many Crown corporations are there in Canada?

2. How many of them have a monopoly?

3. How many are self-supporting?

4. What was the subsidy, if any, paid to each Crown corporation during each of the years 1960 to 1968 inclusive?

Return tabled.

CONSULTANT FIRMS—NUMBER AND COST OF THOSE RETAINED

Question No. 2,452—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. During each of the last three years, which management consultant firms were retained by the government or its agencies?

2. What were the terms of reference of each of these firms and what was the remuneration in each case?

3. Of these management consultant firms retained during the past three years, which were American owned; and does the government give preference to Canadian firms and, if so, in what manner?

4. What was the duration of each of the contracts awarded to each such firm?

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD—NAMES OF FIRMS ASSISTED

Question No. 2,490—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. At what date was the Adjustment Assistance Board created to provide federal financing for the automotive industry?

2. Who have been the members of that Board?

3. Which firms have obtained financial assistance from the Board and on what terms?

4. Which firms were in default on their income tax payments for 1968 to the collective amount of over $80 million?

5. Have any of these defaulting firms been granted assistance for 1969 and, if so, which and in what amounts?

INFORMATION SERVICE—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 2,503—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Veterans Affairs provide an information service and, if so, what was the cost for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How many publications and/or periodicals and/or information sheets and/or public releases were provided by the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive and what was the cost for each publication for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How many copies of each publication are provided and to whom are they distributed and how is the distribution effected?

Return tabled.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITIONS—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION

Question No. 2,522—**Mr. Robinson:**

What international expositions or exhibitions does Canada enter yearly, including trade fairs and where is each located and what is the cost to the government for each such exhibition, exposition or trade fair?

Return tabled.

POST OFFICE—APPLICATIONS FOR SECOND CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

Question No. 2,590—**Mr. Baldwin:**

1. How many applications for second-class mailing privileges have been received by the Postmaster General?

2. (a) How many such applications have been rejected or denied (b) who or what are they?

3. Have the $15 fees accompanying the rejected applications been retained in all cases?

4. (a) Have refunds been made in some cases (b) if so, for what reason?

Return tabled.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—TECHNICAL SERVICES BRANCH

Question No. 2,593—**Mr. Orlikow:**

With reference to the information contained in the reply to Question No. 1,984 (May 7, 1969) Sections 2-(a) and 2-(c), the following additional facts are sought (a) what is the age of Mr. E. W. Wallace; what degrees, if any; what diplomas, if any, does he hold from recognized universities; when were these obtained; what positions (including where and for how long) has Mr. Wallace held in the USA and in other countries (b) was Mr. Wallace the first or original American citizen among the six of eleven professional people in the Physical Planning Division (c) what was the date on which each of these Americans were hired by the government (d) what are the names, ages, degrees held, diplomas held, teaching posts held, working posts held, and present classification rating of the other five Americans in this Division (e) are there any reasons for such a concentration of Americans in one specific area of employment in view of the fact that as of 1969 there is an opportunity to hire Canadians trained in landscape architecture in Canada?

Return tabled.

NUMBER AND COST OF AIRCRAFT AVAILABLE TO CABINET MINISTERS

Question No. 2,632—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many aircraft are presently available to the Prime Minister and members of his Cabinet, what types of aircraft are a part of this fleet, what was the total mileage logged in the last fiscal year and what was the expenditure for maintaining and operating these aircraft in the last fiscal year?

2. How many trips have been undertaken by these aircraft in the present fiscal year to date, what has been the total mileage logged to date,

how many times has the Prime Minister used the aircraft in the present fiscal year and what has been the total mileage?

3. How many Cabinet Ministers have made use of the aircraft in the present fiscal year, what are the names of the Ministers, how many times has each used the aircraft and what was the destination of the Minister in each instance?

4. Has the Prime Minister or any of the members of his cabinet used any of the government aircraft at any time for personal reasons and, if so, what ministers and on what dates and in each instance, what was the destination of the aircraft and the estimated cost in each case?

Return tabled.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL—SUBMISSIONS IN OPPOSITION

Question No. 2,634—**Mr. Coates:**

How many submissions were received by the Prime Minister and/or the Secretary of State, in opposition to Bill C-120 and what were the names of the individuals or organizations who presented the submissions in question?

Return tabled.

APPOINTMENTS TO COURTS, 1960-69

Question No. 2,640—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many appointments have been made to the Supreme Court of Canada in each of the years 1960 to 1969 inclusive and from which province did each come?

2. How many appointments have been made to each county and superior court of each province for each of the years 1960-69 inclusive?

3. Were any appointments to the county and/or Supreme Court of any province appointed from outside that province and, if so, from what province was the appointment made?

Return tabled.

HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S-ST. BARBE—PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 2,662—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What projects are being undertaken by the Department of Public Works in the District of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and what are the projects (a) being investigated (b) approved (c) for which are tenders being prepared (d) for which tenders have been accepted, who are the successful tenderers and the amounts?

2. What are the expected completion dates of approved projects?

Return tabled.

PUBLICATIONS—LANGUAGES OF PRINTING

Question No. 2,664—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. In how many different languages and in what different languages are government and/or departmental publications printed?

[Mr. Coates.]

2. What is the cost of translating the publications into languages other than French or English?

3. Where are the translated publications circulated and for what purpose?

Return tabled.

SPACE PROGRAMS—UTILIZATION OF CANADIAN SCIENTISTS

Question No. 2,670—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. Since 1960, and for each of the subsequent years, how many Canadian Scientists immigrated to the United States to work for the American Government in the development of space programs?

2. Since 1960, and for each of the subsequent years, how many Canadian Scientists were working for Canadian corporations whose operations are related to American space programs?

3. How many Canadian Scientists are working in space research for the Canadian Government in conjunction with American space program authorities?

4. Have Canadian Scientists made any discoveries which would contribute to the development of American space programs (a) in the United States (b) in Canada.

Return tabled.

PURCHASE OF CLEANING SUPPLIES FOR EASTERN TOWNSHIPS POST OFFICES

Question No. 2,681—**Mr. Rondeau:**

From which retail or other companies does the Department of Supply and Services, acting on behalf of the Public Works and Post Office Departments, "purchase cleaning and maintenance supplies for post offices in the Bois-Francs, Eastern Townships and Montreal areas, and what procedure does it follow in selecting such suppliers?

Return tabled.

STUDY OR INVESTIGATING BOARDS APPOINTED SINCE 1950

Question No. 2,685—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. How many study or investigating boards and commissions were appointed by the Canadian Government since 1950?

2. (*a*) What was the cost of each such commission (*b*) what were these commissions and what were the names of the members of each?

Return tabled.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD—TRANSLATION OF AND REMUNERATION FROM FILMS

Question No. 2,688—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the federal government provide a translation service for documentary films produced by the National Film Board?

2. In what countries are National Film Board films shown?

3. What remuneration was received from the showing of National Film Board films outside Canada in each of the years 1960 to 1968 inclusive, in (a) USA (b) United Kingdom (c) France (d) other English-speaking countries (e) other French-speaking countries (f) other countries?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN COMMERCIAL CORPORATION—MILITARY AND NON-MILITARY SALES

Question No. 2,696—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 2,375, by country, what was the value of non-military sales in which the Canadian Commercial Corporation was involved for the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968?

2. What was the value of military sales, by country, in which the Corporation was involved during 1966?

3. What types of weapons and what quantities were involved in the sales to the Netherlands and to West Germany for each of the years 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968?

4. If Portugal was a purchaser operating through the Corporation for any of the years above of either military or non-military material, what specific commodities were involved and in what quantity?

Return tabled.

DIVORCE ACT PETITIONS

Question No. 2,710—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many divorce petitions presented in the first six months under the new Divorce Act have been decided, by province?

2. How many petitions were presented in the first year under the new Divorce Act, by province?

3. What grounds were alleged in the petitions presented during the first year, by province?

Return tabled.

W. S. MARTIN—POSITION HELD AND GRIEVANCES ADJUDICATED

Question No. 2,717—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. (a) When was W. S. Martin appointed Chief Adjudicator for the Public Service Staff Relations Board (b) when did his term as Chief Adjudicator end?

2. What position does W. S. Martin now hold with the Public Service Staff Relations Board?

3. (a) In what capacity did W. S. Martin adjudicate the grievances of The Council of Postal Unions against the Treasury Board (b) when did W. S. Martin complete work on this adjudication report (c) when was the report submitted to the Public Service Staff Relations Board?

4. What is signified by "date of decision" as used on the cover page of this report?

5. In what capacity did W. S. Martin adjudicate the grievances of A. Southern against Treasury Board and the grievances of Gomez, Coppock, Levins, Beauchamp, Levesque against Treasury Board?

6. When was work completed on each of these reports and when did W. S. Martin submit each of these reports to the PSSRB?

Return tabled.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the members who have posed the remaining questions on the order paper have either indicated their wish that they be withdrawn or have agreed to do so.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that questions 1,706, 2,057, 2,568, 2,575, 2,668, 2,690 and 2,718 are to be withdrawn. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 179, 203, 217, 225, 254, 264, 266, 268, and 269 are acceptable to the government.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that notices of motion Nos. 179, 203, 217, 225, 254, 264, 266, 268 and 269 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN APPEAL PROCEDURES

Motion No. 179—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all appeal procedures established by the Provinces made pursuant to the Canada Assistance Plan.

Motion agreed to.

SUBMISSION TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY

Motion No. 203—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the studies referred to by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in their submission to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, Wednesday, April 23, 1969, appearing on pages 4929-4932 and pages 5003-5008, of the Committee Proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—PLANT REJECT IN TASU SOUND

Motion No. 217—**Mr. Rose:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Wesfrod Mines Limited regarding the dumping of cobbling plant reject and mill tailings in Tasu Sound, adjacent to Moresby Island, Queen Charlotte District, B.C.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

BOROUGH OF YORK, ONT.—LAND SALES

Motion No. 225—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between Levy Industries Limited and the Government of Canada regarding the sale of lands in the Borough of York, Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

TELESAT CANADA—PLANS OF FREQUENCIES AND LOCATION OF INSTALLATIONS

Motion No. 254—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

That an Order of the House do issue for plans of frequencies and locations of installations for use of Telesat Canada referred to on pp. 161-162 of the Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

Motion agreed to.

DRUG PRICES

Motion No. 263—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and provincial governments regarding the subject of drug prices.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 263 is acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential documents and to the authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the conditions mentioned by the minister, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt motion No. 263?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

DUMPING OF ACID INTO HAMILTON BAY

Motion No. 264—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the investigation report on the dumping of 150,000 gallons of acid into Hamilton Bay by the Steel Company of Canada mentioned by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources as reported in *Hansard*, July 15, 1969 on page 11269.

Motion agreed to.

LOAN OF AIRCRAFT TO CANADAIR

Motion No. 266—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Order-in-Council passed during June 1969, under the Financial Administration Act, the loan of one CL-41 Tutor Aircraft and one CF-104 Starfighter to Canadair for Aerospace Exhibits Limited.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Rose.]

ANGOLA, MOZAMBIQUE—STATEMENT DISAPPROVING PORTUGUESE POLICY

Motion No. 268—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the Canadian Government's statement of disapproval of Portuguese policy in Angola and Mozambique referred to in the answer to Question No. 2,599.

Motion agreed to.

ORDER IN COUNCIL AUTHORIZING MEMBER TO VISIT SWEDEN

Motion No. 269—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Order-in-Council passed during June 1969, authorizing C. L. Caccia, M.P. to visit Sweden to study their manpower policies.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 139, 152, 176, 178, 189, 197, 200, 201, 204, 221, 222, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262 and 270?

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

Motion No. 139—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Cabinet Directive on summer employment for students referred to by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his Press Release of April 30, 1969.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a cabinet directive is a cabinet document. It has always been the position of this House that cabinet documents would not be included among those documents covered by motions for the production of papers. I would hope, therefore, that the hon. member would be agreeable to withdrawing the motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I do not agree to such a decision, Mr. Speaker, but I will carry this motion over to the next session.

Mr. Speaker: Dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REPORTS FROM MRS. CLAIRE CULHANE

Motion No. 152—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence and reports with the Prime Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Canadian International Development Agency from Mrs. Claire Culhane with respect to her observations concerning Canada's involvement in foreign aid to Vietnam.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, some of the correspondence referred to I believe has been shown to the hon. member, and I am not quite certain whether he is prepared to withdraw his motion.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have had no documentation shown to me yet by the officials that would persuade me that this motion should not go forward, but in view of the fact that this is the last day of this session I am prepared to bring it on again at the earliest possible moment in the next session.

• (2:40 p.m.)

PUBLIC WORKS OUTSIDE CONSULTANT STUDIES

Motion No. 176—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all agreements and arrangements on consultant fees negotiated between the Government of Canada and the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada and provincial associations of the Professional Engineers of Canada as mentioned in reply to Question No. 1,256, Tabled on May 14, 1969.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the arrangement to which this motion makes reference has to do with an undertaking on the part of my department to adhere substantially to provincial professional fees. The agreement to do so was made verbally. There is no written agreement whatsoever and I therefore ask the hon. member if he would consent to withdrawing this motion.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree. Therefore I will raise this matter again in the next session.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We must assume that the motion has been dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

QUEEN ELIZABETH II TELESCOPE

Motion No. 178—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Committee Report, headed by Dr. D. C. Rose, on the Queen Elizabeth II telescope, presented to the government in August, 1968.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Rose report is a confidential report sponsored by the Science Secretariat, in its role as part of the Privy Council Office, at the request of the government. It is under active study at the present time and consideration will be given to making the report public at a later date. In these circumstances I wonder if the hon. member would withdraw his motion?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, since today is the last day of the present session I agree to having the motion withdrawn. May I tell the Parliamentary Secretary that I will re-introduce my motion early next week since I do not believe the government has the right to keep such reports confidential.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REPORT ON PENSIONS OF RETIRED PUBLIC SERVANTS

Motion No. 189—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the special committee on increasing the pensions of retired public servants referred to by the President of the Treasury Board in his speech on May 8, 1969, to the Canadian Pension Conference, and noted in *Hansard* on May 16, 1969, at page 8782.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the President of the Treasury Board on May 8, the report of the special committee referred to in his speech deals with costs and benefits involved in the whole of the social security system, including the issue of pensions of retired public servants. This report forms the basis of reappraisal of government policy in this area and as such it is part of the internal function of government and not in the public interest to be released.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Walker: In view of this, perhaps the hon. member would be agreeable to withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, because I believe it to be in the public interest to have this report I shall introduce this motion again in the new session.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING POLLUTION AT LONG HARBOUR

Motion No. 197—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Fisheries and Dr. L. Dickie of the Bedford Institute of Oceanography regarding potential pollution of Long Harbour, Newfoundland.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I move this order on behalf of the hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, there is no correspondence on file between the Department of Fisheries and Dr. L. Dickie. In view of this fact it would be a nil return and I wonder if the hon. member would, therefore, be prepared to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REPORT BY DR. R. W. TRITES RESPECTING LONG HARBOUR AREA

Motion No. 200—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report by Dr. R. W. Trites of the Bedford Institute of Oceanography for the Department of Fisheries regarding the Long Harbour area, Newfoundland.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move this motion on behalf of the hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the report referred to in this motion is an internal working paper prepared by a member of the staff for use by department officers. Such documents are traditionally privileged and not tabled. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Kootenay West would like to introduce this motion again in the next session.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING POLLUTION OF B.C. WATERS

Motion No. 201—**Mr. Rose:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and pulp mills in British Columbia regarding the pollution of B.C. waters and the pollution guidelines of the Department.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, it is the view of the government that the tabling of this correspondence would seriously affect the confidence and effective relationships between the department and the companies in question. Frank discussions between the parties would be inhibited and the successful relationships established between the department and the pulp mills seriously hampered. In view of this fact we should like to request that the motion be withdrawn.

[Mr. Harding.]

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I find the grounds for refusal unacceptable in view of the minister's recent statement supporting greater access to public information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Motion No. 201 is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING ELECTRIC REDUCTION COMPANY PLANT

Motion No. 204—**Mr. Carter:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada or any of its representatives and the Government of the Province of Newfoundland, the Bedford Institute of Oceanography and the Electric Reduction Company relating to the establishment of the Electric Reduction Company's Plant in Long Harbour, Newfoundland.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the correspondence requested in this motion which can be produced has already been approved by the acceptance of motions Nos. 198 and 199. In view of this fact I would suggest that the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE IN UNDER-DEVELOPED AREAS

Motion No. 221—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies or reports, etc., undertaken by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the subject of the effects of technological change in less developed areas of Canada.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has not undertaken any studies such as are requested by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion dropped?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

GROWTH CENTRES IN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Motion No. 222—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies or reports, etc., undertaken by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the subject of growth centers in less developed areas of Canada.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this motion is the same as the one for the previous motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): So is mine, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This motion is also dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

WINNIPEG—DISPOSITION OF AIR CANADA OVERHAUL BASE

Motion No. 227—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Contract or Agreement between Air Canada and Northwest Industries, regarding disposition of the Air Canada Overhaul Base in Winnipeg, including the contract showing purchase price, agreement as to future employment of present Air Canada employees, etc.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada reports to me that the agreements and contracts between Air Canada and CAE Aircraft Limited are considered to be proprietary documents between two commercial corporations and therefore should not be released.

In answer to the motion I would be pleased to file a short listing provided by Air Canada containing a summary of the provisions for the employees, both permanent and temporary, together with other pertinent information, if it is agreeable to the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I will accept that for now but I give notice that I will introduce a similar motion early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the conditions and reservations expressed by the minister is it agreed that motion No. 227 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

RAINBOW TROUT FARMING

Motion No. 228—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the cost-benefit study on rainbow trout farming referred to by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry in the June 23 press release of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, notes prepared for the use of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry when announcing the construction of the new Freshwater Research Institute in Winnipeg on June 23, 1969, referred to "other possible methods of commercial trout rearing" which "justify experimentation." To date no cost-benefit analysis of these alternative fisheries has been completed. Since there is no conclusive study or final report available on these "other possible methods of commercial trout rearing", the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REVIEW OF CANADA-U.S. AUTOMOTIVE PACT

Motion No. 230—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the review at the end of 1968 of the Canada-U.S. Automotive Pact referred to by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in his statement before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on June 17, 1969.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that only one paper in the form of a press release was prepared as a result of the review referred to in this motion. This paper, outlining the results of the review, was tabled on September 16, 1968, and I would refer the hon. member to pages 39 and 40 of the House of Commons Debates. In light of this I wonder if the hon. member would be agreeable to withdrawing his motion.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

IRON ORE—HANNA MINING CORRESPONDENCE

Motion No. 231—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid

before this House a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States regarding the Iron Ore Company of Canada and its parent company Hanna Mining Company of Cleveland.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Winnipeg North first raised this matter it was an oral question that was directed, I believe, to the Minister of Finance. Your Honour suggested that the hon. member should put it on the order paper. On that there now appears a notice of motion for the production of papers which involves correspondence between the Canadian government and the United States government. It would have been possible to answer the original question but I now have to obtain the acquiescence of the United States government, and that is being sought.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member agree that the motion might be dropped for the time being.

Mr. Orlikow: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

FEDERAL WORKING PAPER ON REGIONAL DISPARITY

Motion No. 232—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the federal government's working paper dealing with constitutional aspects of regional disparities in Canada presented at the recent federal-provincial constitutional conference in June 1969.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the paper to which the motion refers was in the nature of a preliminary consideration of some aspects only of the subject of regional disparities and reviewed certain positions of the federal government which have been revealed in white papers published on the occasion of the several Constitutional Conferences. The government's over-all approach to the subject of regional disparities is still being examined and will be discussed in the future with the provinces. For that reason it would not be helpful nor proper to table at this time the preliminary statement made at the private session of the Constitutional Conference in June, and I would ask that the hon. member withdraw his motion under these circumstances.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Agreed, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to the final statement.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

PRIME MINISTER—SCIENCE COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

Motion No. 233—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the November 4, 1968 letter by the Prime Minister of Canada to the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada as mentioned in the Third Annual Report of the Science Council.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the letter from the Prime Minister to the chairman of the Science Council of Canada is part of the internal functions of the government and not in the public interest to be released. In view of the long established principle of the House that such documents are privileged, perhaps the hon. member would be agreeable to withdrawing his motion.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Broadbent: Agreed today, but this matter will be raised again next week.

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS CONSULTANT STUDIES

Motion No. 234—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all outside consultant studies undertaken for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1,323, tabled on June 25, 1969, as reported in *Hansard* on page 10597.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this notice of motion for the production of papers and the 18 which follow are all related to a number of consultants studies which were identified in an Order for Return tabled in response to a question. To grant this motion and the other 18 motions would involve the tabling of 1,188 consultant studies, or literally thousands of pages of documents. In the circumstances I wonder whether the hon. member would be prepared to withdraw his motions and be prepared in the new session to indicate the specific reports he would like to see. We could then consider whether they could be tabled.

Mr. Skoberg: I am sure we would not want the individual reports as such to be tabled, but we must have the reports which are available to the public. I deplore this type of governmental secrecy and ask Your Honour to put this notice of motion to the vote.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Skoberg) which was negatived on the following division:

• (3:00 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Bell
Benjamin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu
Carter
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Dumont
Fairweather
Flemming
Fortin
Gleave
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harkness
Hees
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Valade
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—68.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Buchanan
Cadieux
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Otto
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Éthier
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gervais
Givens
Goode
Gray
Greene
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harries
Hellyer
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Lachance
Pelletier
Pepin
Pilon
Portelance
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—119.

• (3:20 p.m.)

AGRICULTURE CONSULTANT STUDIES

Motion No. 235—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all outside consultant studies undertaken for the Department of Agriculture as mentioned in answer to question No. 1,323, tabled on June 25, 1969, as reported in *Hansard* on page 10597.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion and the succeeding 17 relate to the 1,184 remaining consultant studies. In the light of the decision which has just been taken, might we have agreement that these 18 motions be dropped?

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, this is a small price to pay for democracy, but in view of the time element today I agree to drop these motions and re-introduce them during the next session of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Motions 235 to 262 inclusive are dropped.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, you just mentioned going as far as motion No. 262. Are there not some motions other than those of the hon. member for Moose Jaw which should be called, for example, 258, 259, 260 and 261? With respect, I think Your Honour went too far when you went to 262.

Motions for Papers

Mr. Speaker: I will now call No. 261.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I move it on behalf of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding).

NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE

Motion No. 261—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies, briefs and correspondence submitted to or prepared by the Government of Canada in relation to North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA).

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am informed there are no studies or briefs and there is no correspondence relating to North American Water and Power Alliance. Under the circumstances, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I guess I have no alternative.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

NEWFOUNDLAND—REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION STUDIES

Motion No. 258—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies and reports, etc., undertaken by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the Province of Newfoundland.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has not undertaken any studies such as are requested by the hon. member.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ARMED FORCES VOTERS, HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S-ST. BARBE

Motion No. 259—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a list of the names of all members of the Canadian Armed Forces who were entitled to vote in the Armed Forces Vote for nominated candidates for the District of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe during the Federal Election of June 25, 1968; the present military address of these personnel and the listed Newfoundland address of these personnel.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) that a list of the type referred to by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe in this motion is not required under the Canadian Forces Voting Rules, Schedule II to the Canada Elections Act. Lists are only prepared and provided where authorized by virtue of the Canadian Forces Voting Rules. Under these circumstances, it is requested that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

WATER DIVERSION STUDY, NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Motion No. 260—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the study "A Proposed Water Diversion Program out of North Western Ontario into Lake Superior" dated June 25, 1964, and all the progress reports which have followed this study.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in response to the request contained in the hon. member's motion, I must advise that the June 25, 1964 report to which he refers does not appear to be available in the department. If the hon. member could advise what agency prepared this report I shall endeavour to have a copy obtained for further consideration of his request.

With regard to the progress reports which the hon. member has requested, I do not consider it would be in the public interest to table these at this time. They simply report progress achieved on certain elements of this co-ordinated investigation and study. Some of these elements could be misinterpreted if they were considered separately, without regard to the over-all scope of the study—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. parliamentary secretary that the statement he is making now should not be in the form of an answer to the motion proposed by the hon. member. He should indicate as briefly as possible, on behalf of the government, whether he is prepared to answer the motion or whether he wishes it dropped.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. In the light of what I have said, I would ask the hon. member if he is prepared to withdraw his motion at this time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will draw the remarks of the parliamentary secretary to the attention of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) when he returns from the NATO parliamentary conference at Brussels.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

NORTHERN CANADA TOUR BY UNITED STATES GROUP

Motion No. 262—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, or memoranda in relation to the tour of Northern Canada by a group of sixty-eight Americans including Senator Frank Moss in the month of June, 1969.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that a search of departmental files has revealed that there exists no correspondence within the purview of this motion. The motion is, therefore, not acceptable to the government and it is hoped that the hon. member might wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

COMBINES—EXCLUSION OF SERVICE INDUSTRIES FROM ACT

Motion No. 270—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Combines Investigation Branch and forwarded to the Economic Council regarding the implications of the exclusion of service industries from the Combines Investigation Act.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the study referred to in this motion was prepared for internal use in the department and was passed to the staff of the Economic Council of Canada to assist the Council in the reference by the government to the Council for a report on competition policy. It is considered to be a privileged document and in view of this I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining motions, if any, be stood.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

SOCIAL SECURITY

INCREASED PENSIONS TO MEET COST OF LIVING

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the government decided to take any immediate action to relate old age security and other pension payments more appropriately to the real increase in the cost of living which has been at the rate of about 5 per cent for the past several years and which has increased already this year by 3.5 per cent?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No immediate action is contemplated.

Mr. Stanfield: Is the government reconsidering the 2 per cent ceiling on cost of living adjustments under the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act? If so, when may we expect a decision to be made with regard to these matters in view of the fact that pensioners who depend on this income seem to be steadily losing ground in competition with the cost of living.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, this is part and parcel of the over-all review of which he is aware. When the government has come to a decision on policy matters of this kind it will be announced in the house.

Mr. Stanfield: I have one further supplementary question. Does the hon. minister think these people can exist on government reviews?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is argumentative.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if I may address it to the Prime Minister. In view of the problems facing all our older and retired people, the old age pensioners, the retired civil servants, veterans on the war veterans allowance and so on, can we expect action to increase the pensions of these people early in the new session?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the hon. member has simply reiterated the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the previous question had to do with only one phase, namely the 2 per cent cost of living bonus. I am asking about a general increase in pensions across the board.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The program for the next session will be announced in the Speech from the Throne and subsequent speeches. Therefore I suggest that the hon. member is a little premature with his question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—INQUIRY AS TO SPECIAL WINTER PROGRAM

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Having regard to the fact that the seasonal unemployment figure is the highest since 1963, is the government contemplating any special program to alleviate unemployment this winter when unemployment is usually higher than at any other time of the year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for a reaction from the Prices and Incomes Commission which has been faced with a new position by the labour unions. We will see if we have to have other policies to combat inflation which will do it in a way that will not increase unemployment.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the unemployment problem is already here, may I ask the Prime Minister whether any information has been conveyed to either the provincial governments or the municipalities, to the effect that the government intends to introduce an improved and adapted winter works program in the coming months.

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member knows, the winter works program has been replaced by a much more productive and useful program, that of manpower retraining, and we do not want to go back to old programs.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPLY TO PROTEST RESPECTING VISIT OF JEAN DE LIPKOWSKI

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister. Could he tell us if he has received an answer to the note of protest he has sent to the French government with regard to the famous Lipkowski affair?

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

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Could the Prime Minister tell us if communications have been exchanged between himself and the government of Quebec in that connection?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

TRADE

WHEAT—CONTRACT WITH U.S.S.R.—FUTURE SALES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt. It has to do of course with the assumption of his new responsibilities—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —in connection with wheat with which I hope he will be more successful than with some of the other responsibilities that have fallen on him recently. I should like to ask him whether he is in a position to advise us on the present situation relative to the 135 million bushels of wheat which were comprised within the three year contract that terminated in July. Have any final arrangements been made respecting the terms, the price, etc. for these 135 million bushels, and when is a meeting expected between the authorities in Canada and the food authorities in the U.S.S.R. concerning not only the 135 million bushels but also future sales of wheat to that country?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I believe the right hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that when the foreign minister of the Soviet Union was in Canada he made a very positive response in connection with the negotiations which were to be undertaken relative to the past and future contracts for wheat between our two countries. It has not been the practice in the past, and I do not intend that it should be my practice in the future, to discuss in public negotiations which are under way or about to be undertaken. This is not the best way to negotiate. Therefore, I will not talk about specific details until these negotiations are completed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I then pass on to the minister the fact that the meeting is to take place in about six weeks time. He does not know anything about it yet, it seems.

WHEAT—MOVEMENT THROUGH PORT OF VANCOUVER

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour a

question relative to the same subject matter of grain. Is the strike in Vancouver over yet and can he assure the house, as he has assured the public through the newspapers, that grain is moving unhampered through Canadian ports?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): As I promised, the grain is and has been moving. I know from questions previously raised by the hon. gentleman that he shares my belief that the problem of grain is a national one.

In so far as the strike itself is concerned, unfortunately the collective agreement was not ratified by the membership. However, may I say in a more positive vein that I understand the point of dissension so far as the membership is concerned is not centred on the monetary issue but rather on certain clauses concerning working conditions, and I am hopeful that these can be ironed out in the next few days.

Mr. Woolliams: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Labour could intimate to the house whether it is the new labour policy to move certain commodities and not others.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, judging from the attitude of the hon. gentleman just before the house recessed he, more than any other person, emphasized the necessity of moving grain in this country—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression that the question was in some way argumentative. The reply is of the same nature. I think that we should go on to a further supplementary question.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES—ACTION BY GOVERNMENT

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the unequivocal refusal by the CLC and the CNTU, announced last Friday, to co-operate in any way with management and government in establishing voluntary guidelines as urged by the Prices and Incomes Commission, will the minister advise the house what alternative action the government will propose as a substitute for its apparent failure in its fight against inflation?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the question he is asking, although very important, is one which invites a statement of a general nature which normally should be made on motions, and I doubt that hon. members would want to return to motions at this time.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION—POSITION OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a related question to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister, who referred to the situation a few moments ago, tell the House whether there have been any discussions between him or any other member of the government and Dr. Young about his continuation as head of the Prices and Incomes Commission? Is he going to return to his post at the University of British Columbia, a position which is still held open for him?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that the question was put in an improper form.

[*Translation*]

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION—CANCELLATION OF PRESS CONFERENCE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The Prices and Incomes Commission was supposed to hold this morning a press conference which was cancelled or postponed. I should like to know whether the postponement of that press conference is due to the statements made by the labour leaders on the price freeze as a means to fight inflation, and whether the Commission had been instructed by the minister not to comment on that matter.

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have only read the morning newspapers from which I gather that the press conference was cancelled without comment. I do not think it is related to the factors to which the hon. member referred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is scheduled to hold a national conference next December, can the minister give us the assurance that this conference will take place on that date?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the question is so urgent as to be put at this time. I

have doubts in that respect. However, if the minister is ready to answer, I have no serious objections to it.

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: As I understand it, that was the plan announced by the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission. If there is any change, since this is an independent commission, any announcement would have to come from the commission.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS—TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I should like to address my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having in mind the recent massive underground nuclear tests conducted by the Soviet Union and the United States, the latter being of particular concern to many British Columbians, can the minister undertake to make an early report on what Canada is doing to expedite the signing of a test ban treaty?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Canada has been very active in its discussions to try to bring about a comprehensive test ban and is of course on record to that effect in the general assembly and the Geneva committee on disarmament. The main problem is how to identify violations of an underground test ban. We will be sponsoring a motion at the current General Assembly calling for all member states to submit lists of their seismological monitoring facilities, together with assurances that they will promptly supply data to help verify whether or not a seismic event is an earthquake or an underground nuclear test.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister whether the question of nuclear testing has been one of the subjects discussed by the Government of Canada with representatives of the government of Peking at Stockholm, and whether any mention was made in those discussions of the high-level nuclear testing that has taken place in recent weeks in China?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the general purpose of our negotiations at Stockholm is to get into a position where we can have these kinds of discussions with a government that represents so many millions of people.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST FRENCH NETWORK PERSONNEL

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): I should like to put a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

In view of his recent statements concerning the CBC in which he seemed to speek of a factual situation, can he tell us what specific steps he intends to take to throw light on this matter and substantiate his accusations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As far as the truth of the matter is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I was relying in part, on what the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) said repeatedly during the last session, and also on what has been said by members of all parties in the house.

With regard to specific steps, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any at the present time; I have confidence in the management of the CBC. I feel that, for the time being, I should rely on them, trusting that they will live up to their responsibilities. If they are not successful, the question becomes hypothetical, and the government will have to consider some other action.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister made serious charges against the CBC and that the latter is answerable to parliament, can he say whether he intends to bring this question before the house or one of the committees?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the committee already exists and if its members express the wish to look into this matter, I will be very happy to hear their request. But members of the Ralliement Créditiste sit on that committee and as I said, the most violent charges brought against the CBC came from them. I feel therefore that they must know their diagnosis better than I do.

[*English*]

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Right Hon. Prime Minister's suggestion that the government might deal with separatist propaganda broadcast by the CBC, I am wondering if the Prime Minister has any similar plans to deal with the overwhelmingly heavy percentage of propaganda broadcast by

the CBC favourable to states such as the Soviet Union and China as opposed to the United States?

Mr. Trudeau: I have no such plan in mind, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that Mr. Davidson has intimated, in a statement, that he would not take into account what the Prime Minister has said and that he would carry on with the planning of CBC programs as he thinks best, does the Prime Minister intend to take any action against Mr. Davidson who was appointed by the present government?

Mr. Trudeau: I have no inclination to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I should be pleased to receive representations from hon. members in that connection, if they feel that I should do it.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RESERVE FORCES—CONSULTATION WITH DEFENCE ASSOCIATIONS RESPECTING STRENGTH

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Since the minister made his statement with regard to reductions in the Armed Forces of Canada, both regular and militia, a little over a month ago, has he had consultation with the defence associations in connection with the strength and organization of our militia forces in the future? If so, can he indicate when he will be in a position to make a statement to the House as to what the future organization of our militia will be?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we had many consultations with the defence associations, the last one being held on Monday of this week in the conference room at the Defence Department. It was a very fruitful meeting. I am sure that eventually we are going to produce a plan to which we both agree, but this of course will depend on many circumstances. However, I think there is hope that within three weeks to one month this matter will be finalized.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PUBLIC SERVICE

METHOD OF REDUCTION OF PERSONNEL

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. In carrying out the government's plan to reduce the Civil Service by 25,000 has the government given consideration to allowing the normal attrition of 10½ per cent per year to do the job in one year and four months, as it would do, instead of dismissing a large number of people who are senior in years and who must retire on inadequate pensions because they will be unable to find other jobs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of consideration has been given to that. The figure of 25,000, as has been abundantly explained, is one which comprises those who would be released by attrition, plus those positions that would not be filled and for which there has been establishment, as well as those who would be dismissed. The figure of 25,000 comprises all these classes.

Mr. Hees: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I take it that it is the government's plan not to fire any civil servants but to allow attrition alone to look after the lessening of the numbers of civil servants, something which the Prime Minister and the government have expressed their intention of doing?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister explain to the country just what the hell he intends to do?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Benson: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

BEEF

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PRICES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the statement made yesterday by the Ontario Minister of Agriculture that retailers are not passing on to the consumers the recent reductions in the producer price of beef, will the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs initiate a full investigation into beef prices as I urged as far back as June 16?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my officials are obtaining a copy of the report mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario.

Mrs. MacInnis: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may we have some indication when that report will be available to this House?

Mr. Basford: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a report published by a provincial government and I am trying to obtain a copy of it. I will now try to obtain two copies, one for the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ISRAELI-ARAB HOSTILITIES—PROMOTION OF CEASEFIRE

Mr. Georges C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question relating to the conflict between Israel and the Arab world.

In view of the speech delivered by the Secretary of State for External Affairs before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 29 last, and in the light of the recent statement of the Prime Minister of Israel as to the lack of UN authority, what steps does the hon. minister intend to take to promote a cease-fire in that conflict?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of establishing a ceasefire; it is a matter of respecting a ceasefire that has already been agreed upon. On behalf of the Canadian government, I have been urging the parties to this dispute to observe the ceasefire and avoid the forays and raids which are causing so much loss of life and property.

POLLUTION

CO-ORDINATION OF CONTROL EFFORTS IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It arises from the announcement of a $30 million federal-state program in the United States to cope with pollution in the Great Lakes, the Arctic and other waters. Has his department been in consultation with United States officials to see that Canadian efforts are co-ordinated in international waters?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, my department is in continuing consultation with U.S. authorities under the aegis of the International Joint Commission. I do not know of any specific negotiations that are going on in connection with this particular program that was announced by the Vice-President of the United States on Saturday last. But I certainly believe there will be some under the aegis of our continuing negotiations with the United States in this regard.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question may I ask the minister whether his department is considering a similar type of program for Canada, that is a federal-provincial co-ordinated effort?

Mr. Greene: Well, Mr. Speaker, during the summer recess the government announced its position papers in respect of the proposed Canada Water Act, and there has been continuing negotiation with the provinces on the subject matter of those position papers. It is our belief that the Canada Water Act will achieve the objectives that are envisaged in the presidential program announced in the United States, and in fact our's is a program that will be even better suited to the problem of fighting water pollution in Canada.

SHIPBUILDING

EXTENSION TO OTHER VESSELS OF STEEL SHIP CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport who, I am pleased to note, has removed himself from the leadership fiasco in his native province. In view of mounting unemployment in our shipyards in Atlantic Canada, is the government giving any consideration to making the present 35 per cent subsidy payable on the construction of steel ships applicable to ships constructed of other substances such as wood, fibreglass or ferrous concrete?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have also removed myself from the shipbuilding subsidy responsibility and questions on this matter should now be directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I presume the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce heard my question. Perhaps he would be permitted to answer.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. May I ask the minister if it is true that there has been a delay in the departmental investigation on this subject and if so, what is the reason for the delay?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I am not aware there has been a delay, Mr. Speaker. I received a report yesterday, and I saw an article in the paper confirming it, that the inquiry was going quite well.

HISTORIC SITES

THREATENED DEMOLITION OF SIR ROBERT BORDEN'S RESIDENCE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister concerning the threatened demolition of Clansmere, the long-time residence of Sir Robert Borden, one of his illustrious predecessors. Can he advise if the government is taking any steps to preserve this historic house for the people of Canada whom Sir Robert served so well?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure the destruction is imminent or that the question is urgent, but in view of the fact this is the end of the session and it is difficult to suggest that the matter be debated at ten o'clock tonight, the question might be allowed.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will undertake it will not be done before the next session.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and ask him whether the position of chairman of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, which has been vacant for some months, has been filled? If not, when we may expect such an appointment?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet succeeded in finding someone to replace Mr. Fullerton, which is not an easy thing to do, but I hope to be in a position to find somebody who could fill that difficult position in the near future.

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MONTREAL—MURRAY HILL LIMOUSINE SERVICE

Mr. Raymond Rock (Lachine): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport and I hope he does not remove himself from this question too. Has the Minister of Transport anything to report regarding the serious problems involving the Murray Hill limousine service at Dorval airport?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): There is a pun there but I will resist it. It is my intention, immediately the new session begins, to raise this entire matter of transport at airports in Canada with the parliamentary Committee on Transport and Communications.

DRUGS

ALLEGED INEFFECTIVENESS OF PRESCRIPTION PRODUCT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Last July I asked the minister whether he would consider making a statement on motions based on a study released by the United States Food and Drug Directorate which showed that large numbers of prescription drugs were ineffective. Did the minister give consideration to the statement?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to make a full statement on this matter. I intend to do so on motions at the first opportunity.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

RECOGNITION OF ARCTIC WATERS AS CANADIAN TERRITORY

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can the minister tell us whether some action has been taken since the Manhattan has sailed in Northern waters, with a view to having such waters recognized as Canadian territory?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I expect that this matter will be the subject of some discussion at the next session.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government now settled its anxieties and vague doubts and is it in a position to make a definitive statement as to sovereignty in Arctic waters and resources on the continental shelf, as well as the extent of the continental shelf north of the Arctic coast?

Mr. Sharp: This will be discussed in the coming session. I think the government has a pretty clear idea of the extent of our sovereignty in the north, but I hope the opposition is not confused.

Mr. Stanfield: We are not thinking about it; we have known for some time.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER ALLOCATION OF MONEY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. May I ask how soon he will be in a position to make a statement to the effect that the Cape Breton Development Corporation will receive a further allocation of money?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): I do not understand the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): For clarification to the minister, may I explain that the monies allocated to Devco, as they call it, are rapidly being depleted and as a result their work will be curtailed.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I will answer the question during the next session.

[*Translation*]

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Fernand-E. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State a question about the Company of Young Canadians. Since the problem is urgent and of national importance, could the minister suggest a possible date for the establishment of the committee he mentioned in his statement and inform the house about its terms of reference?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): This will be done as soon as possible in the course of the next session, Mr. Speaker. As for the terms of reference they are still to be set in a specific way.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CHURCHILL, MAN.—ACTION TO ASSIST DISPLACED WORKERS

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker. In view of the decisions of this government and of the United States government to reduce sharply the work being carried on at the National Research Council range at Churchill, Manitoba, and in view of the statements by local spokesmen concerning the drastic effect this action will have on the economy and the entire future of Churchill, what action is the government planning to assist those displaced as a result of this decision?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great regret that the NASA authorities, National Aeronautical Space Administration of the United States, have not found themselves, for budgetary reasons, able to continue the rocket research at Churchill. The National Research Council, however, will continue on its own, and on a reduced scale, the rocket investigation which has been conducted. With a view to causing as little local dislocation as possible, a study is now under way by the personnel of the National Research Council and the Department of Public Works to see how this can best be arranged.

Mr. Simpson: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the President of the Treasury Board say if any consideration is being given by this government to asking the NASA authorities for further consultation before a final decision is made?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the news to which the hon. gentleman referred emanated from an almost five-day discussion with NASA at which an endeavour was made to get them to continue.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the National Research Coun-

cil to continue to operate the NASA tracking station at St. John's Newfoundland, which has also been closed down?

Mr. Drury: No, Mr. Speaker. This was a station being operated by Canada on behalf of NASA as part of a total world space program. Since this station was built by NASA, they concluded that, for budgetary reasons and because the fall-out of scientific information from that particular station had reduced very considerably, they no longer wished it kept open.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question on this matter for the Minister of National Defence. Is his department giving consideration to re-activating Churchill as a military base in order to take up this slack and also to meet the demands he mentioned in his statement a month ago for greater military presence in the north?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, to the specific question of whether we are contemplating the re-opening of the base at Churchill, unfortunately my answer has to be no, at the present time. In answer to the other question about the Canadian presence in the north, I may say this matter will have to be studied with more precision by the task force that we are forming. I hope it will make some recommendations to the Minister in the near future so that we can better determine where the facility should be based in the north.

Mr. Baldwin: Why not send the *Bonaventure* up there?

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must advise hon. members that we are running short of time. Other hon. members are anxious to ask questions and perhaps we might go on with some others and, if there is time, return to the question asked by the hon. member for Churchill.

MONTREAL—SMITH REPORT—REQUEST FOR ACTION

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question about an important matter to direct to the Minister of Labour. Since the operations of the Port of Montreal were almost brought to a standstill on October 21 because of a dispute between truckers and longshoremen, what action is the minister contemplating to bring this dispute to an end and assure the free movement of goods through the port? May I also ask if the minister has received the Smith report which has to do with an inquiry into labour unrest at the Port of Montreal? When will this report be tabled? May I also thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me at last.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the labour unrest to which the hon. member has referred, and which brought the Port of Montreal to a halt yesterday, has been rectified and that the port returned to normal operations this morning. However, I should not want to mislead the House by saying there are no serious problems involving labour unrest in Montreal. I received the Smith report on October 2. There is now a translation. I hope the report can be the basis of action that will once and for all rid the Port of Montreal and, indeed, other ports in this country of many causes of labour unrest.

TRADE

SASKATCHEWAN—JURISDICTION TO ISSUE POTASH EXPORT PERMITS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. May I ask, in view of the announcement by the government of Saskatchewan of its intention to institute minimum prices or price controls and disposal programs with respect to potash for export, and the obvious conflict of interest that arises in these two areas between provincial and federal jurisdictions, whether there was any consultation on this matter between the federal authorities and the government of Saskatchewan? If there was, has the federal government given permission to the government of Saskatchewan to issue export permits, or is it just looking the other way?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, there was plenty of consultation. The obvious possible conflicts were brought to the attention of the Premier of Saskatchewan; they were ones having to do with legality, feasibility, economic desirability, and so on. The premier is going ahead with his program. It is difficult, before we know exactly how it will look, to pass judgment on it. I, therefore, reserve my

judgment. I will not pre-judge the sort of program he will come up with, but he is very much aware of the pitfalls.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUBVENTIONS FOR TRANSPORT OF FEED GRAIN

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Could he tell us by how many millions the subsidies granted for the transportation of feed grain in western Canada and in British Columbia will be reduced?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the subsidy on feed grains to eastern Canada and British Columbia will not be reduced in the current year. Indeed, the subsidies will be increased from $21.5 million to $22.5 million. There is such an increased volume of grain moving from the prairie area to both eastern and western Canada that it is necessary to reduce the rates as well, to keep this matter within budget limitations.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

SUDBURY, ONT.—SUGGESTED ACTION BY MINISTER IN NICKEL STRIKE

Mr. Gaétan J. Serré (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Since the miners' strike in the Sudbury area has been going on for more than three months, as the nickel market has substantially decreased inside and outside this country, as thousands of families find themselves in a more and more precarious condition, and also as the unemployed are calling for the federal government's intervention in this conflict, on account of the provincial mediator's failure to bring both parties to an understanding, is it the intention of the minister to make representations to the responsible authorities so as to bring this conflict to an end?

[*English*]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I say from the outset that this naturally is a provincial matter. I wish to reassure the hon. gentleman that the provincial mediator in the dispute, Mr. Dickie, is considered one of the most respected and talented mediators in the country and I am sure he is capable of bringing this dispute to an end. I understand talks will be resuming in a day or two. In any event, the Minister of Labour has enough federal problems on his plate without becoming involved in provincial disputes.

HOUSING

BUILDING SOCIETIES—REQUEST FOR INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance which has to do with the recent announcement by the government of Ontario that it is showing interest in building societies. These, I understand, will perhaps make more money available for mortgages. Could the minister advise us whether the government has been in contact with the government of Ontario about this matter and, in particular, whether the matter of the granting of income tax concessions was discussed, since this would help with respect to the formation and operation of such societies?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there has been no direct consultation between myself and the government of the province of Ontario. The only information I have received in this regard has come through the press and from my colleague, the minister in charge of housing, who said that he heard something about this. Perhaps the Ontario minister with responsibility in this field would like to meet with me at some time in the future.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—SUGGESTED NATO PRESSURE TO OBTAIN PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have desperately been trying to ask a question about the political situation in Greece, although I expect it could wait until the next session. I wonder how Canada responded to the appeal of the political committee of the North Atlantic Assembly last week when the suggestion was made that NATO should place concerted pressure on the government of Greece within the NATO council with a view to a rapid return to free elections, parliamentary democracy and the rule of law in that unfortunate country.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that has been the view of the Canadian government throughout. We do not believe that Greece

should be thrown out of the NATO alliance because of the nature of its present government when we are all trying to help restore democracy in that country.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which, I suppose, could wait until the next session; but it will save time then if I ask it now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Since the question period has expired, it seems to me that questions that can wait until the next session might very well be asked within the next few days. With the consent of the House, we might take another minute to recognize a few of the hon. members in the back benches who have not had an opportunity to ask questions.

AIRPORTS

REGINA—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SALE OF PROPERTY TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the urgency of reaching a settlement of negotiations between the city of Regina and the government of Canada on the sale of airport property to the federal government, can the minister indicate what progress is being made in these negotiations?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that the Mayor of Regina is coming here and that I am to meet with him at ten o'clock on Friday morning.

HIGHWAYS

EASTERN PROVINCES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON COST SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, since my question involves the Departments of Transport and Regional and Economic Expansion, perhaps I might direct it to the Prime Minister. Would he, as soon as possible in the new session, indicate what cost sharing arrangement with regard to highway construction will be offered to eastern Canadian provinces?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is asking for a statement to be made in the new session. Perhaps the question might be asked again then.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL PARKS

NEWFOUNDLAND—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING BONNE BAY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I gave him notice of it. Could he advise us if the government of Newfoundland has indicated it is willing to turn over the land for the establishment of a national park in the Bonne Bay area? Could he also advise us of the present status of negotiations between the two levels of government?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. Negotiations are being carried on in a regular way.

[*English*]

FINANCE

DATE OF PRESENTATION OF WHITE PAPER ON TAXATION

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance? Can he tell the House when he will present the government's white paper on taxation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on November 7 at 6 p.m. I will table it in the House, with the consent of the House.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CLINTON, ONT.—REQUEST FOR NORMAL MAINTENANCE OF BASE

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Speaker. In view of the announcement that the Canadian Forces Base at Clinton is to be phased out by September, 1971, would the minister give us an assurance that the normal maintenance service, such as the painting of houses, will continue to be carried out up to that time?

Since I may not have an opportunity to put a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask a further question at this point. Would the minister consider initiating, and paying for, a feasibility study by a private concern so that such a study could be made available to potential buyers who may take over this

place after 1971? Can the minister give an assurance, also, that nothing will be removed from the base—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): First, I can give the hon. member an assurance that the base will be kept in good shape and good order until we vacate it on the date the hon. member has quoted. As far as a feasibility study is concerned, it has been our experience that working with the provincial organizations, which specialize in problems of this nature, we have been quite successful. Instead of my department paying for a feasibility study, it is my suggestion that perhaps the provincial authorities who are concerned with these problems might wish to talk to us about it. They would be welcome to do so. I am sorry, but I did not hear the last part of the question.

Mr. McKinley: It is very short, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member indicates he has a short supplementary question. At the same time there are a number of other hon. members who would like to ask questions, and I suggest we have for some minutes, now, gone beyond the hour reserved for oral questions.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Government House, Ottawa
October 17, 1969

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable John R. Cartwright, P.C., M.C., Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 4.45 p.m. on Wednesday, October 22nd, for the purpose of proroguing the First Session of the Twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

Louis-Frémont Trudeau,
Brigadier General
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

PRIVILEGE

MR. McGRATH—OMISSION FROM TRANSPORT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I am rising on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to direct a question to the chairman of the transport committee, the hon. member for LaSalle, but since he is no longer in the House, and since I failed to catch Your Honour's eye, perhaps I could raise the matter now in the form of a question of privilege. It has to do with the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications which was presented in the House this day. My question arises from the fact that this report does not contain the unanimous recommendation of the transport committee, which met on Monday last, October 20, in accordance with which the committee decided to recommend to the House that the House extend its order of reference to the committee, permitting it, or instructing it, to make a study of the transportation problems of the Atlantic provinces and, more particularly, of those relating to Labrador and the north shore of Quebec.

The report of the committee presented today contains only a part of that recommendation. Unfortunately, as this is the last day of the session I am not in a position to move a motion—otherwise I would do so—to refer this matter to the appropriate committee in order to find out why the instructions of the transport committee were not carried out.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I am not familiar with the report or with its contents but I have had discussions with various members of the committee and I understand that the verbatim transcript of the committee's proceedings was not prepared in time for the committee to complete its final report. I indicated that to the extent I could give such an assurance we would establish a new order of reference in the new session in order that the subject matters referred to by the hon. member could be considered by the committee. The committee could then complete its report. I am glad to repeat this assurance, given privately, in public.

I wonder if I might suggest to Your Honour that we suspend this sitting until the call of the bell.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The house will accordingly suspend its sitting until the call of the bell at 4.45 p.m.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 4.45 p.m.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

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

Whereupon the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the first session of the twenty-eighth parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:
Members of the House of Commons:

The first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament was noteworthy both for the importance of the measures carried into law, and for the preparations set under way for further action in this Parliament.

Canadians were saddened during this session by the death of a distinguished and much respected former Governor General, Field Marshal The Right Honourable The Earl Alexander of Tunis. His gallant leadership in war and his devoted public service in peace won His Lordship the respect and affection of all Canadians.

Appreciative of the need for the effective administration of our public affairs, you approved far-reaching changes in the organization of the Government and its departments, and procedures by which each of the chambers of Parliament discharges its public duties. The Departments of Regional Economic Expansion, Communications, and Supply and Services were established. The rules of the House of Commons have undergone fundamental reform so that the Members of that chamber may undertake a more profound scrutiny of public affairs. Research assistance was provided to the leaders of the Opposition parties to enable them to better discharge their vital responsibilities.

Amongst the most important legislative contributions to the preservation of Canadian unity were steps taken to reduce inequalities of language rights and economic opportunities. The Official Languages Act recognized the right of Canadians to deal with federal government institutions in French or English. To combat regional economic disparities, you sanctioned the creation of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the enactment of the Regional Development Incentives Act.

During the session, the Government re-convened the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference to consider changes which a century of experience and the challenges of our time demand in our basic constitutional structures. Wide ranging proposals for constitutional reform continued to be studied by heads of governments and by their official representatives.

In pursuance of its objectives of justice and equality, the Government proposed a policy within which Canada's Indian peoples might overcome the discrimination, economic, legal and social, under which they have long suffered.

The Government has, as a result of its review of external and defence policies, undertaken fresh departures in foreign policy. It decided to re-align Canadian forces within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Negotiations were commenced with representatives of the People's Republic of China with the aim of establishing formal diplomatic relations with that government. Discussions between Canada and the Holy See resulted in the decision to exchange representation at the ambassadorial level. Canadian ministerial missions visited Japan and Latin America to explore possibilities of increased trade, investment and closer co-operation.

The Prime Minister attended the Conference in London of Commonwealth Prime Ministers and visited Washington at the invitation of the President of the United States. He and his colleagues received a number of leaders of other countries, including the Presidents of Niger and Tanzania; the Prime Ministers of Barbados, Lesotho, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand; the Foreign Ministers of the United Arab Republic, Belgium, Israel, Germany, Britain, Dahomey, Gabon, the Soviet Union, Italy and Burma; and the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and NATO.

Inflation continues to threaten the economy. Through fiscal and monetary policies, the establishment of a Prices and Incomes Commission, and strict control of its own expenditures, the Government is attempting to reduce the upward pressure on prices. Continued care by the Government and matching concern at other levels of government and in the private economy will be necessary, however, to contain cost and price increases within the limits of increased productivity.

The Canadian dollar has remained strong during a period of uncertainty in world foreign exchange markets. As one step toward the establishment of a larger liquidity base for international trade, you have approved changes in the Bretton Woods Agreement to establish special drawing rights.

You have also approved amendments to the Customs Tariff for the purpose of implementing Canadian undertakings in the Kennedy Round Trade negotiations. At the same time, you approved the Anti-Dumping Act and the creation of an anti-dumping tribunal to protect Canadian producers from unfair trading practices. As a further aid to the competitive position of Canadian producers on world markets, you have established the Export Development Corporation with broad financial powers to facilitate sales to foreign customers.

You have approved amendments to the Estate Tax Act, and to the gift tax provisions of the Income Tax Act, which will ensure a fairer distribution of the burden of taxation. Other amendments to the Income Tax Act with relation to insurance and banking institutions will have the same effect.

The Government has initiated a thorough review of the present social security system and of veterans' pensions. Parliament has approved amendments to the National Housing Act to expand the powers of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to assist limited dividend and non-profit housing companies. You also increased the funds available for housing loans to individuals and revised the terms on which such loans may be made.

At no session since the Criminal Code was introduced in Canada have there been such extensive and fundamental amendments of the criminal law. The amendments which you approved reflected the concern of Canadians that criminal sanctions be employed to protect public order, but not to enforce private beliefs.

It was this concern about the use of legal controls to regulate private conduct which caused the Government to establish a committee of enquiry into the non-medical use of drugs.

You have directed your attention to the high cost of the medical use of drugs and by assuring competition in their production and sale without prejudice to safety standards, you have strengthened the position of Canadian consumers.

You have also approved legislation that will protect Canadian consumers from the dangers of certain hazardous products which may be available on our markets.

In order to improve the quality of health, recreation and competitive sport in Canada, the Government tabled the Report of the Task Force on Sport and implemented a substantial number of its recommendations.

Labour disputes of major concern to the national interest were considered by Parliament. Anxious to improve many aspects of management-labour relations, the Government tabled a Task Force Report on Labour Relations which wil provide the background for legislation to be introduced in the next session.

During this session, you have enacted a number of measures to give financial assistance to the farming community. You have extended the provisions of the Prairie Grain Advance Payment Act to provide further liquidity to the farmers of Western Canada. The Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Farm Syndicates Credit Act, and the Farm Credit Act have all been expanded in their application. You have approved a measure to regulate plant quarantine, and to provide or extend compensation for losses due to pesticide residues, animal contagious diseases, and plants destroyed to prevent the spread of disease.

A new measure which you have enacted established the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to improve marketing opportunities for the fisheries industries of Western Canada. The Government has also provided special assistance to the producers of the Atlantic fisheries to help them through a difficult period.

The creation of the new Department of Communications sought to consolidate the responsibilities of the Government of Canada in that field and to assure that recent advances in technology would be made available to Canadians. You approved amendments to the Post Office Act, and a study of the future development of the Post Office was undertaken. An imaginative piece of legislation established Telesat Canada which will provide this country with communications from a synchronous satellite early in the next decade.

In the face of encouraging prospects of resource development in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, you have approved the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act which will provide a new system for the orderly development of oil and gas resources.

A number of other important items of legislation were approved in this first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament which has been distinguished by innovation and reform. This creditable record is the beginning of a comprehensive program of legislation which must be enacted if we are to achieve our common goals of peace, justice and national prosperity.

Members of the House of Commons:

Thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the previous and current fiscal year.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the first session of the twenty-eighth parliament.